

3-27-2017

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 27, 2017

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2017 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 27, 2017" (2017).
Faculty Senate Documents. 270.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/270

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

Regular Meeting #1790
UNI Faculty Senate
March 27, 2017 (3:30-5:07 p.m.)
Curris Business Building (Rooms 1 & 3)
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. **Press Identification:** No members of the press were present.

2. Provost **Wohlpert** commented on two committee's work: The Faculty Handbook Committee and the University-Wide Student Learning Outcomes Committee. Provost **Wohlpert** will continue conversations next year about the mission and learning outcomes of the General Education Program. He mentioned faculty leadership retreats this spring with the Strategic Plan Action Committee and planning for UNI's 150th anniversary. He encouraged faculty to visit the newly renovated Schindler Education Center.

3. Faculty Chair **Kidd** would appreciate leadership of a faculty member to work with students on a Diversity Certificate. He also spoke about the progress of the Faculty Handbook Committee and the possibility of a special meeting during finals week. The handbook will take effect July 1st. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will include a brief closed executive selection to discuss selections for the Regents Faculty Excellence Awards.

4. Faculty Senate Chair **Gould** mentioned that as per the Board of Regent's directive, this fall incoming freshmen at all Regent's institutions will take financial literacy training either online or in person.

5. **Minutes for Approval:** February 13 & 27, 2017 (**McNeal/Burnight**) Passed.

6. Consultative Sessions:

Consultative Session with Associate Provost **Dhanwada** to talk about UNI's annual curriculum process. (See pages 18-30 and Addendum 1) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-faculty-senate-talk-about-unis-annual>

Consultative Session with the University Writing Committee regarding recommendations and survey results. (See pages 30-48) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/recommendation-university-writing-committee>

7. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1322 Emeritus Request for Hans Isakson, Economics; and Patricia Gross, Family Services.

** Passed. (**Campbell/Hakes**): <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-hans-isakson-economics-and-patricia-gross>

1312 Proposal to revise Policy 6.10, newly titled Academic Freedom, Shared Governance and Academic Responsibility (*previously referred to the EPC*)

** Passed. (**O’Kane/McNeal**): <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/proposal-revise-policy-610-newly-titled-academic-freedom> (To be docketed in regular order for April 10, 2017 Senate meeting)

1324 University Level Student Learning Outcomes for Consideration

** Passed. (**Pike/Skaar**): <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/university-level-student-learning-outcomes-consideration> (To be docketed in regular order for April 10, 2017 Senate meeting)

1325 Proposal: Elimination of the additional thirty-two credit hour requirement for UNI students seeking a concurrent undergraduate double degree (two different degrees, such as a B.S. and a B.A. or a B.A. and a B. Music)

** Passed. (**Hakes/Pike**): <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/proposal-elimination-additional-thirty-two-credit-hour>

1326 Consultative Session on draft of new Faculty Handbook

** Passed. (**Walter/Cooley**) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-draft-new-faculty-handbook> (To be held on April 24th, 2017)

8. Adjournment: (**Campbell/Hakes**).

NEXT MEETING:

Monday, 3:30 p.m. April 10, 2017

Rod Library, Scholar Space (LIB 301)

Full transcript of 53 pages with 1 addendum follows

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1790
March 27, 2017 (3:30 – 5:07 p.m.)
Curris Business Building (Rooms 1 & 3)**

Present: Senators Ann Bradfield, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Joel **Pike**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**. Also: Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**,

Not Present: Seong-in **Choi**, Amy **Petersen**, Leigh Zeitz, NISG Representative Tristan **Bernhard**.

Guests: Dale **Cyphert**, Jeff Funderburk, David M. **Grant**, Scott **Peters**, Paul **Shard**, Ira **Simet**, Colin **Weeks**.

Gould: Okay, I’m going to call this meeting to order. Thank you all for coming out to Curris Business Building for our meeting today. We have Courtesy Announcements, so first thing, do we have any press here? Seeing none, I will go on to comments from Provost **Wohlpert**.

Wohlpert: Thank you all. I’ve been getting feedback from the Faculty Handbook Committee that they are working tirelessly, actually put a lot of effort into this and their doing some very interesting and collaborative work. I understand there are some very interesting philosophical conversations going on which I think necessarily anticipate in the short time frame that we have to do this, but I appreciate those philosophical conversations, and I think they are enriching and I do think that we will need to think about this work as on-going next year. We’re not going to solve all the problems, and come up with all of the interesting

solutions that we can in the short time frame that we have. So that group is working I think really, really well from what I understand it. The Student Learning Outcomes Committee are they presenting today? No?

Gould: No, we're going to docket for April 10th.

Wohlpart: They also have been meeting across campus with all the College Senates and doing wonderful work. Remember that this is a requirement for Higher Learning Commission, that we need to have university-wide student learning outcomes, and every program then on campus will need to then revise their learning outcomes to fall in line with those University learning outcomes. If you have seen the report, it is a very streamlined set of learning outcomes which is the most appropriate process. They have also done fantastic work: very collaborative; very inclusive. Next year, we will ask every program to take their learning outcomes and fashion them around these University-wide learning outcomes, and develop assessment strategies if they don't have them, so that we can be prepared for Higher Learning Commission. We will also, based on the recommendation of this group the last time we met with President **Nook**, have a conversation about learning outcomes for our General Education Program in the Liberal Arts Core. We'll talk about what the mission of the General Education Program is, what the learning outcomes will be, and then strategies for achieving those. That's all next year. And then the third thing I want to talk about are some leadership retreats which will include faculty leadership on April 10 and May 8. We will talk about the vision, mission and Strategic Plan Action Committee. The Strategic Plan Action Team, Strategic Plan Action Committee--they didn't want to be called the Strategic Plan Implementation Team, so I suggested Strategic Plan

Action Team, but they didn't like that one either. So they are the Action Committee, has been working on targets, and at one or both of those we will hear updates on their work for the Strategic Plan process. We will also begin thinking about our 150th anniversary: what the priorities are and how we will get there, and we'll talk about the budget. I think those meetings, President **Nook** intends to start them by having conversations about leadership principles, and how we make decisions on our campus. I think it will be an interesting conversation. And then finally, I would just remind everybody that that Schindler Renovation Dedication Ceremony is this Friday at 3:00, which is really, really exciting. If you have not been in the Schindler Education Center since it's been open, I would strongly encourage you to go visit. It is a brand new building; completely different from what it was, which is awesome. That's it.

Gould: Thank you. Comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: Yes. Thank you. Over the past year, mainly in the fall, a committee met together to work on a proposal by the Student Government on a diversity exit requirement. During these meetings we found that the best way forward would be to see if faculty would be interested in working with potentially Student Affairs on creating a diversity-type certificate. Maybe not the name so much. If any of you would be interested in leading such an effort, I don't think I'm qualified to lead such an effort. I teach physics. I would be very appreciative. I was going to send an email out to the Senate to see if anyone would be interested in joining this group. Any comments on that topic? Second thing, the Faculty Handbook is coming along well. We should have some groundwork, not only for a document which will take effect on July 1st, but also our intention is to lay the groundwork

for how will issues that we do not have time to address right now, be addressed in the future; setting a proposal for a standing committee to be working on various aspects of the handbook. We think we will be 90% done by the next Senate meeting, but some factions, and I think it might be useful to postpone that meeting until finals week, depending upon the Senate's if you would be okay with that. It would be a special meeting for a half an hour Tuesday or Wednesday during finals week. However, it is finals week, so I don't know if people would like that.

O'Kane: There will be something we can chew on ahead of time?

Kidd: Yes.

O'Kane: Are you looking for a blessing, so to speak, from the Senate?

Kidd: We're looking to provide ---it's consultative.

Wohlpart: Feedback will be published.

Kidd: The Handbook Committee itself—we are a consultative body. We are not bargaining. We do not have determination, and so neither does the Senate. It's a consultation, though. Mostly, to elicit feedback to see: (A) Are we missing something that needs to go in now? And hopefully we won't do anything like that, but more importantly, I think, [B]: What are the issues that need to be worked over the next year. And more importantly I think, that's going to be the bigger task. And yes, we want to have something for the Senate to look at in advance. That's one reason actually we're concerned about the 24th. It's getting you something to look at in advance.

