

3-22-2010

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 22, 2010

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2010 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 22, 2010" (2010).
Faculty Senate Documents. 843.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/843

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.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

3/22/10

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/08/10 meeting by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz asked senators to be sure to attend UNI's Commencement, May 8, 2010.

Discussion followed on the feasibility and appropriateness of refreshments after commencement to encourage social interaction between faculty, students and parents.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1036 Inclusion of 48C:011, 48C:004, and 48C:004 or 48C:013 (6 total hours) to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #934 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Lowell. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Wurtz reminded senator's that the draft of UNI's Strategic Plan is available at . There will be a special Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan on April 5, 2010.

Chair Wurtz also stated that there will be a Spring Faculty Senate Retreat, Friday, May 7, 2010 9:00 A.M. to approximately 4:00 P.M. in the Oak Room, Maucker Union, including all senate representatives as well as those that will be newly elected.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

930 Creation of Liberal Arts Core Coordinating Committee -
Liberal Arts Core Committee (*tabled from 3/08/10 meeting*)

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) Coordinator, asked that the Senate leave this item on the table, as it was difficult to get things accomplished during spring break when students and many faculty are gone. She will be more prepared to discuss this at a future meeting.

931 Transfer of Non-Liberal Arts Core Courses for Liberal Arts Core Credit - Liberal Arts Core Committee

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

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion by Senator Hotek to call the question; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to approve Transfer of Non-Liberal Arts Core Courses for Liberal Arts Core Credit failed with one abstention.

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities and Fine Arts Senate

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

Laura Terlip, College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) Senate Chair, was present to discuss this with the Senate.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to table for discussion after the Faculty Senate's May 7, 2010 Retreat with the understanding that the Senate cannot take action but they can craft a motion to be addressed by the Senate at the next regular meeting by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Neuhaus.

A brief discussion followed.

Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 3/22/10 1680

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Michele Devlin, Bev Kopper, Michael Roth

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 3/08/10 meeting by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz asked senators to be sure to attend UNI's Commencement, May 8, 2010.

Senator Patton encouraged those senators that are planning on attending to call the Registrar's Office as soon as possible to order apparel.

Discussion followed on how past commencements were organized, including refreshments which encouraged social interaction between faculty, students and parents.

Senator Patton, UNI's Registrar, noted that it would probably be too late to arrange any type of refreshments for the morning ceremony because of the transition time between the morning and afternoon ceremonies. His office would be happy to fund a social gathering after the ceremonies in the future, and noted that they have done so in the past.

Provost Gibson stated that her office would be willing to contribute to the expense of such gatherings.

Chair Wurtz commented on the past discussion regarding budget cuts and class sizes, but some of the loudest voices were those that talked about the small classes with personal interaction. It does reflect badly on faculty to not be present at such an important event.

Senator Patton added that money for such things comes from the graduation fee paid by students and no state money is involved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

1036 Inclusion of 48C:011, 48C:004, and 48C:004 or 48C:013 (6 total hours) to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #934 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Lowell. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Wurtz reminded senator's that the draft of UNI's Strategic Plan is available at . There will be special Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan on April 5, 2010.

Chair Wurtz also stated that there will be a Spring Faculty Senate Retreat, Friday, May 7, 2010 9:00 A.M. to approximately 4:00 P.M. in the Oak Room, Maucker Union, including all senate representatives as well as those that will be newly elected. She has contacted a facilitator for that meeting but has not yet received confirmation. She asked senators to also send her suggestions for possible facilitators. A tentative agenda has been sent to senators, which includes our governing documents, processes and procedures, all of which are approximately thirty years old, with the hope to get these all up to date. Things that senators would like to have considered to be added to the agenda should be sent to her.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

930 Creation of Liberal Arts Core Coordinating Committee - Liberal Arts Core Committee (*tabled from 3/08/10 meeting*)

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) Coordinator, asked that the Senate leave this item on the table, as it was difficult to get things accomplished during spring break when students and many faculty are gone. She will be more prepared to discuss this at a future meeting.

931 Transfer of Non-Liberal Arts Core Courses for Liberal Arts Core Credit - Liberal Arts Core Committee

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

Senator Neuhaus asked for input from Dr. Morgan on this.

Dr. Morgan replied that this item was drafted by the LACC. This is an issue that she has had to deal with for many years, many times from students who took a course at UNI and did not receive LAC credit but whose friend did for the same course taken at a community college. It has been a long-standing problem for the LACC with how courses are brought in from transfer students and given equivalence here at UNI for our courses and LAC credit. Theoretically a student could take five classes at a community college and complete Category 3 and Category 5 but if students take those same five classes here at UNI they don't any LAC credits. This is unfair to all students involved.

Dr. Morgan continued, noting that the argument has been made in the past that this is unfair to transfer students, that they would have less counting towards their degree and would have to make up more courses because they took these courses at a community college which counted for that community college's gen ed program. It's also the case that students need a certain number of elective hours, noting that not all majors have the same number of hours, and those hours could be used as electives. It removes the confusion that students have about what really does count for LAC credit. With the catalog and other references not being printed, students don't always have the list of LAC courses in front of them. Students tend to listen to their friends more than their advisor and they need to have the right information. This plan would put all the courses on the same playing field. They are also looking at two different course issues, the courses that UNI has as equivalents to our courses that count exactly as the course in the major; if it doesn't have that LAC credit it shouldn't have it. If it's a course that UNI does not offer, such as an introductory environmental science course, that can come in and count as LAC credit if it meets the requirements of the LAC. If courses fulfill the LAC requirements they will be allowed in as LAC credit.

