

1-14-2008

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, January 14, 2008

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2008 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, January 14, 2008" (2008). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 896.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/896

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.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:18 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/26/07 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Mvuyekure. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker updated the Senate on recent budgetary issues, noting that the three Regents universities, UNI, Iowa, and Iowa State were hoping to receive \$40 million to fund salary increases, which is now in question.

Interim Provost Lubker also reviewed the budget shortfall for the state, which according to various sources is between \$155 million and \$344 million, which could mean the Regents universities will not get all of the \$40 million for salary increases.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that in talking with President Allen, they would like to initiate a discussion as to whether faculty were interested in broadening the definition of research and scholarship as it is used in promotion and tenure. They would like to establish a small committee to look at this, and after discussion, the general consensus of the Senate was to move ahead with this initiative.

Also contingent on the budget situation, the UNI Cabinet has approved funding to re-establish the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) on campus, and the search for a director could begin immediately. The Cabinet has approved a maximum budget of \$325,000 per year. Discussion followed.

Interim Provost Lubker also noted that the UNI Cabinet has given his office \$200,000 to enhance the Liberal Arts Core (LAC). Discussion followed.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet noted that when he began as Faculty Chair there were two things he had indicated that he would work on. The first was to continue the initiatives that Sue Joseph started with academic integrity, which he will be working on and has scheduled three meetings this semester. He has also started the process of reviewing Faculty Senate minutes from the past several years to see if there were any things that had "fallen through the cracks."

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari update the Senate on the search for the new Provost, noting that the deadline for applications was January 11. They have received approximately 40 applications and are in the process of reviewing them.

Chair Licari noted that as there are guest waiting, the Senate will move to "New Business."

NEW BUSINESS

Campus Police Carrying Firearms

David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety, updated the Senate on Campus Police carrying firearms. He noted that there is a UNI Public Safety Advisory Committee that has been overseeing the carrying of firearms for UNI Police. Late last year the Advisory Committee looked at the Board of Regents (BOR) policy and re-wrote it, enhancing the level and amount of training for UNI Police. UNI Police began carrying firearms December 23, 2007. Discussion followed.

Critical Incident Training

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach and Special Programs/Vice President Administration and Finance, provided the Senate with an overview of how UNI is addressing emergency

preparedness. She noted that this has been broken down into four areas: evaluation, training, communication and funding, and reviewed each area. Discussion followed.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

950 Graduation with Honors Draft

Motion to docket in regular order at item #859 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Christensen. Motion passed.

951 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion by Senator Basom to refer to the Liberal Arts Core Committee; second by Senator Mvuyekure.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Friendly Amendment by Senator Schumacher-Douglas that the LACC report back to the Faculty Senate on the CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution for the February 11, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting.

Motion to refer the CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution to the LACC and to report back to the Faculty Senate at the February 11, 2008 meeting. Motion passed.

952 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Enhancing the Professional Development Assignment Committee

Motion to docket in regular order at item #860 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

953 Emeritus Status request, Lucille J. Lettow, Library, effective 01/08

Motion to docket in regular order at item #861 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

ONGOING BUSINESS

858 Curriculum Package

-HPELS 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession, consultation with Computer Science Department

A lengthy discussion followed, noting that the Computer Science Department has requested a consultation with HPELS on this, and there has been no response. Associate Provost Kopper stated that she and Diane Wallace, Coordinator Student Statistics and University Catalog, Registrar's Office, will both communicate with HPELS and Computer Science that this must be resolved by the Faculty Senate's next meeting, January 28, 2008.

Motion to table HPELS 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession from the Curriculum Package until the January 28, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting by Senator Soneson; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed with one opposed.

(NOTE: The proposal to change the credit hours for 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession has been dropped by HPELS.)

-B.A. Teaching Degree and Music Degree, minimum total hours review by UNI's Registrar's Office

Associate Provost Kopper reviewed this item for the Senate, noting that when the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) reviewed the B.A. Teaching Degree and the B.A. Music Degree there was a reduction in the number of hours in both of those degrees. There was a resolution that had been passed by the Faculty Senate eliminating the mandated electives, which had an implication related to the number of hours in the degree. The UCC proposed that there be a range and the Registrar's Office indicated that an exact number was necessary, 120 hours. A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to approve the B.A. Teaching Degree and Music-Composition Theory Major from the Curriculum Package by Senator East; second by Senator VanWormer. Motion passed with two abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
01/14/08**

1655

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

Patti Rust was attending for Phil Patton.

Absent: Gregory Bruess, Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:18 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 11/26/07 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Mvuyekure.

After a brief discussion the motion was passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker updated the Senate on recent budgetary issues, noting that the three Regents universities, UNI, Iowa, and Iowa State are hoping to receive \$40 million to fund salary increases. Until recently university officials had felt that that was a pretty sure thing. There is an individual in the state house that has convinced some people that we are asking for too much. It is believed that his model isn't very accurate but it is still alive and he is trying to convince the governor that we do not need \$40 million for the three Regents universities, that it could be as much as 60% of that. We're hoping to be able to maintain our argument on this. This is a warning that there are enemies lurking out there.