Campbell: Your statement there was that it would be a half-hour meeting...

Kidd: A presentation.

Campbell: A presentation, but it might be easier if you're just looking for feedback, to send a draft to the Senate and have them email your committee with comments if that's all you really are looking for.

Kidd: One thing that would be useful however, I think, is for the public to comment; for comments to be made public, so we couldn't do that over email.

Pike: My question was: Do you have in mind a timetable for when a draft might be available for review, that's one. And two: Once that draft is made available for us to review, would we be able to share that with our faculty and colleagues for comment?

Kidd: It would be public.

Pike: Timetable? I'm not holding you to it.

Kidd: That's where if we're going to go the normal Senate route for the meeting which would be April 24th, so April 17. I don't think we're going to have something that we think is ready by then. So I'm thinking the end of April.

Pike: I guess finals week tends to make sense to me, although even there I'm not sure to what extent there's time to get feedback from colleagues.

Kidd: I understand that.

Pike: But it's better than a week early.

Kidd: Right. I don't think it would be appropriate if we just came to the meeting and said, "Okay, here's the document." Which might happen with the April 24th deadline that we'd be comfortable sharing with everyone, because once we share it at the Senate meeting, it's public information. We don't want to miss something. So what I would prefer to do is be able to give the Senate something in advance, make it public on the Senate website, and give people at least a weekend or more to review it. I don't have a timeline at the moment, as in, I don't know if that's going to be necessary, but I wanted to see if that opportunity would be palatable.

O'Kane: Tim, are you folks writing this in sort of chapters? The reason I ask is perhaps if you were to finish one, you could make that available earlier.

Kidd: That's something that we might be able to do. Yes. We're working on the sections in parallel. So we have a subgroup working on various sections of the handbook at once. I'd be comfortable with that. I'd have to check with the committee if they'd be comfortable with releasing things piecemeal. Any other questions on that?

Wohlpart: I just really would like to hear what you all are thinking. This is really important, and I know it weighs heavily on faculty's minds. So I think it would be really important to talk about the process, and how we can allow the committee to be deliberative and reflective and take the time that they need, but also get it out to the faculty, so that the faculty can see it and provide feedback before summer hits.

Kidd: Did you want to say anything, Nancy? (**Cobb**)

Cobb: I think you've stated it very well. As anybody could know, this is not an easy task and I think the goal is to have things that operate, but even to pull out what we think needs to be worked on is sometimes a challenge. I agree with Provost **Wohlpert** that we need to hear what you think.

Pike: I would prefer to maximize, given the constraints, I'd like to maximize the time for consideration of discussion which is likely to be, which would mean that we would meet for this during finals week. Again, our colleagues are going to be here. To the extent that they're concerned and want to provide feedback, I think that's going to maximize the opportunity to do that, so I would support that.

Koch: Is this eventually published as a handbook? A pamphlet?

Wohlpert: Probably just online. The University Senate would put it online.

Koch: Is there a Table of Contents? So maybe the Table of Contents could be passed around first, to get a sense of the overall range of topics.

Kidd: Maybe. It's the basic structure of the Master Agreement.

Cobb: Yes. Right now, it's looking at the Master Agreement--what's not appropriate to be in a faculty handbook, and what needs to be in a faculty handbook. I don't know if there are going to be things new, that's not in the faculty handbook. I don't think we can do that at this point.

Kidd: I don't want to. No.

Cobb: We don't have time, so I think the thing is if you look at the topics that are in this year's Master Agreement, you would know what the structure would be. Is that fair to everybody that's on the committee?

Kidd: Yes. We might combine some things. But what we're trying to do is take something that's a bargaining document...

Wohlpart: It's a contract. The Master Agreement is a legal, binding contract, that you can sue over. This is a faculty handbook, which does not have that same...

Kidd: It's going to be University policy, as opposed to contract law.

Hakes: My question is, the revision cycle for master agreement is precisely defined. So once it's signed its law for a few years. This is not of that nature, which seems to me...can it be revised anytime?

Wohlpart: Anytime.

Hakes: Anytime and continuously, so if we wanted a standing committee that was always looking as feedback comes in, and people run into problems with it, it doesn't change or maybe it does change, but it's not on a cycle like a master agreement? It's not binding for a year, or binding for a period of time? It can be revised at any time?

Wohlpart: That's right, David (**Hakes**) and that's why I said at the beginning that I hope we see this as ongoing. I personally think that the really interesting conversations that you all can have, and that the University community should give you feedback about, are what are the topics we should take on next year,

because we won't be able to take on everything that we would want to take on. I think there's going to be a lot of, from what I've heard, interesting things that we can now address because we're outside of bargaining, but we can't take all of it on immediately. So what are the high priorities for conversation?

Kidd: that aspect is actually something we could discuss if there was time in the last Senate meeting especially. What is the structure of such a standing committee? What would be the mechanisms? And we'd have a proposal, of course. That I have high confidence that we'd be ready to discuss. We're just kind of worried about are we going to have everything that we need to have finished for the document for July 1st in advance of that April 24th meeting, so that you have time to look it over, for it to be public for the University. That kind of thing.

Swan: I would say two things, and I'm sure you're doing the first: Following AAUP standards for faculty handbook. It's well established how legitimate universities create and have faculty handbooks. I'm sure you're following that and I would say that's very good to follow that. The second thing is right now about what a lot of people are kind of most concerned about with the removal of the master agreement, and us now moving forward, and that's evaluation of faculty, particularly probationary faculty. Particularly probationary faculty who want to become tenured this next year and promoted. But, other faculty as well, including term faculty and other faculty who want promotion. So how is that proceeding? Some departments in the past have had procedures which no longer exist because the master agreement is gone and wait for the new handbook. But under the previous past master agreement, some departments have procedures that

started already for next year. Of course we can't do that now and so I imagine no one's doing that now since there isn't a procedure yet to go forward with. And so that's the question people are having. Well we can wait, and technically even under the master agreement we were supposed to wait until the fall and that's when we would publish standards and that sort of thing. Is that what...It sounds like that's what we should be doing. We do need to wait until the fall to know what it is we need to do for the evaluation of faculty, such as probationary faculty. So I've said a couple of things there with my second point, and if you could—Provost or Chair or Associate Provost, address these issues.

Cobb: For faculty evaluation, the committee feels very strong that faculty should feel comfortable next year that things are not going to change for next year, especially someone who's in their fifth year. We're committed to them not having to worry about that it's going to be different from this year.

Swan: Okay.

Cobb: And I believe the Provost...

Swan: So that sounds like any faculty that started the process in the spring should be starting the process in the spring.

Cobb: If it's your procedures to do that.

Wohlpart: One of the things that we had been discussing in bargaining that I hope moves forward as a conversation in the handbook, is a conversation about faculty evaluation. Presumably, we would have that conversation next year, even if we came to an agreement about what new process or procedures we put in place. I

would assume there would always be a year lag before you started some kind of a new process. Does that make sense? You have to give people time to catch up to whatever new process that you put out there.

Swan: I agree with that entirely. The facts have been changed from the outside for us though, that we do not have the authority of law, Chapter 20 of the Master Agreement anymore as of July 1st. And so you though, could say you do operate according to the master agreement for the next year, and then we could do that.

Wohlpart: I assume the Faculty Handbook Committee is going to roll what is in the master agreement into the handbook, and hopefully we will bless that and say, "for next year."

Swan: But we won't know that until finals week when we meet, is that right?

Pike: Would the faculty handbook also, because I know there was issues where not every school or department necessarily would follow what was in the master agreement, and under that, there was a grievance process. Would the handbook have some process for addressing those issues as well?

Kidd: That's one of the most complicated parts I think, because we're having to go from a grievance that's mandated by law, to something that's a violation of University policy, and how does that change things?

Wohlpart: Real quickly: There were two chapters that dealt with appeals and grievances in the handbook. One, I think, Chapter 11 is a grievance of the master contract; any violation of the master contract.

Cobb: That's 10.