Senator Patton, UNI's Registrar, stated that one of the historical reasons for this is that native UNI students know the UNI LAC program. Students do get degree audits and can get them at any time. That's not true for transfer students, as they didn't go to another institution under the idea that they would come to UNI and pattern the courses they take at the other

institution to fit UNI's category. The intent of the LAC is truly that, the Liberal Arts Core, not necessarily purely defined by our list of specific courses. As example, the Senate has an item docketed today about expanding our own LAC by including general communications-type courses. It would be very disadvantageous for transfer students, elongating their times to a degree and he's not sure exactly for what purpose if they have truly had had some kind of general knowledge of a liberal arts core course from another institution. Why is that not good enough to meet the requirements at UNI? The native UNI student is advised, does have a degree audit, does meet with advisors, and should follow the UNI program outlines.

Senator Van Wormer asked if this is about students with an A.A. degree? It was clarified that this is for students that have had some community college credits and then transfer in specific courses. We must consider that these students may go to another college that would lean over backwards to accept them.

Senator Patton clarified that these transfers could be from any college, not just community colleges.

Senator East reiterated the proposal, that courses that do not count for LAC credit that aren't transferred in as equivalents to LAC courses would count, or do count? The environmental science course Dr. Morgan used as an example, there's not an equivalent here at UNI and it would not transfer in as LAC credit because there is no equivalent under the proposed policy.

Dr. Morgan responded that that course may be transferred in because it may follow the guidelines for the LAC. Because UNI doesn't have a course like that, that science course may, if it's appropriate for a LAC science course, count for LAC credit as an introductory science course.

Senator East continued, stating that the proposal seems to say that students with A.A. degrees gets credit, but if a course doesn't count as an equivalent LAC they don't get LAC credit for it.

Dr. Morgan replied that is correct.

Senator East noted that the example Dr. Morgan used seems to be an explicit example of it not counting for LAC credit, it doesn't transfer in as an LAC course because there is no such course, but they'll get LAC credit anyway.

Dr. Morgan replied that is often the case currently.

Senator East reiterated that with the policy that would not be the case.

Dr. Morgan responded that it may be the case depending on the course, in which case the Record Analyst should consult with the LACC about the various courses. A student request form could also do it.

Senator East continued that if we're going to have a policy in which the LAC overrides whenever they wish, why have the policy?

Dr. Morgan noted that there may be cases where it doesn't and it would have to be a case-by-case basis. She's trying to be as flexible as possible and flexible as it will be with any kind of LAC. This should not depend upon what our current LAC is like or what courses we currently have. They could decide to put Human Sexuality in the LAC, a very popular course that transfers in but it's not currently in the LAC. If it's put into the LAC then it can transfer in as an LAC course. If the LAC is changed this would change with it in terms of how transfer courses are evaluated.

Senator Breitbach stated that what Dr. Morgan is saying is that as long as it meets the global criteria for that category, there doesn't have to be a specific equivalent course, as long as it meets the global criteria.

Senator Breitbach continued, as a parent, not an instructor, she would say "yes", especially as a parent of a student who's going to transfer from another institution to UNI, she wants to make sure that the tuition money she's already spent is for something. It is also hoped that as many of those courses as possible are able to transfer and her student is not penalized because it's not the exact same course.

Senator East remarked that his assumption is that with the current policy there are some courses that don't actually match an existing UNI course, and also don't match the state goals and objectives of the LAC courses that are actually given LAC credit for.

Dr. Morgan replied that she's not sure. In looking at the transfer list you can see which courses transfer in, how they transfer in, do they transfer in as specific courses that we offer or are they generic electives, and which LAC category they

fulfill. The vast majority of courses that transfer in do not fulfill LAC credit. It's not like we let everything come in as LAC credit but there are quite a few that do come in as our courses and also get LAC credit.

Senator Soneson stated that the category that he's most familiar with, 3A and B, and in looking at the courses on this list he would think most would all be reasonable substitutes for our courses. He's hesitant to make it automatic because some might be really puny courses, in which case they wouldn't be good LAC courses. If the syllabus shows that they're doing the kinds of thing that we do in our courses then it would seem reasonable to accept them. He understands Dr. Morgan's problem.

Senator Van Wormer noted that she believes we ought to have some flexibility but recently the Senate discussed the Dynamics of Human Development and it didn't seem like a good fit for the LAC in either 5B or 5C. The College of Education was really complaining about it being unfair for our students for transfer students to transfer that class in for credit. It's her belief that we should look at particular courses such as the Dynamics course and maybe even look at that course again and see if we should accept an equivalent course or require students to take this course like students in the major have to. Is that something the LACC has been thinking about?

Dr. Morgan responded that they haven't really thought about that. They're just trying to simplify the rules. The course has different value depending on where students take it. By taking it else where it has greater value.

Senator Smith stated that he personally tends to favor a liberal arts core that has more core knowledge course requirements. He favors having our LAC being designed with particular courses teaching students everything we want them to know. When it comes to transfers he believes a different issue applies. We need to recognize that students go to other schools that have different approaches to general education, and if we adopt the principle that it's only UNI's courses that are good then we're not going to get transfer students. One principle of ethics and of any kind of action is, what if everybody did this? If everybody did this we'd find lots of students finding it difficult to get transfer credit for courses that satisfy general education requirements at their institutions but don't satisfy general education requirements at the new institution that they're transferring in to. He believes we shouldn't discourage students from transferring in to UNI and feels that

with respect to transfer credits we should be very open on that. If someone coming into UNI satisfies the number of credits we require in our general education program, yeah. The only thing UNI requires over and beyond associate degrees is the Capstone course. He would prefer a very lenient approach to accepting transfer credits. He's sympathetic to the office that reviews transfer credits but he believes we should let them make these judgments. Personally, he doesn't agree with these kinds of restrictions.