Another, more practical, issue, noted Interim Provost Lubker, is the budget shortfall for the state. According to the Des Moines Register, the best-case scenario presented by the Democratic Party is \$155 million. A private firm contracted by the state estimated \$344 million, a difference between how much money the state makes and how much money the state spends. Either scenario is not good news and could mean we will not get all of the \$40 million for salary increases, and could mean that a lot of things won't happen. We may know more by tomorrow after the governor's State of the State address. This is just information so we are aware of the situation, and Associate Provost Lubker noted that we're still hoping for the best and are moving forward as if we're going to have the best.

His first item doesn't require any money, it can be done with or without any support from the state, Interim Provost Lubker noted. He has spoken with the Academic Affairs Council, Hans Isakson, representing United Faculty, and he is now bringing it to the Faculty Senate. In talking with President Allen, they discovered that they both agreed on initiating a discussion with the proper people about whether or not faculty were really interested in broadening the definition of research and scholarship as it is used in promotion and tenure. He remains neutral on this issue and is open for ideas.

Dr. Isakson had suggested having a very small committee, possibly a dean, a department head, and four faculty, two to be appointed by United Faculty and two by the Faculty Senate. They would discuss if the faculty would like to consider expanding the definition of research and scholarship as it is used to obtain tenure and promotion, or not. If so, what changes would they like to see.

In response to Interim Provost Lubker's question as to interest in this, Senator Soneson asked when the last time this had been considered. Interim Provost Lubker replied not since he's been at UNI. Senator Soneson continued, as it has been some time since it has been discussed he felt it would be appropriate to look at this.

Senator Funderburk asked if Interim Provost Lubker is talking about just research or research and creative activities.

Interim Provost Lubker responded it would certainly be research and creative activities.

Senator Smith responded that he believed it would be a good thing to do. We should also be considering the relative importance of research and creative activities, be it teaching, service, it can be all sorts of other things.

The general consensus was to move ahead with this initiative.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that the second item is great news, but is totally contingent on state funding being what we would like it to be. If UNI gets a reduction in what we need for salaries we will be doing reallocation from our budget to pay for the salaries and will not have the money to do this. The UNI Cabinet has approved funding to re-establish the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) on this campus. That could begin almost immediately with the search for a director and have that person in place by fall. The Cabinet has approved a maximum budget of \$325,000 per year.

The question is whether to begin the search for a director immediately or wait for the new provost to come on board. Personally he doesn't believe it would impact the new provost at all. They believe three elements for the center are needed; a place for faculty to go if they are having difficulty in the classroom, a place that works with faculty on development issues in general, and, it has to be a place that will incorporate information technology (IT) into UNI's teaching and learning environment, specifically in the classroom. As the center will be located in the ITTC, the technology component will be very easy to do. As we're moving forward with technology in the classroom such as WebCT, it would make sense to incorporate it.

Senator Soneson asked if the information technology will be under the CETL director?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he would have to consider that, but he would imagine the director would want to have some input in that, having a person involved to help with those kinds of issues.

Senator East remarked that he agrees that it is great news. However, he questions the specification of having IT a central part of the CETL. He doesn't understand why that would be useful or necessary.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that when talking about a CETL, so much of what is done in the classroom more and more involves

IT. Faculty who are not that knowledgeable with technology need a place to go to learn how to use it effectively.

Senator East noted that if faculty that are not very knowledgeable with IT are going to use IT in the classroom then they need someone to help them. However, there is no evidence that IT makes educational instruction more effective. There is very little research on this, and no evidence. In talking about a CETL, that should be based on evidence about teaching and learning. He also points out that there is a lot of IT facilitation on this campus it, and it would make sense to put all IT with that office.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that this is a discussion that would be good to have but shouldn't stop this from moving forward.

Senator East agreed that he would also like to see this move forward.

Senator Funderburk noted, assuming that IT remains a component of the center, what would be the relationship between the IT and the new CETL director.

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he doesn't know, but it wouldn't have to be any different than the relationship between the IT people each college has. It wouldn't have to be a very large scale or impressive thing.

Senator Gray commented that an IT component is not mandated for each of the colleges. Senator East's point is well made, going forward with the search for a director should be divorced from what components and what composition the CETL takes as it goes forward.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that before going forward with the search there would have to be an agreement on that.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, noting that the UNI Cabinet has also given his office \$200,000 to enhance the Liberal Arts Core (LAC). While this has been called "chicken feed", Interim Provost Lubker noted that this is the largest piece of "chicken feed" that the LAC has received in five or six years. This is a large piece of the money that is being allocated from the money we hope we have to spend. It also indicated to him that the Cabinet and President Allen believe in the LAC, and was a very positive step. That amounts to three faculty lines with some

money left over, or more clinical instructor lines if that is where it is decided the money should go. He will not be putting this money into something that is in a total state of flux and needs re-working. He's not going to put it in a line and then find out in three or four years that the line will not be teaching in the LAC, which has happened.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that he has done some reading on LAC's in the 21st century and there are a lot of changes being made. However, the one thing that remains constant in the core of the LAC, is writing, math, literacy, humanities and oral communication. Those skills are essential. He could see taking that money and putting it into the core of the LAC which is not likely to change, and is probably how he will allocate it. He has met with two of the arts and sciences deans and they will be discussing this along with the relative department heads of the courses that are taught within that group of courses to see how that money could be used to enhance that part of the LAC. He is also very please with this development.