Wohlpart: That's Chapter 10. That will be gone because we don't have a legally binding document. But, there are appeals processes for faculty evaluation: faculty, tenure promotion. Those will remain. Faculty will have the ability to continue to appeal decisions that are made about things like faculty evaluation.

Kidd: That's Chapter 11.

Wohlpart: That's Chapter 11, sorry.

Cooley: It seems to me like there might be another option towards scheduling this discussion, and that would be to call a special meeting. I believe there's a Monday between the 24th and finals week. Is that correct? That's it? There are no more Mondays? Or maybe we could call a meeting during the week? I guess I would like to express my preference that finals week seems too late for many meaningful discussions and any kind of meaningful feedback from the broader faculty to take back. It's just too late I think.

Swan: But the committee's not going to be ready before that, it sounds like, to give us anything.

Cobb: We can work harder. [Laughter]

Kidd: The idea though again, is to have something available for faculty, for the public, before this special meeting. It's not "Hey, surprise, this is what you're going to look at."

Wohlpart: Which means if you wanted to get it out, you'd have to have it done by the 17th.

Cobb: Which is coming up really quickly.

Kidd: That's where the issue comes in. It's trying to get something out in advance of the meeting, so there can be meaningful discussion.

Cooley: All I can say is we would all be really sorry if finals week rolled around and we never got to have the discussion. We would all be really sorry if it worked out that way. There's a lot of pressure to have something to discuss.

Kidd: We have to have some kind of discussion, yes. But we'd like to be able to say, "Here is the thing. Its entirety. This is what we've got. Not just half of it. Not 75% of it, but all of it, and we would like to get feedback on that document. We would like to get feedback on the procedures that will be put forth next year for all the discussions about that document, because I think there's going to be a lot. Right now, we're just rolling over most things--master agreement to handbook, and we're trying to make sure that we do so in a way that maintains the integrity of the document.

Gould: I hate to cut people off. We have a pretty packed agenda, so.

Kidd: I understand.

Swan: The gist of what I was going to say is that whenever we have this meeting, the Committee and the Provost are going to make additional decisions and changes that come July 1st and will say, "Okay, this is the operational, procedure

for the time being, and the faculty of course meet in the fall, and could continue to discuss these things. Anything that's operational that's obnoxious or problematic, we would say so in the fall, and so while I typically prefer having cut offs, and where things are clear, I have to appreciate in this case Provost **Wohlpert's** decision to let it be operational and changeable as we go for another year. So I think that's important to remember, that whenever we meet, either April 14th, April 24th, May 2nd, there are going to be decisions made after that, that we won't be talking about, that will go into what's operational come July 1st, that then we can respond to; change, the first week of classes in the fall, the second, third week et cetera.

Kidd: Absolutely. My plan was just to send out a poll to see availability. If such a special meeting were required, or we would like one I guess for the Handbook Committee, and see if how many senators are available at certain times. And last quick thing, the committee for awarding the Regents Faculty Excellence Awards. We met and this year, we're at a little faster pace than usual I think, because there's a spring awards dinner that we would like to have full approval of these awards before then. And I think the awards dinner is on April 18th, so we'd like to be able to do this the end of the meeting on April 10th. So that would be the next meeting. It's not on the docket. My fault. I was wondering if that would be an issue. The procedure is to go into executive session to discuss the candidates by name, and then leave executive session and vote on candidates not by name. Would there be any objection to holding that on April 10th?

Swan: Can the Chair of the Senate put that on our Calendar right now? To put it in the docket for next time?

Gould: Yes. I can do that.

Kidd: That would be great. That way they can get their letters before the dinner included this spring. Thank you.

Gould: Thank you Faculty Chair **Kidd**. Just a quick head's up, as you know for the past year or so, financial literacy has been one of the things that the Board has really emphasized. Starting this fall, we will be having financial literacy training for all incoming freshmen. This is a requirement from the Board and it will be in effect at all three institutions. It's not a course. No credit's given. It's not an exit requirement. All incoming freshmen will be signed up, and they can do it either online or in person. I just wanted to give all of you all a head's up as faculty members that that is coming down the pipeline. So we have some consultative sessions today, and some docketing items, so I'm going to move pretty fast so we can accomplish everything that we need to accomplish. Next up, we have minutes for approval. I forgot to put the Feb. 27, 2017 minutes on the agenda. I'd like to add those. Kathy said she sent them out to you all faculty. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes from February 13, 2017 and February 27, 2017? So moved by Senator **McNeal**, seconded by Senator **Burnight**. All in favor of approving the minutes, please say "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." [One abstention] Motion passes. First thing we have for consultative session is one with Associate Provost **Dhanwada** to talk about UNI's annual curriculum process.

O'Kane: Were we going to approve the 27th?

Gould: I said both minutes. I'm sorry.

O’Kane: I’m sorry. I thought you just said the 13th. Okay. I only need to abstain from one of them.

Gould: So I am going to turn the floor over to Associate Provost **Dhanwada**, so she can brief us on the annual curriculum process.

Dhanwada: I have a brief PowerPoint. I haven’t taught in a while so I want to get that going so we can follow along. It’s not long. Four slides; five if you count the title. I wanted to have a consultative session because I wanted to describe what is going to be something that we are going to continuously have with the curriculum process, because we have moved to a one-year cycle. At the beginning of this year, there was some discussion about well, “Why do we have to docket at the head of the order?” I wanted to come in and have it docketed and then discuss it at the same meeting, and there was some discussion and I understand that. So I wanted to kind of explain to you all the timeline that we have, and the reason why we have this timeline, so just to kind of keep this in mind, is that we have to think about, because it’s a year, we’re talking, so if I take this particular cycle into consideration, so right now we’re at the College Senate level. We’re discussing things to go into our curriculum, the catalog, for 2018-19. And so we are talking about those things, and we’ll be talking about them in the fall, and then it continues. If we want to get the items that we are currently talking about and will discuss in the fall, into the catalog so that it goes into effect for summer of 2018, we kind of have to follow this timeline. Actually, we’re introducing new things every year. So that’s why I wanted to go through it. So the Board of Regents requires (we have our normal curriculum that we approve everything I bring you the college packets and so forth), but within those are certain items that actually

need additional approvals. So these are the items that have Board of Regents forms that we have to fill out, if you're going to have these changes made. So, any time you're introducing a new major or degree, if you are terminating a major, suspending admissions, or suspending the program, or reducing admissions to a particular program, if you are going to change the name of your major or your department: That is another form. And if you are going to change the length of your major. Many times, it's if you're increasing the length of your major. If you're decreasing it, it's not as...you're okay. You're decreasing the major.

Swan: But you still have to fill out the form?

Dhanwada: Yes, you do. The problem is when you're increasing, so I just wanted to point that out.

Swan: What's the 'Reduced Admission of Majors Degree' business? Do we have a number of people currently that we can admit to each major?

Dhanwada: No. Let's say you're thinking about slowing down and you want to close. Since I've been there, we have not had reduced admissions. I don't know what that exactly means either. It's usually suspension of admissions. And so the difference between suspension and termination is, "Hey we want to take a break. We're not doing something right. We're going to suspend admissions. We're going to fix it, and we're going to come back." And so on that form you have to say how you're going to fix it, what you're going to do, how long you need. Whereas termination we're going to terminate, and the questions are "Do you have a teach-out plan?" and all of those types of things. The reduced admissions-- I'm not exactly...

Wohlpart: That would come into play if you knew you were going to terminate a program, and you announced that in advance, but we never do that. We teach out our programs, and then there's no students in our programs, and then we terminate. We've never had a situation where we've terminated a program and then reduced the admissions to teach it out. That's true for the other institutions as well.

Swan: What you just said about suspension, we could have a program that attracts lots of students that the faculty feels has problems, and then they could reduce the number of students they're going to take to try to fix the problems, but not suspend it. I guess that would be a ...