Senator Patton noted that he doesn't believe our current policy has to do with the value of the course but rather the intent under which the student took the course, and the knowledge that the student possessed while selecting to choose that course. The native UNI student has a specific plan to follow; the transfer student does not necessarily know or follow the UNI plan. If the course is truly a lower division and a general content course and supports the values that we espouse in our LAC program we ought to allow that to meet our LAC requirements.

Senator East asked if the courses listed have been analyzed? He assumes none of them would meet the first part of the proposed policy but do some of them meet the second part?

Dr. Morgan responded that there are more courses that meet the second part, that do not come in as specific UNI courses but do come in with LAC credit. There are usually many more of those courses out there.

Senator East continued, stating that we ought to have a list of those courses as students should know about that or be able to find out about that prior to registering for courses at community colleges. Does the committee plan on anything like that happening? Would there be a list that says in the future what classes will count and what classes won't?

Dr. Morgan replied that it would have to be updated with each catalog UNI puts out. Whenever UNI puts out a new catalog we have to tell the community colleges what our courses are that count for various things so they can advise their students appropriately. It is her understanding that all the Regents universities have a transfer plan or list that is given to community colleges explaining which of their courses transfer in and how they transfer in. That also has to be updated. All community colleges are aware of what we have and what we require for our LAC program and our major programs. They are re-advised whenever we update our catalog.

Senator East reiterated, the current list says these courses will count for LAC credit.

In response to Senator East's question about informing community colleges about the new policy Dr. Morgan stated that if the policy is passed it would probably be in two years because of students at the community colleges currently in programs. It would probably be the 2012 catalog change.

Senator Funderburk noted that he senses that there are two different definitions of transfer. What he sees is the bulk of transfer credits are from our native UNI students already. He knows specifically of cases where not only to save money but to avoid taking a course students go to community colleges to circumvent the LAC. There's a part of it that he agrees with, if it would be an impediment to students transferring in to UNI but he doesn't think that's the majority of people we're talking about. We're talking about students that take the cheaper courses during summer elsewhere. In Music they don't have a lot of successful transfers from community colleges.

Senator Smith pointed out that what strikes him as counter intuitive effect of this, if a student comes from another university, a lot of universities have general education programs that have distribution requirements of many, many courses and very specialized and narrow courses. A student who came from that kind of a program would be allowed to transfer those courses in for LAC credit because we don't have anything in our curriculum that matches them. And yet students coming from a university with a general education program more like ours with broader courses wouldn't be able to transfer those courses in because we have something similar in our curriculum but not in our general education program and they would be denied transfer credit for those in terms of the LAC. We'd be giving liberal arts general education credit for very narrow courses that students couldn't take here but denying credit for broader courses that they could take here but not as part of our LAC. This strikes him as a very bad practice, counter-intuitive and inappropriate.

Dr. Morgan responded that it's the case that we're going to have transfer credits regardless, considering the number of freshmen coming in with transfer credits. The majority of their transfer credits come in as our regular LAC courses, Intro to Sociology, Intro to Psych, Calculus, Composition, Oral Composition, courses like that. There are not a lot of freshmen coming in with

courses on the list. This proposal wouldn't harm our freshmen and the majority of our students who do not have long majors because they need electives. Having courses not count for the LAC is not dreadful for the majority of our students. She couldn't find how many of our transfer students come in with AA degrees where this is not an issue. If we knew how many this would effect, probably not a huge number, it would not be detrimental.

Senator Patton asked Christie Kangas, Director of Admissions, if she knew the breakout of the transfers per thousand, how many are community college students, what percentage have A.A. degrees?

Ms. Kangas replied that of the thousand students that are here at UNI each fall as transfer students nearly 700 of those will come in from community colleges. She doesn't have the break down as to how many have A.A. degrees but believes it's approximately over half. It might be important for the Senate to know that in looking at the full academic year about 4-6% of all of UNI's new students come in as transfers. In the Fall it's about 1/3 but adding in Spring and Summer semesters more transfers come in during those two semesters, and they are a very important part of UNI's student population.

Senator Patton added that students do have to take electives. Some majors have as little as 3 hours of university electives out of 120. There are a lot of majors in the 50-60 credit hours range. Faculty surveys have sometimes indicated that majors are too long. We also look at student choices of majors and minors, programs certificates and endorsements, etc. The students are not replenished with large numbers of hours of miscellaneous university work that we could simply dump the transfer credits into. Typically in some of our degree programs students are graduating with an average of 148 hours, not the required 120.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that motion in front of the Senate is to approve the proposed policy of the transfer of non-LAC courses for LAC credit.

Senator East asked if there is a current policy or is it on an ad hoc basis?

Dr. Morgan replied that there is no policy about which courses can come in for credit. If a department finds out a course is coming in that they don't want to come in with LAC credit they must talk to the Records Analysts in Admissions and have them

take LAC credit for that course off the list or change it if they don't view it as equivalent or appropriate for the LAC.

Senator Breitbach noted that was her question also, who's making the decisions? Is it the Records Analysts or is it by department, or the LACC?

