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1. Courtesy Announcements

A. No members of the press were present.

B. Provost Wohlpart said that work continues on the draft Academic Master Plan that will be re-sent to faculty with additional information about developing strategic goal areas. Also, the Diversity Action Plan developed through the Diversity Advisory Committee, and the Teacher Education Strategic Initiative will feed into the Academic Master Plan. Lastly, he discussed the possibility of presenting a budget program at the next Senate meeting, prepared with Michael Hager. He added that next year maybe a “very challenging budget year,” based on legislator comments.

C. Faculty Chair Peters reminded members about the upcoming UNI Day Feb. 22 at the Capitol and explained his efforts to schedule and showcase faculty and department projects that may be of particular interest to legislators. He updated members on the Quality Initiative Project selection process that UNI is required to do for accreditation. There were 36 proposals submitted. The committee will be meeting soon to select a few of those projects, which after faculty feedback will be submitted to the Provost in March for his final selection.

D. Faculty Senate Chair O’Kane stated there is a possibility that the Senate would not meet on January 25, unless Provost Wohlpart and Michael Hager are ready to meet with the Senate regarding the 2016-2017 UNI budget. Also, O’Kane is one of a 15-member Search Committee for the Chief Diversity Officer, which is chaired by Robert Smith. He welcomed NISG Vice President Paul Andersen and noted a title change for Kavita Dhanwada, from Interim Associate Provost to Associate Provost.
2. **Summary Minutes/Full Transcript** of December 14, 2015 approved. (McNeal/Zeitz)

3. **Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**
   1293 Emeritus request for Patricia Geadelmann, Physical Education

   ** Motion to docket in regular order (Walter/Smith).

   1294 Curriculum change - Earth Science
   (requested to be added at the head of today’s docket)

   ** Motion to docket at head of today’s order (Dolgener/McNeal).

4. **Consideration of Docketed Items**


   ** Motion passed (Zeitz/Walter).

   1291 1185 Emeritus request for Michael Fanelli, Educational Psychology and Foundations, and Tony McAdams, Management

   ** Motion passed (Zeitz/Smith).

   1292 1186 Approval of Revisions to Curriculum Handbook - Fall 2015

   ** Motion passed.

5. No New Business

6. **Adjournment** (Gould/Walter) Passed.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, January 25, 2016, Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30

Full Transcript follows of 17 pages, including 0 Addendum.
Regular Meeting # 1774

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Jan. 11th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. – 3:56 p.m.)
Oak Room, Maucker Union

Present: Senators Ann Bradfield, Jennifer Cooley, Forrest Dolgener, Todd Evans, Lou Fenech, Senate Vice-Chair Gretchen Gould, David Hakes, Tim Kidd, Bill Koch, Ramona McNeal, Senate Chair Steve O’Kane, Gary Shontz, Nicole Skaar, Gerald Smith, Jesse Swan, Senate Secretary Laura Terlip, Michael Walter, Leigh Zeitz. Faculty Chair Scott Peters, Provost Jim Wohlpart, Associate Provost Nancy Hill Cobb, Associate Provost Kavita Dhanwada.

Not Present: Arica Beckman, John Burnight, Cathy DeSoto, Xavier Escandell.

Guest: Barbara Cutter.

O’Kane: Good afternoon and happy New Year everybody. We haven’t seen one another since last year. So here we are. I don’t think we have any press although I’ll make the announcement: Are there any press here? I don’t see any. We usually start off then with comments from Provost Wohlpart.