Dhanwada: That's a possibility. So for these changes or for these approvals, there are as you know, multiple levels of approvals. So the first one, and this is just for the new majors, is that any new major that we introduce has to go before the Iowa Coordinating Council for Post High School Education. (ICCPHE) And so this is basically filling out a form and talking about what types of things. And this form is sent out to all of the Higher Ed institutions in the state of Iowa. So everybody is doing it. We routinely get programs that are being newly offered, and so at this point what we can do, is if there's something that we know is directly in competition, or there is something odd about it or whatever, we can comment. So this is done just for new majors. So that's an external stakeholder. That has to be done for any new major that we send out. If this is a new major, we'll do all of these. The others have to go through the bottom three. So first, it gets introduced at the Council of Provost (COPs) meetings. These meetings now I think---there

was discussion last year---I didn't know exactly how we were going to meet separately from the full Board meeting, but I think it's been decided that we will be meeting--The Council of Provosts, meets the day before the full Board meeting. So the Council of Provosts, so this basically is all the provosts from the three Regents institutions. The next step is that once it gets approval from the Council of Provosts, it goes to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. It doesn't go immediately. So, if we're at one meeting, it can't just go to the next day. Many times it's the same day as the Council of Provosts. So we are talking the next meeting---the next Board meeting, is when ASAC will meet. Then finally, it does have to get approved by the full Board of Regents, so ASAC (Academic and Student Affairs Committee) is just a subcommittee of the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents, and what they've decided is, earlier it used to kind of pass through ASAC, and then the next day it would go and be introduced at the full Board of Regents, so they would normally vote on it. It was an agenda item and it would go through. However, in order to increase transparency and allow for transparency for all members, they are now telling us that "Well if it passes through ASAC at one meeting, you've got to wait until the next meeting, so that all of the Board members have a chance to look at it, and then they will approve it." So now we've talked about three Board meetings to get things through. And so the urgency of this process I think will become apparent to you once I show you my next slide with the dates. I'm going to just talk about the new major or degree, which we had I think last year. We had three majors: two BAS degrees and the BA in physics. This process has started much earlier, because any new major has to be put on the Board of Regents Program Planning List at least six months in advance. It has to be on that list for six months in advance, and so

we're pretty good. Every April I ask the deans, do they have new programs or majors that they want to introduce and put on the program list, so they can do that and they can then begin talking about it for fall, and put it up through the spring through the College Senates and so forth. That usually is a six-month period. So that's going on, and before I can even take it to that first approval, which is the COPs. ICCPHE can be done generally, before COPs which is new to me, because they told me I couldn't do it before. And now they've said that you can actually submit the ICCPHE form before it's brought to COPs [Council of Provosts]. Before we do COPs, we have to have approval by internal governance, and Faculty Senate is the last step of that governance process. So we need approval before it can get to COPs. Just to kind of outline the schedule; kind of put into context, remember, I told you it's COPs, the ASAC committee, and then the full Board of Regents. Okay? So here are the meetings: So September 6th, October, December is telephonic. I have no clue why they've got two days for telephonic meetings, but I'm just listing it, what they have. And then we have the following year. I don't know the dates exactly right now, but generally what they have is a February meeting, and an April meeting. Generally, what we would want is to have everything done, so that we can pass everything---all our curriculum packet for the college, the courses that I bring to you, in addition to all of this stuff that I've talked about: the new majors, the name changes, and all of that. We would like to have everything completed so that the full Board of Regents can actually pass all of that information; can approve it, because we want to try to get it into the catalog. So that's the target goal. So if we think about having the COPs meeting by April, the October meeting, the ASAC---this is how I see it; this is how I've planned for it. So then let me talk about our schedule, because we have to fit

this in with this other schedule. So for fall 2017, we start on the [August]21st, so our first UCC meeting before it obviously comes to you, it has to pass through the University Curriculum meeting. So we meet on Wednesdays. So the first meeting would be the 23rd. I don't know if this will be the fact, but I know it's scheduled for the first day of class, so it is the 21st. I think it's the 21st. However, because two weeks from there, from that date is Labor Day, we won't meet. Right? So do you meet the following week? I'm hoping, because that's what that is.

Gould: I'll have to look at the calendar.

Campbell: Why are we meeting on the 21st? I thought we met on the second and fourth?

Gould: That's the fourth Monday of August.

Dhanwada: So that's even better. So it would work. If you met on the 28th, then the 11th should work. So, the first Faculty Senate meeting would be on the 28th. That's fine. So the second Faculty Senate meeting would be on the [September]11th right? So usually what the UCC has been doing, at least in the past two years that I've been there, we've been completing, kind of going through all of our college curriculum packets and everything by the second half of October—the mid to the third week of October. So what I usually do is I start submitting to you earlier than that, because we do two colleges at a time, I submit the college curriculum packets to you the second half of October, whenever I can get the meeting. So the first meeting in November. So as you see, if you kind of look at the dates. Maybe I should go back. The September 11th is now, since we're meeting on the 28th, now that we are meeting, we can meet and

I can have those items to you to docket. Okay? So I can do that, and then we can have the meeting on the 11th. That will work for next year. But keep in mind it might not work every year. It works for next year, which is good. But if we had a year like this year, that would be a problem. Okay? So all of this is not in vain. So I had asked for permission to docket and then discuss at the same meeting. That was my reasoning behind asking you all permission to do this. Keeping in mind that this is going to be a routine thing, that those items that I listed earlier on: new majors, suspensions, terminations—those types of things, name changes—all of those things, we're going to discuss first at our very first UCC meeting, trying to have that discussion and approve or not—or whatever it is, get through that at the first meeting. I would put all that together; try to get that on the docket so that it could be docketed. Hopefully, I could get that on the 28th. Of course, you know we're meeting on the 23rd, so I won't have the two weeks or the 10 days. It will be right away, but I hope to have that consideration for docketing. And so then it could be discussed at the second meeting. Okay? So again, Senators have to be looking at that information, and be ready to discuss it at the second meeting, is I guess what I am asking. So, I put a little asterisk over here that the stuff that the big packets, all of those course changes, edits, and restatement of majors—any new minors or certificates, those don't have to go through the Board. So they're all combined for you to take a look at. So I don't need that to go earlier. That will be discussed with the colleges and so forth as normal. I wanted to make sure that everybody understood that as well. Okay, so just to kind of give you a head's up on what may be coming, and I've just taken a quick look at. Because right now it's going through the college senates, so I don't know if this is what we'll end up with, but that's what people have submitted. We are looking at

two new majors, two possible termination/suspensions, and there are some name changes, but it's hard for me to look up, and I've asked the Registrar's Office. There's a couple of name changes and again, I'm not sure of where it's at because I haven't seen it coming through the curriculum process. So it's hard when you have a name change to put it through. Some people don't realize that you still have to put it through the curriculum process. So there may be those things, so I just put a question mark by that. These are all my slides. I just wanted to give you an idea of my timeline, of trying to get the information approved through the Board, so that we can have it within the catalog for the following year. And then our timeline with the governance structure, and how we get through the governance--have everything approved with the Board meetings as well. I'm trying to make my way through. I'm happy to answer any questions. Did this make sense?

Walter: We have a time crunch, obviously, and it's not going to change. It's going to stay this way for the foreseeable future.

Dhanwada: Unless we want to go back. Which I don't know if we need to go back.

O'Kane: Do you know if there's a way that things could be worked so that the COPs meeting can flow right into the ASAC meeting if it was the same two days? That's would save a month.

Wohlpert: The COPs meeting happens in the evening after the ASAC meeting.

O'Kane: I should have remembered that.

Dhanwada: ASAC is usually in the afternoon and then COPs is usually...

O’Kane: Because if we had that extra month, that would really take the weight off.

Dhanwada: I know. I agree.

Campbell: The other question was whether you could bring it to us, those few things to us in April.

Dhanwada: They’re right now, right? And so they haven’t gone through the college senates.

Wohlpart: So Russ, (**Campbell**) that’s up to the colleges.

Campbell: You could request that the colleges start that process two months earlier, if the Faculty Senate wanted them at the first meeting in April. For example, just ask the colleges to start their process as early—the departments to start their processes for those things earlier.