Ms. Kangas responded that Records Analysts review the transfer credits coming in. In 1988 when the current LAC came into being one of the things they did at that time in working with people in the Provost's Office was to take a look at what the rationale and philosophy was behind each of the categories within the LAC, and to come up with some general guidelines that they could use for transfer credit. Working with those at that time they reviewed the entire transfer database to determine what could go where. They still fall back on that, trying to look at what the philosophy and intent of a particular category is and is the course coming in meeting that intent in some way. They do have to do with what Senator Smith mentioned, the schools with large distributed requirements, such as the University of Iowa. She looked up the courses on the list and almost all of them can be used at Iowa to meet their core requirements. On the other hand there are the schools that are very restrictive and have a very specialized program. What they try to do with those is look at the courses and give the students as much use of their work as possible. Sometimes it is challenging with programs from those types of environments. They know students don't have much room in many of their programs for many electives and they try to help them get the best use while at the same time trying to meet the integrity of our LAC. It's a balancing act. In some cases departments head have given them direct guidelines and processes to use. In others, it's a case-by-case process and they do try to talk to departments whenever they can. It's not every course; often they use precedence to make a decision.

Senator Soneson stated that he frankly doesn't know what's it is that's being asked of us because the two last paragraphs contradict each other.

Dr. Morgan replied that the first paragraph deals with the courses that are on the list. The last paragraph deals with courses that are not on the list but transfer in as non-specific UNI courses.

Senator Soneson clarified that the LACC is asking the Senate to not accept these courses?

Dr. Morgan replied yes.

Senator Soneson continued that it looks as though some of these courses could fit into the last paragraph.

Dr. Morgan responded that those are all UNI courses.

Senator Soneson noted that they are transferred in as those courses and then given credit.

Dr. Morgan replied that is correct.

Senator Smith added the example of a student coming in with an Ethics course, if this proposal is approved, they would be able to receive LAC credit. However, if a student came in with a Utilitarian Ethics courses, he could because UNI doesn't have a comparable course in our program and that would be acceptable for LAC credit where the other Ethics course wouldn't. That strikes him as being odd.

Dr. Morgan noted that they're not denying any other student LAC credit. We don't teach it but if a student takes it at another institution where this different course is offered, why not count it?

Senator Smith stated that he believes both courses should be counted. We should have the best LAC we can but we should also be very tolerant for transfer students and what they bring in, recognizing that other institutions have very different views of what general education should be like and very different kinds of programs. We don't want to lose transfer students.

Dr. Morgan commented that she doesn't believe we'll lose transfer students with this.

Senator Smith added that when it comes down to who will accept those transfer credits, students will go where they're accepted and won't have to spend additional time and pay additional tuition.

Dr. Morgan noted that students generally plan to go to an institution once they decide regardless of what does transfer. The other option would be to count all courses as non-specific for any major, which would be horrible.

Chair Wurtz asked what damage would be done with the current process?

Dr. Morgan replied that there's confusion for students as to what does count, and they don't want to take the time to look it up somewhere because they don't necessarily have the list handy. The Records Analysts will have to continue checking every course and review new courses that come in and if it is equivalent with our guidelines then it counts. If it is not equivalent it may count towards electives. This proposal just clarifies the policy for the Records Analysts to follow.

Chair Wurtz noted that she's somewhat leery of something that students don't bother to pay attention to so we need to fix it for them. She'd rather they pay attention instead. Is this a burden in the Admission's Office?

Ms. Kangas responded that once a decision is made for a course from a specific college it goes into a database that's automated from that point on. They only have to review it one time.

Senator Soneson stated that he believes the second paragraph is fine, it opens things up but he's not as happy with the first paragraph. How do we make a judgment about this because it would seem the problem is confusion. Maybe we could be clear about the fact that transfer students are in a different category than our current students. If transfer students take these courses they will count but if native UNI students take these courses here they won't count.

Dr. Morgan asked about courses our students take during the summer?

Senator Funderburk noted that he'd like something more loose. Why couldn't students petition for courses to be accepted rather than course-by-course? Is there a reason those courses were specifically excluded from the LAC?

Dr. Morgan replied that they were probably never suggested for the LAC. When the LAC was originally created in 1988 those courses weren't on the list. Courses generally don't get added to the LAC except for Capstone cycles in huge numbers. There have been very few courses added to the LAC since 1988.

Senator Funderburk clarified that there's two ways that we can approach fixing this. The problem is for students here taking a class and another student taking the same class at a community college and that student gets LAC credit but the UNI students don't and they feel like they've been wronged. One way to fix

it is so the student taking the class at the community college doesn't get credit. The other way is to fix it so they all get credit by broadening this as opposed to narrowing it.

Dr. Morgan noted that some departments don't want their courses as LAC courses because of concern for class size and teaching loads, which is understandable. Others may be open to that idea and the LACC is welcomes departments that would want their courses to be part of the LAC to come and talk with the LACC.

Senator Smith asked if the issue is whether they're UNI students or not? If they're UNI students they shouldn't be able to go anywhere and should take it for LAC credit here. If they're not UNI students then they should be given credit. Shouldn't we say for UNI students that this is our LAC and these are our requirements and this is how you satisfy them, but if you're not a UNI student and are transferring here then we open it because we recognize that different institutions have different philosophies of general education and different programs, and we want to be accommodating to those students.

Senator Balong added that that may or may not add confusion to Admission's database. But what if a UNI student wants to continue to take courses during the summer but they also have other constraints such as work and they take a courses at a community college that does transfer for transfer students, it would not be an option for that UNI student to receive credit?

Senator Smith replied that, no, that would not transfer unless under special cases to do it by student request but set the policy so that if you're a UNI student, no, you can't go somewhere else and take non-equivalent courses and bring that credit back to UNI.

Senator Schumacher Douglas noted that we're still awarding them a UNI degree and that, unfortunately, doesn't make sense.

Senator Smith responded that with transfer students we are awarding them a UNI degree that has to take into account what they took somewhere else.

Senator Schumacher Douglas stated that it doesn't say on their degree "UNI and a few others"; it says "UNI" for all students. If it's good for one it should be good for another. Her point is that regardless of if a student is a UNI student or a transfer student, if someone else can bring in a course the UNI student should also be able to bring it in. Because a student

decided to come to the UNI campus, that student's punished and not allow to take what may be a great course at a community college and get the same credit that a friend who took the same course as a community college student.