Senator Soneson asked if this money is to be used new hires teaching only in the LAC, or teaching two-thirds of their load?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that realistically it would be two-thirds. Someone teaching humanities, they would teach two sections of humanities and one section in their specialty every term. Those two humanities sections would be small sections, with about 25 students each and writing intensive. This would combine both the humanities and writing requirements. If approved, this money could also be used to hire one person as a clinical instructor in writing, and teach four sections of writing every semester, or in math. There are a lot of different ways to go with this but we need to sit down and discuss this to do the best job we can.

Senator Smith noted that they could also go back to some of the past hires that were hired to teach in the LAC and have moved away from it, go to their departments and use some leverage to move them back to the LAC to get some of the more permanent faculty involved in the LAC.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that they have already thought on this, moving a permanent faculty to the LAC and hiring a new person to fill that slot in the department. Having seen this does badly, they are going to do their best to make sure these people continue to teach in the LAC.

Senator East stated that he applauds this and thinks it is a very good idea. He also likes the ideas Interim Provost Lubker talked about and but suggested moving cautiously and to not do the same things that have been done before.

Senator Gray asked if there are other investments, things that need shoring up, that could be made in the LAC other than faculty lines.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that when UNI got the additional \$2 million from the legislature for what we're doing right now, he had hoped that it could be spent on things other than just faculty lines. A proposal was sent to the Board of Regents (BOR) for some other things, which was returned, saying that this money had to be used for faculty lines only. \$1.5 million was spent on faculty lines and while faculty can be hired, if there isn't the support structure in place then they won't stay. The \$500,000 that was left over is being used in various staff positions, some IT staff, two positions in advising, and a math specialist for the Learning Center to work with students. Yes, there are other needs but it has to be put into faculty lines. Input from deans and department heads indicated they need warm bodies in the classrooms, so while there are other needs, he had no other option.

Senator Soneson noted, watching the LAC faculty being decimated by cutbacks for that last several years, he thinks this is a good proposal. We need more faculty for the LAC.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet noted that when he began as Faculty Chair there were two things he said would be working on, the first to continue the initiatives that Sue Joseph started with academic integrity. She had two list serves working which he will continue and will try to moderate those conversations, and has scheduled three meetings this semester, early February, early March and early April. Dr. Joseph felt that one of the best things she had done with those projects was to have face-to-face discussion where some of the main threads that came out of the list serves can be dealt with in a focused way, and he will continue with that. Announcements of the dates will be sent out soon.

The other project he set for himself was to review Faculty Senate minutes from the past several years to see if there were

any things that had "fallen through the cracks." He's just begun that project and hasn't found anything from the past 6-7 months of reports. There may be things that emerge the further back he goes, but he will keep the Senate posted.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari update the Senate on the search for the new Provost. The deadline for applications was January 11 and they have received approximately 40 applications. The committee is in the process of individually reviewing those applications and will meet as a whole this Friday, January 18 to discuss them. The committee has not met since fall semester and he is unclear as to how quickly they will be proceeding.

Chair Licari noted that as there are guest waiting, the Senate will move to "New Business."

NEW BUSINESS

Campus Police Carrying Firearms

Chair Licari noted that David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety, is present to update the Senate on Campus Police.

Mr. Zarifis stated that there is a UNI Public Safety Advisory Committee that has been overseeing the carrying of firearms for UNI Police, along with a number of other issues that relate to improving campus safety. One of the issues for the Advisory Committee was to look at was the requirements from the BOR involved with the carrying of firearms by campus police. The BOR policy was re-wrote, enhancing the level and amount of training. There will be some joint training with the Cedar Falls Police, Black Hawk County Emergency Management and others, looking at critical incident events and having a mock review of that process sometime this summer or fall.

The Advisory Committee was provided with the requirements from the BOR in terms of training involving force and use of force issues, and what the force continuum is, from an officer's presence to deadly force. The committee will also be provided with what is involved in UNI's training and anticipate having a year end report on all the use of force issues that have come up, as well as training and programming provided for the UNI campus. This will provide a better and more open view of what

they are doing for preparation, training and to provide a safe environment for the campus.

Mr. Zarifis noted that the Advisory Committee reviewed the BOR's requirements as well as the current UNI policies that are in place, as well as training requirements. All of those requirements exceeded state requirements, which are drafted by the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy. We have exceeded those standards and will continue to do so, making sure we're providing our officers with the best training and equipment.