Dhanwada: The one limiting factor to that is we now have the Leapfrog system, and you can only have one catalog at a time. And so what we have to do is we’re trying to—remember earlier I talked about publishing the catalog? We need to get all of that information. What we’re trying to do is, we’re trying to have the stuff for the departments to actually put into Leapfrog by February 15th. That’s about as early as we can get it right now to get that. So we’ve got to take out the old catalog. So then we give them about three to four weeks. It depends on the college senate. Some college senates are beginning their deliberations the first week of March. It takes about two weeks to get their information into Leapfrog.

Others are starting a little bit later. But my understanding is they are starting earlier, because they do want to get through all of this. It also varies for the colleges. CHAS is huge. They've got a lot of programs. If they have a lot of departments submitting curriculum changes. So, I understand that. I think we can do that, but I think sometimes it might be logistically difficult for some colleges to do that. I know that they are trying to start earlier. I believe the year before they started so late, and they weren't getting everything done. And so they are starting earlier, just to have the discussions and move forward.

Campbell: But they could also go away from the department by department procedure in the colleges, and have the college senates consider the expedited proposals in March.

Dhanwada: They could do that. I agree. That is something that we can certainly talk about with the college senate chairs. But again, that's a further discussion. I'm talking about what we have right now. I agree.

Kidd: Would it be possible on the years especially when there's a problem with docketing in the order, for the information that goes to the UCC just to go to the Senate at the same time? That could be edited after UCC then?

Dhanwada: Yes. What I have been submitting to you is kind of a summary. And so if you want just what we get, I can certainly send you that but...

Kidd: I was thinking about what if people wanted to look at just the new majors, not the rest of the stuff.

Dhanwada: And that's what the first meeting is. It's the stuff that we need to address, but it's all on Leapfrog. We all work through Leapfrog. I can certainly send you directions about how to read it. It's all on Leapfrog. Everything that we talk about at UCC, we're referring to what's on Leapfrog.

Kidd: If you can send links to Leapfrog, that would be...

Dhanwada: I can certainly send you that. That is not a problem.

Kidd: That way, for the people who want to look into it, they could.

Dhanwada: Yeah. I can do that. Not a problem.

Kidd: Great.

Swan: So when we went from the two year to the one-year cycle, I remember voting for that. Understanding that it wasn't to try to squeeze things that happened in two years into one year, it was to just keep going through the process as it needed to be done. And then once something was approved, that department or person wouldn't have to wait more than a year for it to go into effect. And so we could keep doing that, and then all this crunch doesn't matter. What you're presenting here is a crunch, because you're trying to do something in a year that really does take two or more years. When we were in the two-year cycle, it took more than two years to get things approved.

Dhanwada: Four, to go into effect.

Swan: To get feedback back and forth, and then it was approved at the beginning of the catalog cycle, making that department have to wait two years. Just wait-- it's all approved. The Board's approved, et cetera. With this one-year cycle, the

idea would be that you wouldn't have to wait more than one year, even if it's approved. So that's the real value. Why are we forgetting that? I guess there's a lot of pressure to just say, "Just do it by this date," to get it in.

Dhanwada: My understanding is that I've heard a lot of discussion as well about "Our curriculum is so slow," so if we do need to move anything, and introduce any changes, before it was taking four years to get through. So we're just adding changes. We don't have when will it go into effect? When do we put it in the catalog cycle? So if we do continue that, it will just go in every two years. Now, one of the things, not last year because we had only three new majors, but the year before we had six. The pressure that I was hearing from departments was because we had so much stuff, and we couldn't get it through on time, it was like, "Has it gone through? Has it gone through?" because we talked about introducing this major. You can't really discuss anything until the approval goes. So, if you say, "We do have this new major," because you're talking about it, but we haven't put it in our catalog, they don't really know anything about it. It's hard to recruit for those, because you'll have to do it in that second year.

Swan: I'm not understanding that. So if it's finally approved right after the catalog has been approved, you only now have to wait one year. It is one year. But you only have to wait one year before it's in the next catalog. Not two years.

Dhanwada: Right. So you only have to wait one year, but when...

Swan: And that's only if it's approved there. If it's in the middle of the cycle, it's just half a year before it goes in.

Dhanwada: So let's say we don't get it approved by February. We put it into the new catalog. You're putting things... The catalog is constantly changing, because you're adding. I don't know if... that's a question I would like to ask the Registrar because...

Swan: What question?

Dhanwada: Whether if we're adding new things as we're approving them.

Swan: No. It's just once a year. The Registrar adds things just once a year.

Dhanwada: Right. That's right. So if ...let's say if we did this, and it didn't get through—it didn't get into the 2018-19 catalog, it would have to wait for the 1920 [2019] edition.

Swan: One year.

Dhanwada: In addition, because we're actually discussing this in fall of 2017, approving it in fall of 2017, right? We're going through that process, and it wouldn't be introduced into the catalog until the 1920 [2019] catalog.

Gould: We have time for one last question.

Swan: Only if it's not approved in time.

Dhanwada: Right. But if we're going to do these types of things, we do have to get approval. Because if we miss this approval, then that's what I'm saying. It would go into the [19]20 catalog.

Cobb: Did you say 1920?

Dhanwada: 2019.

Gould: Thank you so much. Next up, we have a consultative session with the University Writing Committee. They came to us last spring at the last meeting of last year with some recommendations that we voted to accept. But we wanted them to flesh things out a little bit. They are back with more information, so I will turn it over to David (**Grant**) and Dale (**Cyphert**). Did you want me to pull up the...

Grant: If that's helpful. I do have also extras if folks would like; a print-out report. It's mostly just survey data. Mostly appendix. Does anybody need those? Let's go down to "Writing Expectations." That would be fine. The rest is overview, Chair **Gould**, so thank you very much. You asked us when we last met with you to get more into the details and the specifics of how we could implement our proposal of more writing instruction within the curriculum, without adding any extra anything; make this pretty efficient and usable for everyone in the way that we've outlined it. We went through, we surveyed the faculty and the faculty I think certainly understand and want this kind of--some sort of mechanism by which we can improve the communication abilities of folks without adding courses; without adding credit hours, and without necessarily taking over a particular class and sacrificing content in a particular area. That is also very important. It sounds like, (I just noticed Scott **Peters** walked in) I've talked with him about the communications piece that's going on, a little bit. It seems to be all part of a piece that we can move forward with. Our survey indicated that really this could be done, and probably is already being done, though there's very minimal kinds of resources involved. There's no new program that needs to be unveiled with all kinds of trumpets and horns and things like that. But really it's a matter of

perhaps just convincing—having our University Writing Committee be something of holding folks accountable so that when they say their course is writing-enhanced, that it really is. It's that simple. A lot of folks are already doing it. If they're not doing it, according to our survey data, most are not doing it in the LAC, but most are doing it in their program of study. We have two courses. One which would be a middle level, could be the LAC. There's writing instruction—there's writing-enhanced instruction happening there. And then our second course would be something in the major, in a program, preferably a senior 4,000-level course. A lot of folks, significantly more faculty said that they're doing something like that or know someone who is doing something like that in their program already. So I think this is something that folks are aware of, but we have not been able to look at this before. We haven't been able to see this before, because we've just sort of let it go, and said, "Well, folks do what you want." So we're getting a bit more clarity on that. The major things that we are really asking for is again some commitment, and making sure that things that we already have in place are augmented along this way. We could do things for example through the Center for Education and Learning. Faculty said, they wondered, "How can I streamline?" They understand. It's going to take some time to do this kind of teaching. What can they get as far as resources in terms of supporting that, so they get some workshops or something so they can better manage their time. They can better understand what all is involved in promoting a deep level of writing and engagement with writing in their field. The other thing that we found was that a little bit less than half didn't quite know how to match it up exactly with their field of expertise. I think there is an understanding that "Hey, this is a way to deliver content through some writing instruction." But maybe they don't quite

understand. “I get the idea, but I’m not quite sure how to actually make that real.” Some of the things that our committee could do, that CO could do, that other groups can do would be something that we’re asking for full implementation of this. Given Provost **Dhanwada** latest talk, we had some sort of sense that this complexity was out there, so our time horizon in asking for these things would have all departments, within the next four years, have all departments self-assess or do whatever they need to do. I’m sure that it doesn’t take anything more than looking at your programs and asking, “Where does this really happen?” It doesn’t take a full, detailed assessment. Within four years, have departments identify, “These are the ones we want to have a check-mark on the process. That check-mark sends the syllabus to us; some of the assignments maybe, and we could ask for assignments and we would vet it and say, “Yes. That’s writing-enhanced. That’s getting writing into the curriculum. That’s holding folks accountable,” and then we’ve moved forward and go from there. Anything you want to add?