Senator East reiterated that a UNI student can go to another institution, take a course there that is equivalent to an LAC course here and count it for credit. They cannot go to another to another institution, take a course that vaguely meets some general standard and bring it in for credit. The equivalent courses would be counted for UNI students, the non-equivalent course would not. Students coming in to UNI having non-equivalent courses that currently are counted, under the proposal would not allow them to be counted.

Dr. Morgan stated that that's not correct.

Senator East continued, that if students have a course that transfers in as something that is not LAC credit they cannot count it.

Dr. Morgan responded that that is the proposal. If UNI doesn't count it as LAC credit it should not count as LAC if it's taken here, if it's a UNI equivalent.

Senator Hotek noted that the UNI Registrar's Office, nor the UNI Admission's Office, see this as a significant problem. The current way of handling the situation is not a problem.

Senator Patton replied that in his opinion the operation that UNI has been under for the last 30-40 years is beneficial to students and has not penalized anyone, and he would encourage us to continue with that policy because it's in the best interest of students. He also thinks it supports the intent and goals of our LAC program.

Senator Hotek asked how significant is the gap of students getting together to compare what they took and what was counted for credit? How often does that happen?

Dr. Morgan stated that that information would need to come from the Provost's Office where the student requests go. She doesn't get all those but she does occasionally. There are situations where students are confused about what counts and what doesn't count, and she's had students come to her and ask why something doesn't count. She has to explain, and has done that several times, and it does cause confusion. There was a case today

where a student did not talk to her advisor or look at the LAC requirements and may not graduate in May.

Senator Hotek reiterated that he wants to know how significant it is, how often does it happen? He will choose the one that causes the least significant problems.

Emma Hashman, NISG Vice-President Elect, stated that she has run into that problem personally but she didn't take any action on it. What can you do? You just take another course. It didn't really bother her that much.

Senator Hotek asked again what percentage? That's it not known?

Senator Van Wormer stated that there's no problem with someone taking Intro to Sociology or Statistics over the summer at a community college because UNI counts that. It's the un-equivalent courses where it becomes a problem.

Senator Neuhaus asked if there's a way to find out how many students this does affect? Maybe the Provost's Office has record of these but are all students that are disgruntled complaining? Do we really know how upset students are about this? The Registrar has reported that things seem to be working from his standpoint. He's having a hard time supporting this because there's too much nebulous gray area.

Motion by Senator Hotek to call the question; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to approve Transfer of Non-Liberal Arts Core Courses for Liberal Arts Core Credit failed with one abstention.

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions
Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities
and Fine Arts Senate

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

Laura Terlip, College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) Senate Chair, was present to discuss this with the Senate. Dr. Terlip stated that they're not sure if a Task Force is what they're really asking for. They're just trying to get their heads around how mergers of departments, which occurred in CHFA, should take place in the future or how mergers of academic units should take place. There are currently no policies or

procedures for how that happens. The administration gets to merge those things but we could look back at the process that was used in this last merger and learn from what worked and what didn't so that it becomes something that can be used in the future. We also need to look at ways that the faculty has input because the Provost has told us in some of these discussions that if faculty want to propose a department moving to another college, or those kinds of things, we could do that but we don't know how. There's no place to go to find that information. While the structure of the university falls under the administrative part, clearly there are faculty governance issues that occur as a result. The Provost wants to work with the faculty on this and solicit input. They're looking for a group of some type to take a look at this. They really didn't know what to call it, a separate committee, whether it should go to the Educational Policies Commission (EPC). It seems as though the university is trying to become more flexible and adaptable, which is a great thing but without that initial structure to figure out how to get things started they're just spinning their wheels. They are looking for a group of some sort, faculty, students, staff, and administrators, to look at something that might be workable or give some guidance for those things as they emerge in the future.

Faculty Chair Swan remarked that Dr. Terlip is here representing the views of the CFHA Senate.

Provost Gibson noted that Dr. Terlip has already addressed whether we need a task force to look at this issue. There were a number of task forces working last year and made recommendations. If we're going to have task forces that make recommendations then certainly those recommendations should be considered, otherwise, why go through all the trouble of having a task force. While the Academic Program Assessment was conducted she heard conflicting information about what we needed to move forward with and what we didn't. Those task forces spent a lot of time, most of last year, looking at curricular issues. Certainly some of the points that some faculty made were valid but if faculty spend a great deal of time studying an issue those recommendations should be looked at.

Provost Gibson continued, noting that a task force recommended a number of items, including big ticket items such as facilities, program restructuring, which included looking at existing structures within Academic Affairs, outsourcing, teaching load, and early retirement. To have another task force to look at a task force recommendation from last year is, in her mind, an

appropriate action. The motion as it reads now includes two items, to look at policies and procedures for the future and also says to review the recent UNI actions.

Dr. Terlip replied that the CHFA Senate meant that for how the merger was carried out so that they could learn how that process took place and be a learning organization. Figuring out what worked and what didn't work so that could be built into the new policies and procedures. It wasn't the substance of the change; it was the process that was used to implement the change.

Senator Smith stated that it's his assumption that currently these kinds of moves invite the Provost, with consultation with whoever she chose to consult with, faculty, administration at whatever level, and his question is, what kinds of policies and procedures does the CHFA Senate envision that would deviate from that?

Dr. Tulip responded that it could talk in more general terms, something consistent for internal mergers with AAUP language for mergers and acquisitions, with two institutions merging. Adequate time for faculty consultation, some of that phraseology so they would have some of those kinds of things on board. She not saying that didn't happen but we need to make sure there's a commitment to faculty input some place. The other thing is there is a big hole. If a department wanted to leave their college, how is that done if it's faculty generated?

Senator East stated that we probably wouldn't want to divorce administrative from non-administrative structures. We should suggest looking closely at how to deal with academic structures as irrelevant of administrative structure. If we manage to do that then whatever the Provost or President choose to do administratively changes everything. It doesn't change everything, it allows faculty to continue to function in a way they feel comfortable functioning. He doesn't know how that can be done but it would be an interesting intellectual exercise. He worries about blending the two, and where do we stop when we start down that road.

Faculty Chair Swan responded to Senate East, technically that's what it takes, the UNI Faculty Constitution uses the language, such as colleges that administrative structures uses but they are distinct. An administrative college and a faculty college are similar but also distinct so we can be of a faculty of Natural Sciences even if we don't have an administrative college of Natural Sciences. With the current merger within the

administrative structure, if the faculty did not do anything with it's governance structure there would be a faculty of Natural Sciences and a faculty of Humanities and Fine Arts. Although there would be an administrative unit that doesn't reflect that. Representatives would still be elected to the Faculty Senate from those faculties, but then it would have to be more defined. Technically when the Chair of the Faculty distributes the Roster of the Faculty that's the organization of it. Currently it mirrors administrative structures but the administration has chosen to make it so it doesn't mirror it any more, and we're now thinking about if we want to follow that or not. Which is a very important question that needs to be answered.

Senator Smith asked in what respects did the recent merger fail to satisfy AAUP standards? He's a bit concerned about going back and reviewing the recent actions because that just may turn into a "gripe fest." It is ultimately an administrative decision and hopefully the relevant administrators have had plenty of opportunity to learn from what's happened. He's not sure a committee or task force would serve much purpose by going over that. If there are lessons to be learned he suspects they've already been learned. In what specific respects did the recent merger fail to satisfy AAUP?

Dr. Terlip replied that she believes he's reading into the document that the recent merger didn't satisfy AAUP. She's looking for a continued commitment to AAUP standards. The AAUP standards do not deal with internal mergers and acquisitions. They have a document that deals with two separate institutions merging together and how that needs to be done. They would like UNI to take the step forward saying if we're going to have internal mergers we want them to parallel what AAUP expects of external mergers because it does give the faculty a voice. She's not saying that didn't happen, we don't have a commitment to that anywhere and it's important.

Senator Breitbach clarified what Faculty Chair Swan is saying is that it would be perfectly okay for the faculty within those two merged colleges to decide they want to continue to have two separate faculty senates. What the faculty decides, in terms of their own governance, can be very different than the administrative structure.

Dr. Terlip replied that Senator Breitbach is absolutely correct. There are pros and cons to doing that.

Senator Breitbach continued, that that decision will be a faculty decision.

Chair Wurtz added that she has nothing against AAUP but we are governed by our governing documents. Anything that AAUP or any other organization may have would be something that we would look to for wisdom, guidance, and advice but we certainly are not governed by them. It is our faculty documents that govern us.

Dr. Terlip noted that she's speaking for the CHFA Senate.

Senator Lowell stated that the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences supports this suggestion. She doesn't see any downside to having a committee, or whatever, to look at this. This reorganization is a faculty concern and it makes sense to get some sort kind of a committee together to come up with some statements about what procedures would be best, what worked well, what didn't. She doesn't see any problem with this as something we should not do.

Senator Balong noted that a lot of Dr. Terlip's emphasis, when introducing this, was put on the first paragraph compared to the second. In reading the motion she feels like the language in the second paragraph is stronger than the first. However, when Dr. Terlip presented it there was more emphasis on the future. She would be okay with just the first paragraph and leaving the second paragraph out, knowing that that would be part of the way that the future would be crafted.

Dr. Terlip remarked that the other thing to keep in mind is that we keep focusing on the college merger but two departments were also merged. These are academic units; how do those faculties work through becoming one faculty. Are there any policies and procedures that need to be in place for that that we as faculty members would like to have? Theoretically it would be real easy for a big department to swallow a little department if we don't have something in place. They would really like to see a commitment made to take a look at this.

Senator Soneson asked if the faculty can establish policies and procedures to which the administration's bound? Can we actually tell the administration what to do? He's worried that there's a sort of division of labor. Is this proposal going from one arena into another by establishing policies to which they then think the people in the other arena will be bound?

Provost Gibson noted concern that this task force or committee would be developing policies and procedures. What she's found in the time she's been here is that there are some issues with policies and procedures and for this group to come up with and develop policies and procedures is a little troublesome. However, she does believe, and has every confidence, that the two departments that are coming together and the two colleges, the faculty in those units can develop policies and procedures that are relevant to this merger. It's a little problematic to have those from the outside trying to develop something for those departments and colleges. She also noted that Dr. Terlip is here today all by herself, and to her that also sends a message.

Senator Funderburk remarked that he agrees with Senator Soneson that there are procedural things that this proposed committee would have nothing to do with. He does think that there are structural things that need to be looked at at some point, and the Senate will be involved in that. It may be once CHFA and Natural Sciences figure out what their structure is, and it may also be helpful to involve the Senate from the beginning.

Dr. Terlip responded that if it does it's going to be an incredibly long process for them to work it out and to then bring it to the Senate who decides if they've worked it out well. There's nothing in place for them to work together during mergers. Its uncharted territory.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure noted that he was wondering if these concerns could be taken to the transition teams of the two colleges and the two departments.