After a review our current policies and the BOR's requirements, the Advisory Committee provided President Allen with a letter stating UNI Police were in compliance. President Allen then gave direction for UNI Police to be armed. UNI Police have been armed since December 23, 2007. And although the process has been started, there is still a lot to do in terms of training.

Senator VanWormer asked if there are any members of Public Safety that do not want to be armed.

Mr. Zarifis replied that there are two staff that have been placed in other positions. The other members of UNI Police are fully capable of carrying firearms. As their requirements have changed since those UNI Police Officers were hired, this is a decision that each individual officer will have to decide, whether to carry a firearm. If they are not comfortable carrying a firearm and don't want to work under those conditions there are other remedies, including employment elsewhere.

Senator Mvuyekyre asked how the moral is now as officers had previously they had indicated that they did not feel respected as police officers.

Mr. Zarifis responded that his concern was that if you put someone in a uniform and a squad car, and ask them to do a job they should be equipped to do that job. Many of our officers have carried weapons before in previous employment.

In response to Senator Funderburk question as to what the officers are carrying, Mr. Zarifis stated that they are carrying 40 caliber Glocks.

Senator Funderburk ask if there was an additional cost to carrying these weapons in terms of hardware and training.

Mr. Zarifis replied that he balances the cost of hardware and training with safety and the ability of these officers to respond. The benefits certainly equal the costs. Once they have a better idea as to the cost, he can provide the Senate with that information. One of the biggest obstacles right now is acquiring ammunition due to the requirements of the military. They will be working with Cedar Falls Police to see if some of the cost can be reduced through a joint purchase. They have also been able to utilize the FAT machine, Automated Training Machine, that offers officers situations that are real time-based video scenarios. This has been most beneficial for them in those decision-making situations where there is very little time to think.

In response to Senator Gray's question as to how the hardware UNI officers carry compare to that of the other Regent's institutions, Mr. Zarifis responded that the decision to carry Glocks was based on the fact that that is what the majority of area law enforcement departments carry. Familiarity with the weapon in any kind of crisis situation, ours with theirs, theirs with ours, was one of the key components in deciding to carry Glocks. As an all-around weapon, reliability and dependability wise, they selected the Glocks.

In response to Senator Soneson's question, they are using hollow-points, which are standard and break apart on impact.

Chair Licari thanked Mr. Zarifis for his update.

Critical Incident Training

Jan Hanish, Assistant Vice President Outreach and Special Programs/Vice President Administration and Finance, provided the Senate with an overview of emergency preparedness on campus. This was broken down into four areas: evaluation, training, communication and funding.

Ms. Hanish stated that the evaluation component involved a planning team of about fourteen from across campus who looked at what we were doing, what our strengths and weaknesses were, looked in detail and in depth at various reports from other universities as well as the report from the Governor's Office of Virginia on the Virginia Tech shootings to see how UNI stacked up relative to policies, procedures, training and so on.

Relative to training, at this point they have tried to share information. A series of workshops were offered fall semester for faculty and staff about Critical Incident Response and threat identification. An expert from Iowa State University who is trained in threat assessment was brought in and worked with a smaller group to help identify what else UNI needed to do to be prepared. There is also a small group going to a conference on threat assessment to raise our level of knowledge and training. This is an ongoing process here on campus. There were about 400 people participating in the workshops, mostly UNI staff. Discussions have been held on how to do more outreach with faculty because in the classroom is where a lot of these situations manifest. They will be meeting with the Council of Department Heads in February as to other things faculty would like to help them better to deal with behavioral issues or identifying some of their concerns, and how UNI as an institution should respond. There will also be another campus-wide training session in April. They will also be meeting with Northern Iowa Student Government and students to make sure they are aware of the changes.

Ms. Hanish noted that UNI signed a contract in December with NTI to purchase and put together a campus emergency communication plan, which includes phone, text and email. They have started gathering information to make sure their database is up to date. Senators should go back to their departments and colleges and remind colleagues to update their information so it is part of the UNI alert system. They have an active program with the Department of Residence and Orientation to continue to update their information. The notification program is only as good as the database that they are drawing from. They plan to test the program in February and they realize that they will find glitches, and that is why they are testing. They will then tweak the program and have ongoing, regularly scheduled tests so what we think we're doing is in fact what we are going.

Ms. Hanish continued, stating that in addition to the communication system, they are looking at having that system interact with a speaker or horn notification system in campus buildings so there would be an audio alert with flashing lights for those that are hearing impaired. This system would only notify that an emergency has been declared and direct people where to go for information. They are trying to have multiple ways and the most efficient ways as possible to notify the campus of emergencies.

Ms. Hanish stated that they are putting together a request for federal funding for this, \$2-3 million to help with these costs but that UNI is committed to making these changes. Federal assistance would help us make them more quickly. They are also looking at entrance and egress locking systems, systems to track people going in and out of buildings, things like that to help monitor safety on campus.

What she would ask to be communication to the campus is that this is an ongoing effort. They will always be having informational sessions and workshops, continuing to upgrade our infrastructure. If colleagues have concerns or suggestions they should notify the planning team or her. This is something new for all involved and they would appreciate any input.