Grant: That’s how this thing can happen. We don’t have to go what we call the Cadillac model of writing programs, where you hire a writing director and you’ve got staff and program. That happens on many campuses, even some that are our size.

Cyphert: I think that’s the perspective. I’m not sure who was here the last three years this has been going on, but we were asked to do an assessment of other university’s writing programs, and we were really behind the curve. So then the next request was, “Well, what can you recommend?” and we said two more classes would get us above average. It wouldn’t necessarily make us the best in

the world, but it would certainly make us above average. And then, the next request was, “What would this actually look like? How can we flesh this out?” So this is really the same recommendation--two more classes, but more detailed in terms of what that would really look like here. And the survey that we just did in the last couple weeks or month, we knew there were a lot of things going on, but we hadn’t ever had a systematic look at what this would look like in each department. And there were quite a few departments where they already do have one or two writing courses already as part of the degree. So, what you said you wanted was something to put flesh behind it, so that you could make a university requirement, and this I think says it’s possible. There are some departments that would need some assistance in either professional development. Over time it does mean that we can’t put too much pressure on class sizes, even if they have class sizes now that accommodate writing, that would then be a catalog requirement and be maintained in some way. It’s looking not impossible.

O’Kane: Do you envision that these courses would be marked as writing-intensive in the catalog? In other words, would students easily be able to see that this is an intense writing course?

Grant: I envisioned it that way. It would be something that if a student wanted to know that they’re meeting the requirements, that that would be honored.

Cyphert: It would be totally up to the department as far as whether those were handled as electives in a department for instance. A department could say, “We’ve got five courses here that we know are writing instruction. Not just a

bunch of writing, but actual instruction, you could take any one of those.”

Another department could say we’ve got two classes in our curriculum that’s already required and we’re going to make those writing instruction. Or, you could have a department that said, “What we really need are some LAC courses at the upper level.” One of the implications that’s actually explicit here is the mid-level course is what you might consider an argumentation course, where it could be across the curriculum. The senior-level course is envisioned as more of a disciplinary course. But even then, multiple science departments could say, “Yes there is a science writing course that would fit that bill.” It’s very much open to how a department would want to do it. What we’re recommending is that there be a curriculum change that would designate what that would look like in every program, but it certainly could look different in every program.

O’Kane: The reason I ask is I wonder if there’s a potential impact on enrollment. My impression is, I teach a course has lots of writing. I’m not sure if the students knew that ahead of time if I would get as much enrollment as I get.

Cyphert: If what we’re saying is that all majors should have two writing courses, in addition to the freshman comp, so at least you’d be in the same boat with everybody else. A student couldn’t pick and choose a major going, “Oh well, I’ll take math. It won’t have any writing,” because every major would be obligated to have a writing element.

Campbell: I want to go back to that you said you would be vetting the course. I’m looking at “Provide writing instruction without slighting course content,” and the departments will determine what writing they need for their majors and what

happens when you say, “We do not consider that to be a writing course”?
because this is not supposed to increase the length of our majors. I was looking
where you were comparing it to the LAC oversight and the College of Education
oversight. For the LAC, it’s quite different than saying, “We are going to control
your major,” we’re saying we are not taking your course and putting it in our
program, and the College of Education has a special constraint that they must
make sure they satisfy state requirements. And here, if you have oversight, it
looks like you are getting oversight over our major.

Grant: Well for one, I wouldn’t call it oversight. We’re looking at accountability.
And so if you look at the things we’re suggesting that make this writing-enhanced:
That it’s genre-appropriate, that it conforms to having some multiple drafts and
opportunity for revision. I don’t care what you write about. I don’t care how you
do it. You put that in there, that’s pretty good. We want to make sure that the
two things that are necessary for writing instruction happen. Consistent practice,
so that’s consistent so that’s what’s happening in mathematics isn’t something
different than is happening over in psychology, as far as the practice goes. Right?
That the messages we give to students are fairly consistent. Because I’ll tell you
one thing right now, a lot of students, and a lot of people I think, are confused
and they just throw up their hands and they’re like, “I’m not even going to bother
with writing because Dr. **Swan** said one thing and in 5th hour my course and then
Dr. **Cyphert** said something else, and I just can’t make sense of it.” Right? We’re
not overseeing your course at all. What we would do is, we would say, let’s be
accountable to these things that we have here, and we could send back and say,

“This proposal is really good. Could you make some changes here, there or elsewhere?”

Campbell: And if we say no?

Cyphert: It’s going to be up to the UCC. What we proposed, this is totally a proposal, because we have no power. But our proposal would say, it would be something like “getting a library consult during the curriculum process.” Our major is going to designate these two courses. We look at it and we say, yeah. It’s a class that includes some sort of writing assessment or feedback in writing instruction, and all the things that are in those three paragraphs. And if it didn’t, we would say, “We think these things ought to change,” and then it’s up to the UCC basically. There’d be no power.

Campbell: That is giving the UCC a different role.

Dhanwada: That’s right. It is.

Campbell: Of decertifying a major, rather than certifying a major.

Dhanwada: And is it a major or a course? You’re talking about courses.

Cyphert: We are recommending that every major include nine units of writing. Now three of those would presumably be Freshman Comp, and then another course that could be a Liberal Arts Core course. There’s lots of options. There’s a lot of different stuff you can do. And then a third level that would probably be more disciplinary.

Grant: The fact too is it's not as if there's one group that says, "This is what writing is." It has to be a team effort. It has to be. I know T.J. **Hitchman** teaches, but I know he teaches writing in mathematics. Right? I know Doug **Shaw** will do that. I know lots of folks in math. I'm sure they're very good at it, but I am not a mathematician. So I can't necessarily judge the quality of the writing. I can certainly go in and talk to folks that have and say, "Here's some things that you could do in order to support the students you have, and these are my recommendations because I want you to succeed as a good teacher."

Kidd: Just a thought. I don't know, as far as curriculum proposals go, I don't know if you can tell majors what to do. We can make an exit requirement that some courses designated as writing-enhanced would have to be taken by the students, but I don't think we're going to be in the business of saying, "You will offer this." Or you will decide this.

Cyphert: No.

Kidd: But some majors could. They could not choose anything.

Cyphert: This is our understanding from three years ago. It's been a long conversation. Our understanding is that it's the Faculty Senate's role to set a University graduation requirement.

Kidd: Exit requirement. Yes.

Cyphert: And if you want to pass a foreign language requirement or you want to pass a nine units of writing requirement, or whatever--that's up to you. We were asked to recommend the best way to implement such a requirement, and we've

tried to make this what would actually work. Some envision of how things really do work around here. But there are a lot of things like, who would actually look at the courses? Well, we thought that the Writing Committee—it's cross disciplinary, it's been in effect for 25 years, seemed comparable to some other committees that might be able to give you that sort of consultative thing that you'd need in the curriculum process. But this is totally just our best guess of what it would look like.

Pike: I'm getting a little lost here. Let me see if I kind of understand. So, for example, you could choose for the third course to say you need to take a course over in LAC and not within the school, or you could say, the Accounting Department has a research, an accounting research-oriented course which requires writing and that would.

Cyphert: With a qualified professional writer teaching it, too.

Pike: But that would then qualify for that third course. So you have a lot of options. But what the consultative portion would be to say, "Here's our syllabus. Here's what we do. Would that meet the requirement?"

Cyphert: Does it really look like a writing class? Okay, just to give you a little background: A research project a couple, three times ago was to do benchmarking of the best writing courses all over the country, and one of the things we found wasn't exactly what we were looking for but how they go bad-- Where is the total meltdown? And the total meltdown, to be honest, was when they put it in the department's hands, and the departments got to say, "Okay, those are our three writing courses." And after another few years, the

department heads were going, “Oh, gee, enrollment’s pretty bad in that class. Let’s make that our writing class.” Then you really have some bad stuff going on. There’s got to be some curriculum approval process somewhere along the line, and this just seemed like...