Dr. Terlip replied that the groups are going to be working on this, that the transition team has faculty governance as one of their topics. Because there's separate administrative and faculty governance structures they have no guidance for how to get the faculty governance part done. They could develop what they feel is a really good model and bring it to the Senate and then the Senate will disapprove of it. How is it all going to work? There is a need for guidance from the Faculty Senate or it's going to be five years before they get faculty governance figured out. They used the term task force because that's the most generic term they could come up with. They also thought it might go to the EPC, Committee on Committees, there are a number of places it could go.

Senator Schumacher Douglas stated that this would be a very interesting piece of research, data gathering, opinions and resource gathering. The term task force is a bit heavy. The Senate would welcome a report on some of those issues from the parties that are interested in this topic, how it was done, how it's going to proceed, what kinds of things are already in place and what things can be found from external resources to help guide this group. If this happens for any other groups then we have some kind of basis within our own community to reflect. With this understanding that it's a report about possibilities and recommendations rather than a protocol.

Dr. Terlip commented that it's just a language issue. They were trying to find a term that wasn't too specific. She's not clear what Senator Schumacher Douglas means when she speaks about the groups involved, the transition team, the departments? The Senate needs to figure out who it wants to do that.

Provost Gibson noted that she likes the concept of a report, which to her could include discussion from various groups, and whoever else might want to be involved. Another issue was the involvement of the Faculty Senate. She does believe that the task force co-chairs should make some type of a report to the Senate, which would be very helpful.

Senator Smith stated that it seems to him that we're slipping into a couple of issues between making the decision to merge versus implementing mergers. Originally this was focused a lot on the decision to merge, and takes us back to what's an administrative purgative as opposed to a faculty purgative? It seems that we're relying on administrators to bring in faculty involvement and to solicit that. There might be some kind of policy and procedure that we could establish that would bear on that in a useful way but not that's enforceable. To the extent that this was encouraging he's not sure this is a productive use of time.

Senator Neuhaus noted that he doesn't know of anything that would keep people within CHFA and Natural Sciences, should they reach a point of misery, from coming forward to the Senate to report it. Creating something and going looking, as a kind of "muckraking" isn't productive and he prefers looking at something such as best practices but a task force doesn't have to do that. He would like to hear from the people that are going through this merging experience whether things are going well or not. It would be more effective to bring forward specific things that are not working. Whether the Senate could

do anything about them or not would remain to be seen. This is like a "safari" looking for things. He'd rather leave the door open and welcome them to come and talk about things. In moving into a new structure, we as the Senate need to be thinking about how to make sure people are well represented. Prior to the Senate retreat if people from CHFA/Natural Science have some ideas it would be nice to hear from them.

Senator East reiterated that it's very appropriate for the Senate to figure out how to deal with faculty governance. We might want to suggest forgetting about college lines and boundaries altogether come up with some other entirely creative, outside of box, way to organize faculty. We don't have to follow the administrative structure. Why don't we consider taking this opportunity to say we're going to govern ourselves and make our own governance structure that doesn't depend on whether or not administration has us organized in departments, let alone colleges?

Senator Funderburk asked if it would be a possibility to put this discussion of forming such a committee on to the agenda for the Senate's upcoming retreat?

Dr. Terlip added that the charge for the committee could be figured out there. One of the reasons they tried to bring this forward was because they knew the Senate was working on that. We've got to start working together.

Motion to table for discussion after the Faculty Senate's May 7, 2010 Retreat with the understanding that the Senate cannot take action but they can craft a motion to be addressed by the Senate at the next regular meeting by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Dr. Terlip stated that what they wanted was to start a dialogue to get this started. They didn't have a solution when they proposed this, which is why they called it a task force. There were a number of linguist problems with this that caused all kinds of discussion, and while they were all on the same page we need to work together to figure this out, and as long as there's assurance that this will be discussed at the retreat.

Senator Schumacher Douglas noted that by voting this down it would say something whereas tabling it for the first meeting next fall, the first meeting after the retreat, says we'll be considering it but will not be doing anything right now.

Faculty Chair Swan informed the Senate as to the procedural possibilities if this is tabled. Tabling this until the first meeting of the Fall 2010 term, with the understanding that this retreat is largely designed to work out what the Senate wants to do, or tabling it for the next meeting to finalize the motion that will then create the assignment to work on at the May retreat with finalization the first meeting of the Fall 2010 term. These both sound procedurally good.

Senator East suggested an alternative procedure that would be to go ahead and pass it and figure out what it means to form this committee and then form a committee later on.

Dr. Terlip noted that the CHFA Senate did not want to imply that they wanted to tell the administration what to do. They weren't reviewing the decision; they were trying to figure out ways to help give guidance to others who are going to go through this in the future. They thought they could learn from what they were doing as well as trying to get groups to work together. That was their intent all along. She apologized if the language of what was sent forward was confusing, they were just trying to figure out how to problem solve the best way they can.

Senator Breitbach commented that if the Senate is going to craft a motion to meet the intent of the request she'd just as soon not table it and go ahead and vote on it and do whatever we're going to do, create a committee or craft a motion, that does meet the intent of the request.

Chair Wurtz asked if tabling it could be used as a space holder for that to happen?

Dr. Terlip suggested voting it down and then follow with a motion to discuss it at the May retreat and bring something to the first meeting of the Fall 2010 term for a vote.

Motion to table passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

TO: Susan Wurtz, Chair of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator

DATE: March 10, 2010

RE: Request to add courses to category 1B Speaking and Listening of the LAC.

The Liberal Arts Core Committee is asking that the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the following course sequence to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core.

48C:011 Oral Interpretation: Texts in Performance, or 48C:071 Public Speaking, or 48C:074 Argumentation and Debate

AND

**48C:004 Interpersonal Communication, or 48C:031 Group Communication
6 total hours required**

Background:

The Liberal Arts Core Committee voted on March 5, 2010 to approve the inclusion of the above course sequence to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core. These courses are required for students in Communication Studies programs and cover content that is currently offered in the current course 48C:001 Oral Communications. By allowing students who wish to use the above two-course sequence to substitute for the single course, students who are interested in this area of study will be exposed to the topics in greater depth earlier in their academic career. It is not expected that many students outside of Communication Studies would be interested in making use of the two course sequence, but that mainly those that are either majors or minors will use this option to fulfill the Category 1B requirement. Students must take two courses to fulfill the requirement. If they elect not to continue with the sequence, they must take 48C:001 to fulfill the requirement. Currently these courses have a prerequisite of 48C:001, but that will be waived until a curricular change is put into place.

A copy of the proposal for inclusion of the courses into the LAC is included along with recently used course syllabi.

Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal

Department: Communication Studies Date: Feb 12, 2010

Liberal Arts Core Category/Subcategory: 1B

Course number and title:

48C:004 Interpersonal Communications
 48C:011 Oral Interpretation: Texts in Performance
 48C:031 Group Communication
 48C:071 Public Speaking
 48C:074 Argumentation and Debate

Credit Hours: _____3/course, 6 hours required_____

Class size: Range from 18-36_____

Proposed semester and year for initial offering as an LAC course: Fall 2010
 (See note about *Deadlines* at the end of this form).

1. Course Catalog Description (limit to 400 characters):

Interpersonal Communication -- 3 hrs.

Study of communication in relationships; exploration and experience with concepts and processes involved in one-to-one communication. Prerequisite(s): . (Offered Fall, Spring, and Summer)

Oral Interpretation: Texts in Performance -- 3 hrs.

Introduction to the performance, analysis, and criticism of literary and aesthetic texts. (Offered Fall and Spring)

Group Communication -- 3 hrs.

Study of how people use their communication to create and perpetuate effective groups; experiential exploration of the dynamics and processes involved in group communication including the pitfalls and struggles faced by students when they work in groups. Prerequisite(s): . (Offered Fall and Spring)

Public Speaking -- 3 hrs.

Teaches students to prepare, adapt, present, and critique a variety of speeches in a public setting. Prerequisite(s): . (Offered Fall and Spring)

Argumentation and Debate -- 3 hrs.

Training in the basics of academic debate and policy analysis. Prerequisite(s): . (Offered Fall)

2. Describe student learning goals and objectives for the course. Include course content and student learning outcomes (texts, readings, forms of assignments, methods of assessment, grading rubrics, schedule of topics/lectures, unique learning activities, etc). If this course has been previously offered, attach sample syllabi to the proposal.

These courses are intermediate level communication courses. Students with an interest in the courses or Communication Studies as a major or minor should be able to handle such coursework. The attached syllabi provide answers to the questions of content, assignments, etc.

There are two groupings of courses in the proposal. The first focuses on public presentation and analytical skills. Those three courses are

48C:011 Oral Interpretation
 48C:071 Public Speaking
 48C:074 Argumentation and Debate

The second grouping of courses focuses on the development of interpersonal/small group skills. Those courses are

48C:004 Interpersonal Communication

48C:031 Group Communication.

The material covered in these courses is similar to that currently offered in 48C:001, but at a higher level, and students will need to take one course from each group to fulfill the 1B requirement. Until action is taken to revise the curriculum, students will be allowed to register for these courses without the 48C:001 prerequisite.

3. Describe how the proposed course's student learning objectives are integral to the objectives and purposes of the LAC Category/Subcategory in which it will be located. Proposals should indicate how specific course learning goals and outcomes are linked to those for the category or subcategory. Course proposers should contact the LAC Coordinator for information about specific category or subcategory learning goals and purposes.

The courses in this proposal address the learning goals of the Oral Communication course in greater depth. Students completing two of these courses will have completed more coursework and assignments in the same areas as the students in Oral Communication.

4. If this course is currently or is intended to be part of a major/minor program of study as a requirement or elective, include the majors/minors programs impacted and the estimated number of majors/minors served by this course.

All majors can fulfill the requirement for category 1B of the LAC by completing a two course sequence, as is described above. While it is expected that the two course sequence would be used by only Communication Studies majors, other majors may also benefit from this sequence. However, it is unlikely that non-majors/minors in Communication Studies would select this course sequence over the current option of 48C:001.

We anticipate that between 50 and 75 students per year would select this option.

5. If this course has a significant interdisciplinary component, or has a potential impact on other programs, consultations with other units (colleges, departments) are required before the proposal is submitted to the LACC. Careful consideration for consultation should be given to courses that may have significant content which is also offered in other departments. Include responses to those consultations to this form and list them here. Proposals submitted without appropriate consultations will be returned.

Not applicable.

6. List all faculty who are likely to be instructors for this course or who have previously taught this course. Be sure to also include any faculty in other departments who may have an interest in offering the course.

All faculty in the communication division in the Department of Communication Studies have taught at least one of these courses in recent years. Any faculty member who may have not done so would be capable of doing so.

Faculty Signature

Date

Department Head Signature

Date

College Dean Signature

Date

***Deadlines:**

Course proposals should be submitted along the following time-lines:

Offering As LAC Course

Fall semester

Spring semester

Summer semester

Proposal Submission Deadline

September 15 of the previous academic year

February 15 of the previous academic year

September 15 of the previous calendar year

Proposals submitted after these deadlines may not be approved in a timely manner to ensure their inclusion in the schedule of courses as an LAC course.

Rev. 10/19/01**Rev. 1/17/02****Rev. 1/22/10**