Senator East stated that it sounds as if a lot the work is reactionary rather than proactive, identifying possible problems in advance versus getting the word out once we have a problem.

Ms. Hanish responded that two workshops were held, one open to the campus on learning how to identify threatening behavior, how to report them, those kinds of things. The second dealt more in depth with those things. The presentation given by the person from Iowa State dealt with being more proactive and threat identification. The general campus presentation was more behavioral and facilities angle, what are things in our facilities that pose dangers, things like the McLeod Center, the UNI Dome and what can we do to prevent issues there? They've tried to balance both, what happens once you've identified something as well as what do we need to do to notify people. The communication systems is about quick notification and everything else is to prepare us to recognize problems and tools to report or deal with them.

Ms. Hanish noted that there will also be a booklet coming out to the campus with much of this information included. They are trying to get people to recognize that safety is everyone's responsibility. Their goal is to help people and not react to them.

In response to Senator East's question as to when they anticipate the booklet becoming available, Ms. Hanish stated they should be coming out immediately as they were waiting until classes started so they wouldn't get lost.

Senator Funderburk asked if this information is also available on the UNI website.

Ms. Hanish responded information can be viewed at UNI.edu/alert. Everything that they have is there including videos of two of the three the workshops they've held. It will be updated as they add resources.

Chair Licari thanked Ms. Hanish for her update.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

950 Graduation with Honors Draft

Motion to docket in regular order at item #859 by Senator Schumacher-Douglas; second by Senator Christensen.

Senator Soneson asked if this hadn't been previously considered by the Senate.

Chair Licari replied that it was discussed but no decision was made.

Senator East noted that there's a number of credits that can be transfer in and that number can just as easily be changed as this number. It would be helpful to have some information about the total number of credits that can be transferred in, as that number can be lowered and those are related numbers.

Motion passed.

951 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion by Senator Basom to refer to the Liberal Arts Core Committee; second by Senator Mvuyekure.

Senator Soneson asked why Senator Basom moved to refer this back to the LAC.

Senator Basom responded that there are college representative to the LACC that were not informed of the action of the CHFA Senate and there was a feeling that to by-pass representatives and come straight to the Faculty Senate, it would be just as effective to have the college representative informed first and then go to the Senate.

In response to Senator Soneson's question as to why, Senator Basom stated that the college representatives will bring this to the LACC for consideration first. It appears that CHFA Senate is asking the Faculty Senate to engage in the work of an ongoing committee.

Senator Soneson stated that no, it is simply asking the committee to stop work on this issue.

Senator Basom replied that the committee really wasn't working on this document, which was released and had not even been considered by the LACC. For this to go forward, you would be asking the LACC to stop discussion on something that hasn't begun yet.

Senator Soneson noted that the intention is to carry this forward on the part of the LACC, and certain steps have been vaguely outlined. The CHFA Senate has recognized that the Faculty Senate has authorized none of this and so there is not faculty awareness or approval for this kind of discussion. The danger is that this is going to go along and people are going to say "but we're not a part of this." It is in light of that that the CHFA Senate is asking this, noting that it is important that we talk about the LAC but they are simply asking for the LACC to come up with a proposal about how to proceed so this can be done in a way where everyone is informed about every step of the way, and when it comes time for a vote everyone's informed.

Senator Basom responded that the document that was released was not a proposal that's going forward anywhere. There were two documents and it's unclear to her which document the CHFA resolution is referring to. There was no intention of going forward with those revisions; that was an internal working document. That was nothing that was meant to be distributed campus-wide. As far as the process goes, there will be no resistance from the LACC, they all would agree that it would be nice to have a process and to go forward with a process that is inclusive. The document that was released is not a document that's going anywhere.

Senator Soneson reiterated that what the LACC is going to be doing now is coming up with a process, which they will bring to the Faculty Senate for their approval, which is fine with him.

Senator Basom commented that her problem with the resolution is one of precedence, to interfere with the workings of a committee, to ask the committee to not do something before it

has started a discussion, and freedom of speech and discussion issues. As the Faculty Senate representative to the LACC, what was distributed is not going forward.

Senator Smith remarked that the Design Team that developed the document is a sub-committee of the LACC. His initial understanding of how the LACC was going to proceed was to approve it first and then bring it forward to the Faculty Senate. However, his understanding is that any member of the faculty can propose curriculum change to the Senate and the Faculty Senate can insist on a vote by the full faculty. Having served on the Design Team and spending a year working on the document developing a very strong proposal, he sees these as attempts to bury it and would like to hear some substantive criticism, a debate or discussion about it. If it's not going to be done as part of the process through the LAC then it's going to be done as part of this other process that any faculty can initiate. He is very comfortable with other people, colleges, whoever, if people in CHFA want to develop a proposal for changing the LAC, they can do. The LACC brought this up a year ago, they asked people to get involved holding open meetings and where were they? How come no one does anything until something is put on the table and then we're kind of afraid something might be changed and we have to rally our forces to prevent that. As long as there is a process that allows the current proposal developed by the Design Team to receive fair consideration, he's fine with that. But if it doesn't get fair consideration they will make use of other approaches.