Wohlpart: Welcome to 2016. It’s going to be an exciting and inspiring semester. Nod in agreement: It will be. I thought we were done with the snow. I thought that we get about 40 inches and I thought that we already had our 40 inches [laughter] and it’s still snowing and on Sunday I did begin to experience really cold weather. But sometimes, I understand it doesn’t go above zero, sometimes for weeks. We have lots going on in the spring semester and everybody’s always got lots going on but we will continue
working on our Academic Master Plan. We have a very good draft, which we sent out as soon as we had approved it in the Steering Committee so that went out kind of late. We will resend that out with some information about developing strategic goal areas. That’s the next exciting component to what we will be doing, and then we will find ways of having University involvement in developing the objectives under those goal areas. That’s one of the big things that will be coming. We are developing a Diversity Action Plan through the Diversity Advisory Committee. That is on the there will be opportunity for feedback on that. And the Teacher Education Strategic Initiative: all of those things will feed into the Academic Master Plan and become components of the Academic Master Plan as we move forward. Last semester we talked about the idea of a budget presentation to the Faculty Senate. I think that it would be a good idea for us to pick a Faculty Senate meeting for us to do that at and I would ask you all to do that, and I would prefer not to do it in this kind of space because it’s kind of hard but maybe in more of a classroom kind of area so that we can all see a screen because it is a pretty detailed presentation that Michael Hager and I put together. So, whatever point you all want to that, I think that would be a good idea.

O’Kane: We can have this room set up that way.

Wohlpart: Okay. However you all want to do it, it would be great. I assume you all have been following what’s happening with the State now that the session has begun. The House and Senate are about $150 million apart on what constitutes ‘new money.’ If the House reigns, then there’s only really
about $30 million in new money. Or if there’s $150 million, $124 is already spent; already appropriated, so there’s very little new money if you go with the House numbers. The Senate has about $100 million more than that, I think, $120-$150 million more than that, so this is actually going to be a very challenging budget year based on the feedback that we’re getting from our legislator comments. So one of the reasons that I’d like to do move forward with the budget presentation, hopefully in February, so we can begin to talk about the ramifications of a wide variety of possibilities coming out of the legislative session. Right now, we have about a $7.5 million deficit for next year. We need to figure out what we’re going to do if we don’t get any funding, get some funding from the State and I’d like faculty participation in that as early as we can get that.

**O’Kane:** We have essentially nothing on the docket or the calendar for two weeks from today. So...can you do that?

**Wohlpart:** Oh dear. So I can see.

**O’Kane:** Let me know and if it works, I’ll get it on the next agenda, otherwise, (I’m skipping you Scott for a moment) there is a possibility we’ll not meet in two weeks, unless the Provost (**Wohlpart**) wants to have the presentation.

**Wohlpart:** If we can pull it together. We’ve done this presentation for Department Heads. They gave us lots of feedback, about other details that would be helpful to have added from a faculty perspective. So we have been working on adding those details. It makes it a more complex
presentation, and it will probably be about an hour-and-a-half long presentation and discussion. But we haven’t finished that and I know Michael (Hager) is out most of this week and I’m in Des Moines a lot of this week. So, I’ll have to see if we can get this together next week. Other questions or comments or considerations?

O’Kane: Okay, comments from Faculty Chair Peters?

Peters: In terms of the legislative session, one thing I’m working on is for UNI day, the date of which escapes me, but it’s in February, (Feb. 22). I’ll send you an email about that. We almost always send a lot of faculty members to UNI Day at the Capitol. There’s often several dozen faculty members there, but most of us spend our time standing at tables waiting for legislators to walk by us. That doesn’t seem like a very expedient use of time and so I’m trying to identify and I’ve been working with the deans and the Provosts to identify programs that might be particularly appealing to the Legislators, and I’ll be contacting faculty members in those programs to talk to them to see if we can get some appointments set up for some specific legislators, since they’re going to be there anyway. The only other thing I had to say is that the Quality Initiative selection project is to pick the project we’re required to do for accreditation purposes. We had 36 proposals submitted. The committee is sorting through those proposals right now and we’ll be meeting in about a week and a half to winnow them down to a handful of proposals and we will come back to the University community and ask for feedback on those potential projects before we
then pass along by about the beginning of March, the top two or three to the Provost for his decision.