Pike: I want to stop there, because I don’t think it’s curriculum approval, it’s approval of courses that they meet the requirements for being a writing class.

Cyphert: And then the other half of it though, and if you’ll look at number three in that same section, is some outcomes assessment. And we really do think that if writing is in fact part of the curriculum assessment for the entire University, that there would have to be some coordinated effort to make sure that the writing was actually being taught in those courses. That’s pretty down the road though.

Grant: If I could add to that, we’re saying that writing-enhanced has a very specific meaning. So for example, there may be classes where a professor assigns the 25-page research paper and says, “Here’s the assignment. Go write it,” and you live or die by that. That’s not what we’re saying ought to happen and in fact, that’s one of the things we know often produce very good results. It works in some contexts, alright. It doesn’t work in all. So that’s what oftentimes folks hear: It’s a writing class, we’re going to do a lot of that. So maybe that speaks to Senator **O’Kane’s** comment too, is that it’s not, “I’m going to do a lot of writing.” Maybe you are, maybe you’re not, right? But you’re going to be coached and supported and understand some of the basic concepts of writing, so that when you go out in the world you understand how writing actually works, and hopefully

that puts you on a lifelong path of learning more about writing, rather than saying, “I am the best writer because I have a degree from UNI.”

Dhanwada: I just want to kind of think about what the UCC’s role in this is again. So departments are supposed to come up with their courses, and you’re saying probably two, because you’ve got one in the freshman year. So to me, I think the UCC ...okay so then they submit to the Writing Committee, and so the UCC would be looking at restated majors.

Cyphert: Presumably, yes because we don’t have that in our majors now at all.

Dhanwada: Right. So what I’m saying is that’s what UCC would be looking at. We’re not looking at the courses per se and saying “this is now writing-enhanced.”

Cyphert: Our recommendation is that it be by program.

Dhanwada: Right.

Cyphert: So a program would look at its own program, and I suppose at some level you’d have to know that the program met those requirements, so even if they didn’t change the program, I guess there’d have to be some restatement to designate what they’re...

Dhanwada: And that’s what I...That’s perfectly fine. The UCC can do that, and look at the major and say, “Oh look, there’s those two in there.” I thought earlier we were going to be looking at these courses.

Cyphert: I could imagine a department saying, “You know what? We’ve wanted to do this forever. Let’s do it.” Or maybe, “Oh my God we can’t think of anything else,” let’s do it. Whatever. That could be one option, although these days, I don’t think that’s going to be very common.

Campbell: If I could go back to Faculty Chair **Kidd**’s comment, which is that we are looking at an exit requirement of three writing courses, then it seems like what you’re really proposing is that there be an exit requirement of three courses, and most departments will identify courses within their department which will satisfy them, perhaps at levels one, two, and three. That would be a lot easier to implement, and a lot less of this friction about controlling the major. I think we do have courses in math that will satisfy this, but if math said, “This is all nonsense,” then they would just have to take two more philosophy courses, or something like that to satisfy the exit requirement, and it would not impact on our major.

Pike: That was my confusion. I understood this to be an exit requirement. It isn’t like everybody’s got to go change their majors. That doesn’t come in to play, and in fact for most majors, it’s simply a matter of saying, “So where do we already require this?” Or if we don’t, “Where are we going to put it in here?” And then passing it through some sort of vetting, to make sure that it’s going to meet the exit requirement.

Grant: One of the things that I hope this has benefit down the road in that one of our big difficulties was trying to figure out: Is writing happen in certain courses, or is it happening more as a function of certain instructors? So I might teach an intro class, or I might teach a mid-level class, and several of my colleagues might

also teach that same class. But we all have our different approaches to it. Maybe mine, it's me as the instructor who's really forwarding the kinds of writing-enhanced opportunities. But that doesn't necessarily happen across all of those classes, so it's sort of hit and miss for the students. Hopefully then, that would foment some discussion among that department and among that program's faculty who'd say, "Why is that? What can we do? Maybe we'd all like to do that. Would you share that with us?" So we all can benefit from having these kinds of greater nuanced discussions and choices in how do we as a group really want to meet these kinds of exit requirements?

Cyphert: it's one of those situations where a lot of good stuff is going on, but because we can't point to it, we can't even claim it. But—and this may speak to Senator **O'Kane's** issue too, if you're the only one teaching writing in multiple sections, there are some disadvantages to that. We all understand that. But if a department says, we want this to be a writing instruction course; a course that includes some writing instruction, then you have some consistency and the students all benefit, regardless of what they take.

Gould: One last question?

Schraffenberger: My question was—maybe you just addressed that to some degree. This is a course change in the description in the catalog. The course will be changed, not just this individual class that's offered in a specific semester. So it won't just be designated one semester. It will be writing-enhanced. This will change it fundamentally, right?

Cyphert: Departments can do whatever they want, but that sounds crazy.

Grant: If they wanted to keep restating it, they could.

Cyphert: I can see where you would have some kind of a system where by department manager approval, a course would be considered one of the electives that would work. I mean, anything's possible. And in some departments, that might make sense.

Wohlpert: There are some challenges with that. Remember that this is going to have to go through the Registrar's and have to be designated in the catalog systems so that if students...

Cyphert: That would have to be by department approval or student approval or something.

Wohlpert: My point is that you couldn't have one section of a course that meet this requirement, and others not. It would have to be every section of that course that was taught. Students will have to know it, so when they get done with their...

Cyphert: There has to be some way to make sure that all students get all those courses. That's part of what we're trying to do. Some students come through, they get lucky they get a lot of good writing classes. That's great. Other students come through and they don't get lucky, and they don't get the writing instruction and that's not fair to them.

Swan: But we do have writing-enhanced sections of courses with all the other course sections that don't take it. So we could label a section of a course.

Cyphert: See that's an administrative sort of thing. The department would figure out how they wanted to handle it.

Schraffenberger: I was going to suggest that as an alternative. And I think in that case, advising becomes much more important, so that students know when they're taking one course over another, and advisor would know, "Well this is a semester I think writing will be more valuable to you." I think that the conversations can be more meaningful.

Wohlpart: Let me say real quickly that I understand that happens now, but it's not an exit requirement now. So when a student checks off the box they took this course, regardless of what section it is, it counts as a writing core, so it's part of the system.

Grant: Unless I misunderstand you, we've got things like philosophy and world religions, and we've got intro to Literature and others that are designated as writing-enhanced. And that fulfills the LAC 1-A writing requirement; which is a graduation requirement. Now, not all sections of those courses do that. Only ones that are specially marked as writing-enhanced.

Cyphert: And that's still only the first three units. We're asking for six more.

Grant: And what is it now, 40% of students are taking that first requirement elsewhere, before they come on campus. So they're very confused. They're told so many different things.

Swan: I know we're done, but I think it's bad to talk about this as an exit requirement. You don't want to establish barriers. We're already meeting these needs. Let's do it more subconsciously, more deliberately, knowingly. And everything is an exit requirement in some way, right? So when you conceptualize something as an exit requirement it makes it an onerous, terrible thing that one has to go through.

Cyphert: No. This ought to be a promise to our students.

Swan: An opportunity.

Cyphert: Yes. Look at the wording on this.

Gould: Thank you for all of your work on this. We still need to continue the conversations, but...

Swan: It sounds like you're ready for a proposal, aren't you? You want action to be taken?

Cyphert: I don't think...We are not proposers. We are an expert group of some sort.

Campbell: Nothing's going to get done then.

Cyphert: You keep asking us questions. We keep giving you answers. I think there would have to be a motion from a Senator to get a proposal.

Campbell: I think a petition to the Senate would get the action.

Kidd: It doesn't work that way.

Cyphert: Since we are a committee of the Senate, I'm not sure that's really appropriate.

Swan: Sure. Committees make proposals all the time.

Kidd: The next step would be to, if you need guidance, that's fine. It's very challenging. Make a curriculum proposal. That's fine. Curriculum proposals come before the faculty.

Cyphert: What kind of curriculum proposal would that be?

Kidd: If you'd like help to write it, I can assist.

Cyphert: But it's not a course addition. It's not a program change. I don't know what it is.

Dhanwada: It's a catalog change. It's under "Other."

Cyphert: Of course! I never looked there. I should have known.

Kidd: That's the next step I think, unless the Senate has strong objections to what they've said. Everyone has had a chance to say what they like or don't like about it.

Schraffenberger: Is it something that the LAC should also be...I mean it sounds like you're linking it to, we have this precedent in the way we do writing-enhanced requirements in the LAC. We're going to have to have this conversation anyway.

Cyphert: We took it to the LAC two years ago.

Grant: And the UCC.

Cyphert: And the UCC and they were all saying, “Yup, this is a great idea.” But again, there had to be some discussion of resources and capacity.

Gould: Thank you so much. We have a couple of minutes left. We have some items that we need to get docketed so I would like to move on to that. First item up for docketing is for an Emeritus Request for Hans **Isakson**, from Economics and Patricia **Gross** from Family Services. Can I have a motion to docket? So moved by Senator **Campbell**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes**. Do we have to vote? All in favor of docketing Calendar Item 1322, Emeritus Request for Hans **Isakson** and Patricia **Gross**, please say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes.

Next up we have Item 1312. This is the Proposal to revise the Academic Freedom, Shared Governance and Academic Responsibility Policy. Scott **Peters** came and talked to us in the fall. We sent it to EPC and requested that the Provost and Anita **Gorton** be consulted, and they have done so, and so they’re ready to bring it back to Senate. Any questions?

Swan: Provost **Wohlpert**, this proposal, how does this—does the change in collective bargaining affect your office’s consideration of this when it came to you? I don’t know when it came to you; maybe before those changes. Is it still obviously okay? Do you need to reconsider it?

Wohlpart: No changes need happen because of the changes to collective bargaining.

Swan: It's okay still with your office. Okay, good.

Gould: Can I have a motion to docket Item 1312? Moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor, please say "aye," all opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. [At least one nay was audible]

Gould: Next up, we have Item 1324, University Level Student Learning Outcomes. Provost **Wohlpart** spoke about those at the beginning. Do we have a motion for that?

Swan: I know we're going very fast Chair, but I heard many 'nays' on that last vote. And I don't know that you heard the nays, but maybe you did and you judged that they were more yeas to nays. And the Vice-Chair says that there were more 'yeas,' and that's everybody's feeling? I heard more 'nays' than I expected.

McNeal: We could revote.

Swan: We could revote. I'm asking.

Campbell: I would be interested in why people voted nay. A little more discussion?

Swan: Or that we just get it accurate is what I want. I don't mind a second.

McNeal: Why don't we revote? We could use a show of hands.

Gould: We are going to go back and revote on Item 1312. All in favor, please raise your hand. All opposed, please raise your hand. [Laughter] Any abstentions?

Campbell: I heard those nays.

Swan: I know.

Pike: I heard them too.

Gould: So back to Calendar Item 1324. Provost **Wohlpart** spoke about these in his comments. Jeff **Funderburk** and Scott **Peters** were co-chairs of the committee to consult with the college senates about potential university level student learning outcomes and they are ready to bring those before us. Are there any questions for them before we vote? Seeing no questions...Is that a question or a motion?

Pike: I was going to move we docket it.

Gould: Can I have a second to docket Item 1324? Senator **Pike** moved and Senator **Skaar** seconded. All in favor of docketing Item 1324, please say "aye," all opposed, please say, "nay," all abstain, please say "aye." Motion passes. Okay Docket Item Number 1325. This is a proposal that has been submitted by Ira **Simet** who is here, to eliminate the additional 32-credit hour requirement for UNI students seeking a concurrent undergraduate double degree. Does anybody have any questions? He's here. Do you want to say something really quick about the proposal?

Simet: Sure. The University makes a big distinction at the moment between a double major, say a bachelor of arts in two different areas of concentration, and a double degree, which from my department, the Department of Chemistry and Bio-Chemistry, is typically a bachelor of science in one science major, and a

bachelor of arts in the second department. If you do that double degree, there's a 32-hour addition, above and beyond the requirements for either of the contributing degrees, and we're only now becoming aware that more and more students are interested in doing that double degree, and are bumping into that barrier, and are pulling back and just either choosing to do a double major, typically a double B.A., or they're eliminating the second degree altogether. We'd like to restore some flexibility to those students. We did a little background to try to find where the 32-hour requirement came from in the first place, and nobody has a sufficiently long institutional memory to tell us where it's from. We looked at other institutions, and they're all over the map as to what they do. So we figured we would put a proposal forward to eliminate the 32-hour surcharge, and then we'd bring it here after consulting with the other collegiate senates to see what they thought; to see what you thought about removing that requirement.

Campbell: Have you looked at the other two Regents universities in the state and what are their policies?

Simet: Iowa State looks like us and Iowa is the exact opposite. They have no additional requirement.

Pike: Is this specific to getting two degrees from the University of Northern Iowa versus potentially coming from another university with a degree and simply getting a second degree?

Simet: Yes. It's concurrent degrees here at the University of Northern Iowa.

Pike: So it's specific to that?

Simet: Right. There is other language that addresses a degree granted by another university, and then coming back for a second major or a second degree here. And we're not going into that, it's just students doing two degrees at the same time.

Gould: So can I have a motion to docket the proposal? So moved by Senator **Hakes**, seconded by Senator **Pike**. All in favor of the motion, please say "aye," all opposed, please say "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Item 1326 is a Consultative Session on the draft of a new Faculty Handbook. I don't know if we should go ahead and docket this, or wait until we figure out the timeline a little better.

Campbell: I think you can just schedule a time as a special meeting or something or docket it. Or schedule it as a consultative session.

Pike: If we don't docket it now, then we're either going to have to docket it for immediate discussion, or put it off when we do docket? Whereas if we put it on the docket now, it could be discussed at any future meeting.

Gould: That's true.

Pike: That's correct. Okay. It would make sense to docket it now.

Gould: All in favor of docketing 1326...Can I have a motion to docket?

Walter: So moved.

Gould: Vice-Chair **Walter** moved, Senator **Cooley** seconded. All in favor, say "aye," all opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." [One abstention] Motion passes. I am

going to hold off since we are running over. I am going to hold off the Consideration of Docketed Items for the next meeting. So can I have a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Campbell**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes**.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Curriculum Process and Timeline for the one-year cycle

Kavita Dhanwada

Faculty Senate presentation

March 27, 2017

Curriculum Process Approval

- Board of Regents requires earlier approvals for several procedures
 - New majors/degrees
 - Termination/Suspension/Reduced Admission of majors/degree
 - Name change of major/department
 - Change in length of major
- Several levels of approvals needed
 - Iowa Coordinating Council for Post High School Education (new majors)
 - Council of Provosts (all)
 - Academic and Student Affairs Committee (all)
 - Board of Regents (all)

General Curriculum Timeline to get through BOR approvals

- New major/degree
 - Needs to be on BOR Program Planning List for at least 6 months
 - Should have completed approval from internal governance (Faculty Senate) PRIOR to submission to COPs
 - BOR meetings in 2017-18:
 - September 6-7, 2017
 - October 18-19, 2017 - **COPS discussion*
 - December 5-6, 2017 (telephonic) **ASAC discussion*
 - February 2018 **BOR discussion*
 - April 2018

General Curriculum Timeline

- UNI start of Fall 2017 semester: August 21, 2017
- First UCC meeting: August 23, 2017
- First Faculty Senate meeting: August 21, 2017
- Second Faculty Senate meeting: Sept 11, 2017
- UCC generally completes curriculum: second half of October
- Submission of college curriculum packets: second half of Oct, early Nov* to Faculty Senate

Would like to docket the items needed for approval at the second meeting and have discussion that day (September 11, 2017)

Would like to take permission for docketing and moving to head of the order at this time so it does not come as last minute request

*Does not need to go through early approvals – usually needed by February meeting

Potential items for discussion

- 2 possible new majors
- 2 possible termination/suspension
- ? Name changes (department or major)