Senator Soneson remarked, noting that Senator Smith wants a discussion of the process and perhaps the best way to get a discussion of the process is to have the Senate consider this resolution in two weeks with representatives from various sides so that there can be a thorough airing of what's going on. The problem is that it looks like it's being done behind doors and it will then come around to "bite everyone." It's because of that that those that are deeply committed to the LAC are asking that the process as a method be approved by the Senate in advance so that everyone's informed about this and they can get together weekly in groups to revise this. The last revision included weekly discussion among faculty across campus and was a long and laborious process by which people find themselves coming on board. The danger of this process here is that it will move forward without the recognition of what's going on. It's not that people are opposed to change, it's that they're having something imposed on them.

Senator VanWormer stated that she would like to see the Senate wait until the Provost position is filled because that's what the Provost does, he's in charge of the curriculum. She could see a situation where they are working on something and then a new Provost comes in who may have something else in mind. She feels it is premature to do this this year.

Senator Basom stated that she doesn't disagree with a lot of what Senator Soneson is saying, the problem is interfering with the work of a committee, and a fear of setting precedent of what a committee can and can't decide. She doesn't disagree with the process. If it is referred to a committee, the committee is going to have to deal with it and get a response back to the Faculty Senate. The committee will have to deal with the issues Senator Soneson has raised, and will have to respond back to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Wurtz commented that apparently the LACC is a Senate committee, which means that when it was formed there would be a charge given to them. She is not comfortable even considering giving marching orders to a committee without the historical evidence, what instructions did we send them. Giving this to them and telling them they have to come up with a process based on recognizing leading research in the best practice, that carries the underlying assumption that they're not doing that. She's not going to make the statement that they're not doing that by adding this to their current charge without first looking at their current charge.

Senator Neuhaus noted that reference has been made to information that has been disseminated and he's not sure that information has been disseminated uniformly. He and most of his colleagues haven't seen anything but they're not necessarily at the front lines of the LAC. To consider this as a group, everyone needs to see the document in question.

Senator Smith stated that the Design Team or the LACC will disseminate it officially, and if that doesn't happen, he will get that document out personally.

Senator Soneson commented that he hopes everyone understands, it is not content that's at stake, it's the process. The process has not been made known to people across campus. He personally believes that the proposal is a very good one and worthy of discussion.

Chair Licari reiterated that the motion is to refer the CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution to the LACC.

Kenneth Baughman, English Language and Literature, CHFA representative to the LACC, asked for clarification of the meaning "referred to committee" as the action that Senator Basom has moved as distinct from "docketed in regular order." If a resolution is docketed in regular order it would then be acted on and voted up or down. If it is referred to committee, is his understanding correct that a response from the committee is requested, but not necessarily addressing every issue raised in the resolution in the way prescribed by the resolution?

Chair Licari responded that that is correct.

Senator Soneson was not clear on what Dr. Baughman was asking. If the Senate refers it to the committee they can talk about this in general and then come back to the Senate and say that they did consider it, it was interesting but they are going ahead.

Chair Licari responded that the committee can react as they want, they don't need to decide yes or no, they can decide what parts, if any, they want to recommend back to the Senate. The idea is that the LACC will come back to the Faculty Senate with their response to CHFA's Faculty Senate's resolution.

Senator Soneson clarified that there would be special focus on the process.

Senator Funderburk stated that he would like to see a little more clarity as to what we're doing first. Obviously someone has taken exception to what the Design Team has done, which he also has not seen. There is another exception to the process, and these two exceptions seem to be getting mixed up.

Chair Licari noted that it appears that the CHFA's resolution is linked more to the process. The substance of the proposal by the Design Team has not actually been at issue yet with the Senate.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked if along with that motion there might be a time frame.

Friendly Amendment by Senator Schumacher-Douglas that the LACC report back to the Faculty Senate on the CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution for the February 11, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting.

Senator Wurtz clarified what has been decided, that in considering items 1-3 of the CHFA Faculty Senate's Resolution, the UNI Faculty Senate is instructing the LACC to never mind about items 1, it is a different issue, but to focus on items 2 and 3.

Chair Licari responded that it is the whole resolution.

Motion to refer the CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution to the LACC and to report back to the Faculty Senate at the February 11, 2008 meeting. Motion passed.

952 CHFA Faculty Senate Resolution - Enhancing the Professional Development Assignment Committee

Motion to docket in regular order at item #860 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

953 Emeritus Status request, Lucille J. Lettow, Library, effective 01/08

Motion to docket in regular order at item #861 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Licari noted that there is a couple of items left over from the November 26, 2007 discussion on the Curriculum Package.

858 Curriculum Package

-HPELS 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession, consultation with Computer Science Department

Associate Provost Kopper stated that Diane Wallace, Coordinator Student Statistics and University Catalog, Registrar's Office, has sent out several requests prior to the semester break and again today, wanting to be updated on the consultations and has received no response. She also stated that she's not sure they can wait much longer and she's concerned that this hasn't been resolved. At some point, after repeated efforts, items that

have not been resolved can be brought forward to the Senate for a decision. The curriculum package does need to be forwarded to the BOR.