**O’Kane**: Thanks, Scott (Peters). I just have a couple of comments, really just one comment and that is that the Search Committee for the Chief Diversity Officer has been put together. Robert Smith is chairing that search. I happen to be a representative on that search as well, and if I remember right, there are about 15 persons on that search. That’s really all I have. Okay, Minutes for Approval. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes from December 14? So moved by Senator McNeal, second by Senator Zeitz. Any questions, comments or discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes, say ‘aye,’ all those opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ Motion passes. You’ll notice there’s a consultative session on the agenda. That’s my error. I forgot to take it off, so we in fact don’t have one of those.

**O’Kane**: But we can now move to Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing, the first of which makes me sad to see Pat Geadelmann go. She has requested emeritus status. Can I have a motion to place her on the next docket? So moved by Senator Walter, second by Senator Smith. Any discussion? All in favor ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ Motion passes.

**O’Kane**: The next calendar item is Calendar Item 1294, and it is a Curriculum Change for Earth Science and this one has been requested to be added to the head of today’s docket and I’d like to hand that over
momentarily to Interim Associate Provost Dhanwada to update us on why we should do that.

Wohlpart: And if I might say, she is no longer ‘Interim.’

O’Kane: Congratulations!

Dhanwada: Thank you.

Wohlpart: We have to be very careful about those words around here.

Dhanwada: So I am asking for this request because it was a mistake on our part. In fall of 2014 the Department of Earth Science had requested a name change. They had gone through the processes of consulting with the other two Regents universities and doing all this work, and they had sent it in, and it somehow wasn’t placed on the Provost’s website. So as you know, there was a transition that occurred in July. I came in, Colleen Wagner left, which was big. We didn’t have anybody in the position, and so I didn’t know that was what was on--- it was supposed to be on there, and so what happened there was I think Dr. Morgan, the department head of Earth Science did send something. But we never, in the intermediate times, we just never got it on to the Provost’s website. We didn’t know. We went through the curriculum process: We had Earth Science, we had approved changes and everything, but this was never done. One of the reasons is that on Leapfrog there is no form to request such a change, so you have to go through it separately and we had to put it on the website in that way. So, therefore, Dr. Morgan wrote to me and said, “What happened to that?” And so I sent all of the information that she had sent earlier on to the UCC
committee, and requested that we didn’t meet in person, but I sent all the information that was presented on the Senate website as well, and requested them to vote and had discussion and so forth and it was unanimously approved that the name change should occur. And so the reason why I would like it to come to the head of the docket is because we have to submit all of our curriculum changes to the Board of Regents by January 26th and I didn’t want to wait until the next Senate meeting, especially if we’re not going to have one. So I wanted it approved so that I would have that authority to send in that documentation to the Board of Regents, you know, along with other changes that we’re making, so that’s why I’d like it to come to be discussed today.

O’Kane: So we need a motion to place this item at the head of today’s docket. So moved by Senator Dolgener, seconded by Senator McNeal, any discussion about moving it to the head of the docket?

Swan: So, I think I’m understanding you when you say that this had been approved before, or it’s just now approved by email?

Dhanwada: It was approved by UCC December 16. Before that by email.

Swan: The department proposed it and it went through the system but it got caught.

Dhanwada: No. They had not proposed it because all of the paperwork. So basically all of the other things that they had proposed went through the Leapfrog system. So we went through everything. It was not brought up
when we were discussing the Department of Earth Science. We did not have any of this documentation on the Provost website either, so I didn’t bring it up. So basically it was not discussed and so therefore when Dr. Morgan wrote to me, it was probably three or four days before I sent it out to the UCC, she had had the letters—the consultation letters, the approval letters, all of that had been done. It all has been done. Everything has been done. It just failed to be passed during our curriculum cycle meeting.

**Swan**: In the consultations, no one has had an issue with the name change?

**Dhanwada**: No. It passed through the CHAS Senate.

**Swan**: All of the appropriate people have consulted?

**Dhanwada**: Yes, especially the other universities also having changes in the departmental name, so the deans have been consulted. There’s letters of support...

**Swan**: I think I interrupted you, you were saying…the CHAS Senate had looked at it...

**Dhanwada**: had looked at it separately, yes. Yes.

**Swan**: Thank you.

**O’Kane**: Any further discussion of whether or not to docket at the head of the order? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion please say ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions ‘aye.’ Motion passes so we can actually move now to that docketed item. And you can see here a summary behind me of what’s going on with the name change. So when someone is ready, if we can have a motion to approve this name change.
Zeitz: So moved.

O’Kane: So moved by Senator Zeitz. Thank you. Seconded by Senator Walter. The floor is now open for discussion.

Hakes: So you said there was no concern about the name change? But was everyone informed who might be concerned?

Dhanwada: Yes. They had proposed a new major, Environmental Science, and so basically that went through the curriculum process in 2014. Okay? So it actually has gone through. So what the name change is for is basically to try to more accurately reflect the majors that they offer, which would be both Earth Science and Environmental Science. So that’s why they wanted to change their name. So they did that afterwards. They did consult, and like I said, the form wasn’t there, so they did go through the CHAS Senate. There was discussion there, but it was approved.

O’Kane: Was there any concern from the CHAS Senate to your knowledge?

Dhanwada: I think there was some from the Department of Biology because it’s Environmental Science, but it was approved so there was some. I think it was more for the major itself and that was earlier. The name I think again, a little bit from the Department of Biology but the idea is to more accurately reflect the majors that they offer.

O’Kane: Anything else? Okay then, all in favor of approving the motion please say ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions ‘aye.’ Motion passes. Thank
you, Kavita. We now move to ...there is no New Business... so we move to Consideration of Docketed Items. Docket Number 1185 is an emeritus request for Michael Fanelli of Educational Psychology and Foundations and Tony McAdams from Management. May I have a motion to approve the emeritus status? Yes, Senator Zeitz, seconded by Senator Smith. Do we have anybody here who would like to say something about these two folks?

Smith: I will speak to the outstanding contributions that Tony McAdams has made to Business Education not only on our campus but nationally. He has written one of the leading textbooks for many, many, editions used in the Departments of Business. In addition to being a traditional textbook, it’s been widely accepted that Tony is outstanding in the classroom and outstanding as a scholar, but he’s a wonderful colleague. As an aside, when McAdams was the chair of the Accounting Department Search Committee from 81-89, he was the first UNI person I met, when he picked me up at what used to be the Holiday Inn. Tony and I go back a long way. He’s a wonderful professional colleague. He is an outstanding member of our academic community and known both far and wide.

O’Kane: Thank you Senator Smith. Anybody else?

Zeitz: I’d like to say something about Michael Fanelli.

O’Kane: Yes, please Senator Zeitz.

Zeitz: For a couple of decades we worked together down at Price Lab School. He has a true love of students and he really brings the best out of students. When Price Lab School closed down and he moved up here, I sat
in on a couple of his classes and it was really student-based learning and he has also done a great deal of publications, things that are quite significant.

**O’Kane:** Thank you. Anything further? Hearing none, then all in favor of the motion please say ‘aye,’ opposed/against, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ Motion passes. And we move to our last docket item for the day, Docket Item 1186 Approval of Revisions to the Curriculum Handbook. Are you going to handle that?

**Dhanwada:** Yes. I will handle that I guess. So let me just begin by saying, that this was our first year of our one-year cycle for curriculum. It was crazy. I was new. It was crazy. So that’s why I have to come back. There was a lot of things we kind of went through, two years ago, Chair Peters was the one who had revised the handbook. This was the impetus behind doing this again this year. There was just changes as we went through with UCC, the timeline was a little different and it wasn’t as accurately reflected as we needed it, because things were being submitted September 15 when we actually met August 26 because we had new programs, new degrees, all of these things happening that we had to get going to get the Board of Regents Approval, and Iowa Coordinating Council and we had a lot of different deadlines pushing it. And so to kind of change and to more accurately reflect that the UCC would actually be sane going through the process, we took a look at the timeline and we made some changes. We incorporated the new degree program that has been passed which is the Bachelor of Applied Science Degree, so there’s wording in here for that.
There are those changes. If you’d like, I could just go through, unless you’d like me to answer specific questions I can do that as well.

**O’Kane:** [referring to the document on the screen] Is that’s the document?

**Dhanwada:** That’s it. It’s not though the entire handbook, it’s mostly about timelines. I will say there are some changes to ...(oh there’s Barbara [Cutter] to the GCC procedure as well, and she can talk about those if you would like. We had just a couple of changes that was actually a recommendation that was given by the Faculty Senate two years ago, and it wasn’t taken on, so we were trying to go back to that recommendation. I can certainly talk about any of these if you want or if you have specific questions--- however you want to proceed is okay with me.

**O’Kane:** Questions about the procedure? It’s pretty straightforward.

**Dhanwada:** Yes. The thing that I just made some copies of is the diagram. I am kind of going through there, making it more clear and then putting in dates so that it’s more clear for the people who are actually going to be doing this. When we expect certain things. The other thing that we really changed a lot on...I’m trying to find this table...which is basically a timeline we have. The schematic is shown, but this tells you exactly who is responsible, what needs to be done, what’s the deadline date and so forth. Hopefully this is much more clear to the people doing the curriculum process. Okay? I will say there is one other thing that we really would like to highlight, which is one of the things we have at all levels, at the College Senate level as well as the UCC level, is the idea of budget. So Senators are
always asking, “You want a new class. You want this you want that. What’s’ the budget for it?” And so we’re always asking, “Have you talked to the Dean?” So we don’t know the implications. By the time we get to the UCC, we’re still asking that question which is really frustrating because we’re two levels away and it’s very difficult to get the answers. The department heads can come and we can ask the question, but it’s not fully resolved. So one of things that we’re really trying to do is we’re trying to hold this accountable. So there is a form, Form K, right? What is that form? There is a form that is a summary form, of all the different changes that the department is making. And so what we want is we want that to be completed by the departments and be sent to the dean. It’s a Word document. So it is a dynamic document, and if there are things that the dean does not agree with, that we are not going to be able to do this, or we can do this if we have funds, or whatever comments, so we want that included and that form should be sent back to the department, so that they know as we move forward that the College Senates now have an idea. They’ll be better informed and then when it does come to the UCC, we are better informed so then we’re not just reconstituting the same conversations that we have been having. That is the one change that we’re trying to incorporate.

O’Kane: Further comments or questions?

Peters: I just wanted to thank the committees and the College Senates for the work this year. I know that especially the first time through the one-year---we call it a one-year cycle, but it’s a one-plus-year cycle--- is a little bit different. And also just to note that as one of the people who combed
through the Curriculum Handbook, and made revisions last time, I really, really, hope this happens every year because it’s a lot easier to make slight changes every year and slight alterations each year than it is to sit down once every seven years and look through the entire handbook and realize how much of it is out of date and problematic.

O’Kane: Thanks. Anything else?

Dhanwada: I will just say one other thing about the GCC procedure. Do you want to say that Barbara? (Cutter) Or do you want me to...about the consent items.

Cutter: All we did on the GCC level is to make it parallel to the undergraduate level, as the Faculty Senate asked us to do a few years ago, which is to divide it between substantive and editorial changes. Editorial changes can move on to the Consent Agenda. So the biggest example is “seldom offered courses.” Why should we be discussing those individually?

Dhanwada: Which is what we’re doing right now at the UCC level.

O’Kane: Anything further? (Pause) Seeing no more comments, let us vote on the motion. All in favor of approving, please say ‘aye,’ against say ‘nay,’ abstentions please say ‘aye.’ Motion passes, and we’re actually done with business for today. Except for one small thing. We have somebody to welcome: That is Paul Andersen who is the new Vice President of NISG.

Andersen: [applause] I was here last year and I’ll just be filling in until April 15th when the new President and Vice President are selected.
O’Kane: Thank you. We need a motion to adjourn, or we could stay another hour. Moved by Senator Gould, second by Senator Walter, all in favor? We’re out of here. Have a great week.

3:56 p.m.

Submitted by,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:
3:30 p.m. Monday, January 25, 2016
Oak Room, Maucker Union