Senator Gray stated that he checked with Dr. Eugene Wallingford, Department Head, Computer Science, and as of Thursday, January 10, he has yet to receive consultation.

Senator East added that Dr. Wallingford also noted that in response to Diane Wallace's message late November or early December he sent a message to Dr. Chris Edginton, Director, HPELS, who responded that he was in China and asked that information be sent to someone else, which Dr. Wallingford did but did not receive a response.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas stated that she was not at the meeting and asked if there were outstanding concerns, and is that why this is still here or was there just no response?

Senator East clarified that the Computer Science Department objected to HPELS change from two to three credits based on a lack of information as to what was in the course, as the description was very vague and there was no rationale for increasing the number of credits.

Chair Licari stated that as Associate Provost Kopper noted, this does need to be resolved.

Senator Christensen asked that if by doing nothing, that stops it from moving forward?

Chair Licari replied, yes, which is something the Senate could do; fail to take action.

Senator Christensen continued, that the Curriculum Package would then go to the BOR without that course.

Associate Provost Kopper stated that that only forward those courses that have been approved by the Faculty Senate.

Senator Christensen asked when the Curriculum Package goes to the BOR.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that it usually goes in at the beginning of spring semester so any changes can be approved for the UNI catalog.

Chair Licari remarked that timing wise, if any action is going to be taken by the Senate it needs to be done now.

Senator O'Kane asked if the "ball" is currently in Computer Sciences "court?"; does Computer Science have everything they need?

Senator Gray responded that they were not given sufficient justification for the change in the curriculum and that was why they requested consultation.

Senator O'Kane noted that the "ball" is actually back in HPELS "court."

Senator East added that it has been since mid-late November.

Chair Licari stated that we can have a motion to approve this, a motion to not approve it, or choose to do nothing.

Senator O'Kane commented that as it is in HPELS "court," HPELS needs to get back to Computer Science, or the Senate, on this ASAP.

Senator Neuhaus asked if HPELS were told that they have to resolve this with Computer Science, has the deadline already passed?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that this could probably be delayed until the next Faculty Senate meeting, January 28 but it cannot be delayed any longer than that, and she has concerns about even delaying it that long. The longer it is delayed, there are other programs that are waiting to move forward and the sooner it gets in the better.

Senator Soneson asked if anyone knew how catastrophic it would be for HPELS to have to wait two more years before they can make this proposal again. Is this a crucial, critical change for HPELS?

Associate Provost Kopper noted that it is a change in hours; the course is already on the books.

Senator Soneson continued, is it crucial that the hours be changed? HPELS is not here, this was on the docket, and if they haven't communicated so far with Computer Science then maybe it's not crucial. If they are concern about it they can bring

it forward in two years time after consulting with Computer Science.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas added that there is an option, if it something that is state mandated or other compelling reasons external to the university for the increase in hours, that they can propose or go forward with this outside of the regular curriculum cycle.

Chair Licari responded that that is correct.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas continued if there is a compelling reason then HPELS can bring it forward in that manner.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that this issue came up because it is a change in hours. No one had any objections to it but there was a request for additional consultation.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas added that this course might have been part of the program description which will subsequently need to be changed back to two hours. It may have catalog implications.

Senator Christensen asked if this would change the hours in the major, or is this course an elective?

Associate Provost Kopper replied that she does not recall.

Senator O'Kane suggested that if this can't be ironed out in two weeks that the Senate address it as it stands, and if it is not addressed by HPELS in two weeks then it must not be that important.

Senator Christensen asked how this information will be communicated to HPELS?

Associate Provost Kopper stated that both she and Diane Wallace will communicate this to HPELS and Computer Science. Chair Licari stated that he will also follow up on this.

Motion to table HPELS 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession from the Curriculum Package until the January 28, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting by Senator Soneson; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed with one opposed.

(NOTE: The course 440:120 Technology Integration for the HPELS Profession has been dropped by HPELS.)

-B.A. Teaching Degree and Degree, minimum total hours review by UNI's Registrar's Office

Associate Provost Kopper reviewed this item for the Senate, noting that when the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) reviewed the B.A. Teaching Degree and B.A. Music Degree there was a reduction in the number of hours in many of the majors of both of those degrees. The resolution that was passed by the Faculty Senate eliminated the mandated electives, which had an implication related to the number of hours in the degree. The UCC proposed that there be a range of hours and the Registrar's Office indicated that an exact number was necessary.

Associate Provost Kopper distributed a table listing all B.A. Teaching Majors, and the Music majors, which shows how these degree programs have been affected by the elimination of those mandated electives. The recommendation from the Registrar's Office is to change the B.A. in Teaching and the B.A. in music to 120, which would match the minimum degree requirements set for B.A. degrees. In the front of the UNI catalog where the B.A. degree requirements are listed there will be notations making it very clear to students where there are exceptions to the 120 hours. Registrar Patton was firm on the fact that it cannot be 121, as in the Music-Composition Theory Major, it must be an even number.

Senator Funderburk asked what it can't be an odd number; they already have odd numbers in several previously approved majors.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that with Music-Composition Theory the major hours were decreased to 79, and when you couple that with not having mandated electives anymore, it comes to 121 hours. The Registrar has indicated that unlike the number of hours for a major, which can be an odd number, the number of hours for a degree needs to be an even number.

Senator Funderburk reiterated why can't it be an odd number; as Music Education/Instrumental and Music Education/Jazz Specialization are 137 and 149 respectively.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that this would be for the minimum number of hours for the degree. By establishing 120 as the minimum there are other degrees that would have varying numbers of hours that are greater. The Registrar's recommendation is to make both of these 120, which would be the minimum degree hours that would be required, which matches our regular B.A. degree.

Senator Funderburk continued that he's still not following, if Music-Composition Theory needs to be changed, why don't we need to change the others listed on the sheet that don't conform to that already.

Associate Provost Kopper responded, as she understands it from Mr. Patton, because those are the majors, and in looking in the UNI catalog there is a minimum number of hours for a degree and because the lowest number is 121 for a degree, the minimum number needs to be set at 120.

Senator Funderburk continued that the Music-Composition Theory is already the smallest degree offered in Music as far as the number of hours and if you crank it down one more so it's an even number when the others are odd numbers doesn't make sense. The degree has already been reduced by 3 hours when they combined two courses; where can they take an additional hour out?

Associate Provost Kopper noted that the minimum number of hours for a degree used to be at 130.

Senator Soneson asked what is wrong with 121 hours? Students would have to take 16 hours one semester to get the 121 hours; how is that a problem?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that she's unaware as to why the Registrar's Office is adamant about it being 120 hours, why an odd number is not acceptable.

Senator East noted that part of the confusion seems to be the difference between the number of hours required for a particular major within a particular major category, such as B.A. of Music. Someplace in the catalog is says that a Bachelor of Science degree requires 126 hours; the Bachelor of Music degree requires 130 hours, which relates to all Bachelor of Music degrees. There are some that require less than 130. What is being talked about is to change that stated minimum number of hours.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that this came about because currently the minimum number of hours to graduate for a Bachelor of Music degree is 130. If that stays the same and there is not a change, then next year when there is a major in Composition Theory, in which the major hours have now been reduced, that coupled with no longer having mandated electives, a student could complete that major in 121 hours. However, that student

will have to take an additional 9 hours because we have indicated that the minimum degree requirements are 130.

Associate Provost Kopper also stated that this change has been discussed with John Vallentine, Director, School of Music, and he is fine with it.

Chair Licari stated that all the Registrar's Office is trying to do is to make sure that if you are a Composition Theory major you don't have to stick around for those nine credit hours that are not required anymore. There are no further adjustments that are required for Music majors. If you are a Composition Theory major, you can get done with your major in 121 hours rather than the 130 hours that used to be required. What the Registrar's Office wanted to do here is to keep the catalog consistent with the major requirements.

Senator Funderburk replied that he's following that part but then it also needs to be done for Music Performance/Track A Instrumental, which is 122 hours.

Chair Licari responded that it's the same thing, you need at least 120 hours, and for Music Performance/Track A Instrumental you need 122, rather than 130 hours.

Senator Funderburk continued then why do they need to roll back from 121 to 120.

Associate Provost Kopper remarked that it wouldn't change any of the hours in the major at all. All of those Music majors listed on the sheet will still have to take the number of hours listed, it won't change anything in the major hours. In looking in the front of the catalog there's language about taking major hours in a major in an attempt to be clear so students recognize where they're required to take additional hours.

Senator Soneson suggested that "...with six exceptions" be added to "Minimum required hours to graduate for a Bachelor's of Music Degree, 130 hours" in the catalog and this should clear up any confusion.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that this is a catalog issue but also a degree audit issue. This is the hours for a degree and a computer can probably not be programmed to make exceptions. Her understanding from the Registrar is that they like to have one set minimum number for a degree. The UCC originally set a range, which was refused by the Registrar.

Senator Soneson clarified that this is a computer problem.

Senator East stated that he likes having a minimum number of hours but doesn't like the Registrar telling us what to do. If it's a computer problem he knows people who know how to write computer programs and they can change it.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that it is unfortunate that Mr. Patton is not here today, and she hopes that she's not misinterpreting what he has said to her. With the changes that were made by the Faculty Senate as well as changes made by departments related to curriculum, there are changes that have occurred in the number of hours in majors and now the issue is matching up degree hours. Regardless of the computer, that is an issue that the UCC wanted to do.

Chair Licari noted that he believes we are over thinking this and asked for a motion.

Motion to approve the B.A. Teaching Degree and Music-Composition Theory Major from the Curriculum Package by Senator East; second by Senator VanWormer. Motion passed with two abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Mvuyekure to adjourn; second by Senator Smith. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary