

4-10-2017

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 10, 2017

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©2017 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 10, 2017" (2017). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 268.

[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/268](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/268)

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 Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**Regular Meeting #1791**  
**UNI Faculty Senate**  
April 10, 2017 (3:30-5:07 p.m.)  
Scholar Space (LIB 301), Rod Library  
**SUMMARY MINUTES**

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

2. **Courtesy Announcements**

President **Nook** commented on three areas and answered Senator's questions. Topics included (a) The University budget (b) Ongoing work to fill the vacancy in the Missouri Valley Conference's left by Wichita State, and (c) Changes to the Commencement ceremony. (*See pages 3-9*)

Provost **Wohlpart** said he is impressed by "the depth, the thoughtfulness, and the philosophical nature of what's being engaged" in the creation of the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** and Faculty Senate Chair **Gould** had no comments

3. **Minutes for Approval:** March, 2017 (**O'Kane/Fenech**) Passed.

4. **Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**

1327 Motion to docket at head of order and move to Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (**McNeal/Walter**)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/regents-award-faculty-excellence-1>

1328 Consultative Session with Marty **Mark**, Chief Information Officer, regarding email account creation and deactivation parameters (To be docketed for April 24, 2017 Senate meeting) (**Pike/Zeitz**) <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-marty-mark-chief-information-0>

1329 Emeritus Request for Alan **Schmitz**, Music (**Campbell/Cooley**)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-alan-schmitz-music>

5. **Consideration of Docketed Items**

**1327/1217?** Motion to docket at head of order and move to Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of Regents Award for Faculty Excellence **(McNeal/Walter) Motion passed.**

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/regents-award-faculty-excellence-1>

**1320/1211** Emeritus Request for Mary Elizabeth **Boes**, Social Work, and Fred **Abraham**, Economics **(Hakes/Burnight) Motion passed.**

<https://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-mary-elizabeth-boes-social-work-and-fred>

**1322/1212** Emeritus Request for Hans **Isakson**, Economics; and Patricia Gross, Family Services. **(Hakes/Walter) Motion passed.**

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-hans-isakson-economics-and-patricia-gross>

**1312/1213** Proposal to revise Policy 6.10, newly titled Academic Freedom, Shared Governance and Academic Responsibility (*previously referred to the EPC*) **(Pike/Walter) Motion to move into the Policy Review Process. Motion Passed.**

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/proposal-revise-policy-610-newly-titled-academic-freedom>

**1324/1214** University Level Student Learning Outcomes for Consideration **(Zeitz/Burnight) Motion Passed.**

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/university-level-student-learning-outcomes-consideration>

**1325/1215** Proposal: Elimination of the additional thirty-two credit hour requirement for UNI students seeking a concurrent undergraduate double degree (two different degrees, such as a B.S. and a B.A. or a B.A. and a B. Music) **(Walter/Pike) Motion Passed.**

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/proposal-elimination-additional-thirty-two-credit-hour>

\*\* Motion to extend session by 5 minutes **(Pike/Swan)**

\*\* Motion to extend session by 10 minutes **(Burnight/Walter)**

**6. Adjournment: (Burnight) 5:12 p.m.**

**NEXT MEETING:**

**Monday, 3:30 p.m. April 24, 2017: Rod Library, Scholar Space (LIB 301)**

**Full transcript of 48 pages with 0 addendum follows**

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the  
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting #1791  
April 10, 2017 (3:30 – 5:12 p.m.)**

**All Present:** Senator Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Joel **Pike**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Leigh Zeitz, Senate Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**. Also: President **Nook**, Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**.

**Not Present:** NISG Representative Tristan **Bernhard**.

**Guests:** Jeff **Funderburk**, Scott **Peters**, Paul **Shand**, Ira **Simet**, Diane **Wallace**, Colin **Weeks**.

**Gould:** Good afternoon on this very hot Monday in the Scholar Space. I want to make a call for press identification. Is anybody here from the press? Seeing no press, I will move on to comments from President **Nook**.

**Nook:** Thank you. Gretchen (**Gould**) and I talked a little bit, and I talked with Tim (**Kidd**) as well, about the possibility of me attending as regularly as I can, just to make a few comment, but not necessarily to take up time on your meetings, but more importantly, to give you an opportunity to ask me questions if you’ve got them, and pick an item or two to help you understand where things are going in the University and then be able to answer your questions. I know Jim (**Wohlpart**) does a great job at that, but sometimes there’s things in areas outside of Academic Affairs, and it’s always nice to know that you’ve got access to the President to at least ask him questions if things are going in a way that you don’t understand.

So I want to talk about really just a couple of things today. We are in the middle of putting together budgets for 2018, but we don't know targets yet from the State. What we have is the Governor's budget, and we know that it is not going to be what comes out the other end. What we know in the Governor's budget is that the \$2.5 million that we had to give them back this year is gone for next year—is what's in his budget, plus another half million--\$577,000. So we'd be looking at a three million-dollar adjustment there. Actually, you've got to keep that in perspective of a \$175,000,000 budget, so it's a couple of percent. The legislature, the House in particular, takes that and the Governor has to send them one, and they routinely ignore it, and put their own together. Right now, what's coming out is they're saying, "He didn't make big enough cuts to the entire State," and there's another \$20 million they want to put into play, as coming out of the possible expenses. But they have not made any comments yet about where it's going to come from. There's a lot more noise about K-12, about private Higher Ed, the Iowa Tuition Grants; other programs and departments and things. So right now, we don't know. We're hoping those targets for each of the Regental institutions come out in the next couple of days; certainly by the end of this week, so that we can start to work on really putting our budgets together. There's some expenses too that we really need to kind of watch: things around health care costs; those sorts of things, that all of those increases in essence, if we could keep those all around, we've got to pay them. Those end up being cuts to our budget as well. We've got to find the money to pay those as well. So all of those could impact this. It's a little too early to put a number on this thing. I can't believe we're going to be able to move forward with the budget that we thought we would be moving

forward with. We will have some cuts to it. What we don't know is how big it is at this point. I don't even want to speculate on what it might be, because we just don't know enough at this point. The Vice Presidents have been working with people on sort of bringing some scenarios together, and starting in on that process, so that when we get a number we can move a little bit more rapidly.

Let me change the subject to Athletics. Everybody should have heard that Wichita State has moved out of our conference. That takes us down to nine teams. The Missouri Valley Conference is really put together around men's basketball because of the revenue that generates for us. We get about \$1,000,000 from the Missouri Valley, via the NCAA and others for our participation in the conference. We get that money because the conference puts men's basketball teams into the NCAA tournament. That's a driver, right? The more games we win--meaning any member of the conference, the better off we are. Right? So what we have started to do, as the presidents of the Missouri Valley, is to start to look at what our options are to invite others to join the Missouri Valley Conference. We're not far enough along there yet to say too much, and you want to sort of keep it quiet. Right? This is like when you're in the eighth grade, and you're going to ask somebody out for a date. You don't tell anybody until you find out if they say 'yes' or not. [Laughter] It's hard enough. So we're kind of in that we've identified some people. We'll be talking with them, and we hope to have a new partner by the end of the summer; probably a lot earlier than that. There are a lot of details that need to be worked out with that other school, and a lot of things that need to be thought through as we select who we go out and talk to. So again, we'll keep you posted but we really don't at this time have anything more than we are very

serious about this. It's a big deal because of the revenues that are generated and come back to the University. Our Athletics Program of course is not revenue-positive, but being in this conference with as many teams—two teams typically, getting into the NCAA tournament, and the revenues that that generates, we're in a lot better shape than we were at most Division II schools and most Division I Conferences that aren't in that sort of power.

We're going to probably make some small changes to Commencement, but nothing that will impact most of you. I've heard that there are a large number of people on the stage, and it gets kind of crowded, so what I think of as the 'platform party.' We'll try to pull that back a little bit to people that really need to be up there. The others I still want to attend, and be seated and gowned and robed up, and those sorts of things, but make sure that we're not too congested on the stage. It makes it a little easier for the students to get across the stage and the parents to see them and those sorts of things. Let me stop there. I'd be happy to answer any questions within the time that you want to give.

**Gould:** Any questions for President **Nook**?

**Hakes:** Do we already have a temporary hiring freeze for next year? What's our situation on that? Are we just on hold?

**Wohlpart:** We don't, David (**Hakes**), so you all hopefully know this: within Academic Affairs, the \$2.5 million dollar cut that we had to take this year, \$1.923 was in Academic Affairs, we took that centrally, out of the Academic Affairs Provost's Office. What I've asked the deans to do is to work with the department heads and with the College Senates to generate a list of prioritized faculty lines

for Fall '18. We haven't stopped the hires that are coming for the Fall of '17, and we're still in the process of making those hires. To create that prioritized list which we will then vet at the Dean's Council. We will probably wait until August or September when we know what our enrollment is, which is a large part of our revenue, to be able to decide what of those lines would go forward for Fall of '18. The other thing that happens here at UNI, perhaps it's common elsewhere--is that we find out sometimes in August that people are going to retire in the fall or will retire at the end of that year, so there's a lot of movement in and out, so we have to track that as well. So we have not frozen hiring, we're going to be very strategic in what we do with our hiring processes.

**Nook:** We haven't frozen them in the other units either. I believe you need to make strategic cuts, if you do need to make cuts in investments—you need to do that strategically, and not just because a position is open. Right? One of my sort of fundamental ways of looking at budgeting is if you're in that realm where you have to make some reductions, you don't have the money to invest in the University that you'd like to have or used to have, then you do everything you can to limit the impact on students. You have the most positive outcome. You invest the best possible. And if you really believe that, and you look at two programs and one is growing, getting more students out, more majors, has growing SCH (Semester Credit Hours), has growing publications--everything about it looks great and they happen to have a retirement, and in another program, all those things are moving in the other direction, do you really take that position? Is that what you want to do because then you're going to hurt more students than taking one



from a program that's not. That gets hard. But that isn't just an academic thing. That's across the board.

You look at where your money is going to get you the best return--for our students, in this case. And so I don't like to make opportunistic, and I also don't like to make across-the-board, for exactly the same reason. I think across-the-board cuts are an administrator's easy way out. You don't have to justify it. Everybody takes the same thing.

**Zeitz:** In some cases, where you don't have a critical mass of faculty though, you end up where you're teaching and you're working and doing all the other service work so you don't get your publications done. So in some cases, I think that needs to be considered.

**Nook:** It always is. It has to be a holistic look at things. But if you don't have a critical mass to even be teaching the classes and a position comes open, then that's a need.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Gould:** Thank you, President **Nook**.

**Nook:** You bet. Thank you.

**Cooley:** As you were talking about these strategic choices, do tuition increases come into the strategy of the equation? Can you speak to that at all?

**Nook:** Yes, we know that we've got a 2% tuition increase already approved. I would not at all be surprised that the Regents consider expanding that; making it

even bigger. It's my feeling, we've got a current Regent president whose term ends in less than 30 days, whose been clear about trying to keep tuition increases steady, and not something that's going to shock students, right? So keep small steps; but constant small steps year after year after year, instead of flattening things out and then have to nail 'em for a year, right, as some people would say. I think that's probably a good plan. It's safer. You go five years without a tuition increase, you get a whole bunch of people that get it pretty easy, and then you slam a whole bunch of other students with a 10%. I'm not expecting that they will come in and say "Let's fill the hole, the entire hole," because the entire hole could mean doubling that 2% or more, and I'm not holding my breath that this group of Regents would do that. But I also do expect that they will have a very serious... At the April Board of Regents meeting which is next week, it could be discussed. It can't be approved. It actually takes two meetings to actually get a tuition increase approved.

**Gould:** Thank you, President **Nook**.

**Nook:** Thank you. Next, comments from Provost **Wohlpart**.

**Wohlpart:** I think I'm good. Everything's covered, unless there's any questions, anything else that you folks are thinking about. I've been reviewing drafts of the Faculty Handbook pieces that have been coming, and they're just awesome. I'm just really, really impressed and pleased with the depth, the thoughtfulness, the philosophical nature of what's being engaged, and I didn't expect that because it's such a short time frame and such complicated issues. I think everybody will be extremely happy. That's my sense.

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

**Kidd:** No. I'd just like to echo that we have a good working relationship with the Faculty Handbook, so I think things are going well. That's about it though.

**Gould:** Thank you. I have no comments since everybody else has covered practically everything. So, moving on, we need to approve the minutes from the March 27<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting. Can I have a motion to approve? So moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Senator **Fenech**. All in favor of approving the minutes from the March 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, please say "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Moving on to Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. As Faculty Chair **Kidd** mentioned at the last meeting, we would take up the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence at today's meeting, since the awards are to be issued very soon. So we will go into Executive Session for a very short time at the beginning, so may I have a motion to docket the Regent's Award for Faculty Excellence going into Executive Session? So moved by Senator McNeal, seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter**. All in favor of going into Executive Session for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence at the beginning of the docket, please say, "aye," all opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Next up we have a Consultative Session with Marty **Mark** for April 24<sup>th</sup>. She wants to come and talk to the faculty about the email account and some issues and problems that they've had and a proposal for moving forward. So can I have a motion to docket that? So moved by Senator **Pike**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor of docketing the consultative session with Marty **Mark**, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye."

**Campbell:** We're docketing it for a particular date, that should be noted?

**Gould:** Yes. Yes. Should I rephrase the motion? [No]

**Campbell:** It's on the agenda.

**Gould:** Abstain, "aye." Motion passes. And the last thing to be considered for docketing is the Emeritus Request from Alan **Schmitz** in the Music Department. So moved by Senator **Campbell**, seconded by Senator **Cooley**. All in favor of docketing the emeritus request for Alan **Schmitz** in Music, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Okay, now we are at the Consideration of Docketed Items, so we will be going into executive session for ten, maybe fifteen minutes or less.

**Swan:** I move that we accept the slate of candidates for the Regents Award presented by Faculty Chair **Kidd**.

**Gould:** Senator **Burnight** seconded. All in favor of approving the slate of candidates for the Regents Faculty Award for Excellence, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." The motion passes. So next up we have an emeritus request for Mary Elizabeth **Boes** from Social Work and Fred **Abraham** from Economics. Does anybody have any comments?

**Hakes:** I will speak on behalf of Fred [**Abraham**] briefly—but I should speak longer since he's been here for 44 years. I don't know how many people know Fred. Fred's head of the department and has been for 27 years, and he's retiring in August. Every member of the department was hired by Fred except one, and I was his first official hire after he became actual head, from being interim head. So, he's actually constructed the entire Economics Department as such. He's an excellent teacher. I'm very fortunate to have always had a department chair that

was an excellent teacher, because I can't imagine how awkward that would be if your supervising first level was a very poor teacher. He's built the department based on that. He's an excellent teacher. He's had 14,000 students of his own, teaching large classes in economics, and built the department from essentially very few majors to cruising at 150 majors and equal or more minors, and I think he's proudest of the fact that when he took over, we only had one endowed scholarship, and now we have ten, and the endowed scholarships from students. So we have nurtured some very productive students who've gone out and had excellent careers, and have given back to the University and have sizable endowed scholarships--all created from past students. It all fits together with his concern for teaching, and the people that he hired and himself keeping a very tight relationship with all of our past graduates, placing them well, or aiding their placement in graduate schools and law school and so on. And then taking them out to lunch when they're back in town, because that's a very dangerous thing when Fred asks you out for lunch, because you know it's going to cost you. That's not a free lunch, as we say. [Laughter] I think that he's had a very honorable career here, and he hired me, and I'm pleased with his management of the department. And I certainly hope that we get his line back.

**Wohlpart:** I believe you're hiring.

**Hakes:** Well we are, but no one wants to follow Fred (**Abraham**).

**Gould:** Thank you, Senator **Hakes**. Any other comments?

**Campbell:** Just a technical note: Isn't he also head of Finance at this point in time?

**Hakes:** You're right, at this time he is also head of Finance; for about the last four years, so he is a dual department head. The two departments are still

independent. They each have their own PAC, [Professional Assessment Committee] and so he goes to double meetings and handles the promotions, and in a sense they have their own decision-making bodies, and then he is the head of both departments. But that's a fairly recent phenomenon—the last four years, I believe. So in fact, since he took on that role, his teaching load has been dropped, which is a shame. It is always a debate: Do you waste your best teacher as an administrator (no offense) [Laughter] you pull them out of the classroom, but we're also offended when we have a very poor teacher supervising other people who are excellent teachers. So it is always a dilemma. There's no answer to that question. In fact, he's an excellent teacher who has continued to teach large sections and be heavily involved until the last maybe two or three years, and we miss him in the classroom. He could teach forever. We'd invite him back, but I don't think that's going to happen, but we certainly would. Yes, thank you for bringing that up.

**Gould:** Any other comments on either Dr. **Abraham** or Dr. **Boes**? Seeing none, may I have a motion to grant emeritus status to Mary Elizabeth **Boes** from Social Work and Fred **Abraham** from Economics? Moved by Senator **Hakes**, second by Senator **Burnight**. All in favor, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Next up is another set of emeritus requests. This is for Hans **Isakson** from Economics and Patricia **Gross** from Family Services. Does anybody want to say anything about either of these two professors?

**Hakes:** Hans (**Isakson**) is retiring as well and connects to the Finance and Economics Department. Many of you know Hans. He's probably most noted for his service on this campus. He's been past Chair of the Senate, and he's past

president of United Faculty. He actually was brought here in the finance department as head of real estate. There were some changes made in real estate. His Ph.D. is in Economics. When that took place, I think we made a trade for Hans (**Isakson**) with two professors to be named later in a future draft choice or something. It was actually a better fit in our department, and it's worked out very nicely, for both Hans and for the Econ Department. Hans is also involved in a great deal of external consulting, so he's very nice to have around, and we hope we can still have contact with Hans and keep his line also. [Laughter]

**Gould:** I hope you made note of that. Thank you. Does anybody else wish to speak on behalf of either of these emeritus candidates? Seeing no one else wishes to speak, I will ask for a motion to approve the emeritus status for Hans **Isakson** from Economics and Patricia **Gross** from Family Services. Moved by Senator

**Hakes:** Did you raise your hand Michael (**Walter**)?

**Walter:** Yes.

**Gould:** And seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter**. All in favor of granting emeritus status to Hans **Isakson** and Patricia **Gross**, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes.

**Walter:** Remind me never to attend a horse auction. [Laughter]

**Gould:** Next up, we have the proposal to revise Policy 6.10, newly titled Academic Freedom, Shared Governance and Academic Responsibility. This came before the Senate last fall. We referred it to EPC, and requested they consult with the Administration and Anita **Gordon**. They have done that, so Scott (**Peters**) is back with an update. Is this the version? The red line version?

**Peters:** Yes.

**Gould:** Okay. So would you like to make any comments?

**Peters:** Sure, just briefly. Thanks for having me back. I'm here on behalf of the Educational Policies Commission. I'm Vice-Chair of that committee. We looked at the referral, made very few changes to it. We did consult with Administration, in fact, suggested language to strengthen the guarantee of academic freedom. If you notice in the third paragraph of the Purpose Statement, the language now says, "The University therefore must guarantee academic freedom for its faculty." The word 'guarantee' was suggested by Provost **Wohlpart**, and so Administration has been very supportive. We consulted with Anita **Gordon** and the Center for Academic Ethics. She, along with Administration, expressed concern that the responsibilities side of the policy needs to be updated. EPC agrees with that. Given the importance of the topic and the tenor of the times, we feel that it's an important statement for the University to make right now about our commitment to academic freedom, and as Vice-Chair of the EPC, I'm here on behalf of the EPC to say that we will take up the responsibility side of the equation next year, and do a more holistic review of not only this policy, but also the academic ethics and research policy, and also the student academic ethics policy, which Anita's (**Gordon's**) Center [the Center for Academic Ethics] recently did a survey that indicated that there's quite a bit of misunderstanding about that policy and it needs to be revisited as well. I think if anything since I last came to talk to you, events since that time have made adoption of this policy even more important. The University needs a strong statement of academic freedom, and the role it plays in institutions of Higher Ed. In our policy. We always needed to make it stronger, I think. But I think that's even more important now, given the



restrictions, so to speak of the Master Agreement, and given some of the things we're seeing nationally in terms of real challenges to the values of academic freedom.

**Gould:** Does anybody have any questions for Scott (**Peters**)?

**Swan:** Does this require us to change our Faculty Constitution? So, for example right now I don't know if tenure-line assistant professors are barred from being Chair of the Faculty Senate, for example, but term faculty are. Adjunct faculty are. This policy sounds like that would be in violation of this policy. It certainly seems to me would be in violation of the spirit of this more academic freedom for more people, that is informing this. So I wonder about your view of that.

**Peters:** I'm not sure that that requires that to happen, but I think it allows it to happen. If you'll notice the language in Roman Numeral Two, which says that, "The University shall strive to integrate all faculty into the shared governance of the University, consistent with the terms of their contract." I think that allows for a level of protection of participation in shared governance that would allow the University faculty, if it chooses to, to expand voting rights to those who play a role in that shared governance, who aren't already members of the voting faculty. So basically that would be the relatively small handful of adjunct faculty who have some service responsibility, and the somewhat larger number of term faculty, I would think, many of whom already do those things. But that's ultimately up to the University faculty to decide. It would have to be a faculty amendment to the Faculty Constitution.

**Hakes:** So you're saying, someone could be Chair of the Faculty Senate and couldn't sit on a PAC? Is that correct?

**Peters:** Well, I don't know because we don't know because we don't know what PACS are going to look like under the new Faculty Handbook.

**Hakes:** I would think that no one would be sitting on a PAC that's not tenure-track.

**Peters:** I actually said nothing about who could be Chair of the University Faculty. All I said was that if the faculty chose, it could expand voting rights, knowing that by expanding voting rights--knowing that in doing so, those people who it's giving voting rights would have some protection in their participation in faculty governance. Right now, those of us who are on tenure or tenure-track lines enjoy the protection of tenure, right? We have people, including people at this table, who do service, but who don't enjoy currently any real level of protection from their engagement in that service under University policy. This would give them some level of protection.

**Hakes:** Am I mistaken or is that not protection earned by having a tenure-track line? What you're saying is a tenure-track person has to go through hurdles and jumps and leaps and supervision, and on and on to gain that independence, but someone who's just hired at a moment and just instantly has it?

**Peters:** I'm making no claims about what the Faculty Constitution will look like or who will be able to have voting rights. That is up ultimately to the faculty to decide. Personally, I don't believe that the tenure system sets up a class system

that denies to an entire category of people the ability to participate meaningfully in the community that they choose to be a part of, but some faculty members do believe that.

**Hakes:** Don't we restrict voting on certain committees and all sorts of things to tenured faculty when we do that?

**Peters:** Again, I would say that that is ultimately up to the University faculty to decide, and we can have that debate. This does not compel the University faculty to make that decision.

**Hakes:** Those individuals would not have the right to be on that committee due to this?

**Peters:** Due to this change alone? No. If the University faculty chose to expand those rights, this change would give some level of protection, that would make that participation more secure and more meaningful for them.

**Pike:** I'm just trying to clarify here. So this policy is about extending academic freedom protections to faculty who are not necessarily currently covered by the policy now? It encourages the shared governance, but it doesn't really address how that would be implemented, or how that shared governance means. This is more about extended the protections of academic freedom? Am I getting that correct?

**Peters:** I would agree with that and I would make one slight change to it, and that is that at the moment, and I haven't seen drafts of the handbook, so I have no

clue what the Handbook says, or what it will say—but at the moment, when the Master Agreement expires, there is nothing in University policy that indicates any level of protection of academic freedom at the moment. Okay? To me, that is fundamentally wrong for a University to have no statements in its policy about the importance and centrality of academic freedom to the enterprise in which we're engaged. So what I would say that slightly changes, is that this policy protects everybody's academic freedom.

**Wohlpart:** If I could just clarify, it protects all faculty member's academic freedom in doing their duties, their responsibilities?

**Peters:** Absolutely. Yes.

**Wohlpart:** Let's just be clear, it does not extend it to staff, professional and scientific staff, or merit staff. And I want to point out that there is distinction between academic freedom and shared governance. This is perhaps opening the door to broaden the culture of who's included in shared governance which goes David, (**Hakes**) to your question. It does not decide the answer to that question, but it opens the door to the possibility. It does not say that someone who's not in a PAC, not tenured, can all of a sudden do X, Y, & Z, but it does open the door for you all to have those conversations. And what I appreciate about this, is the idea that suddenly a class of folks who may not have been included in certain shared governance practices, now can be, and it's really up to the faculty to come together to decide what that means. I will just give you—this is not an imposition on the faculty—I would agree with what Scott (**Peters**) said, I don't see any reason why you should not extend that courtesy to all faculty who are doing the core

work of teaching our students, in different ways. But that's up to the faculty to decide.

**Swan:** I'm glad you pointed out the Section Two because I think that's the nub of what we're discussing here. This is a policy, right? And so it will be incumbent upon the Administration to execute this policy, and it sounds to me that Faculty Constitution is in violation of this policy. But you're saying that it's not. That we can continue with the current Faculty Constitution, if that's what we decide. And it sounds to me that we can't. And I'm supportive of changing the Faculty Constitution to do this, but I want it to be clear here that this body--the representatives of the Faculty, are putting into policy--something that makes their Constitution obsolete or in violation, and in need of updating, changing, embracing the increased academic freedom for more people; these sorts of things. So I don't think that it's good for us to say that it doesn't do that. We can continue to be at odds, but we would be at odds. We the faculty representatives, say this is good, and our Constitution does need to be changed, and we should address that in the fall, it seems to me.

**Peters:** I understand what you're saying. I've have always been—I'll admit that I've always been a little...I don't know what the right word is—confused, I guess, for a lack of a better word, about the relationship between the Faculty Constitution and University policies. I've certainly heard faculty members express the view which I understand, that the Faculty Constitution and the bylaws of the Senate is fundamentally about what the faculty want to do. We can reorganize ourselves, and in sense our organization of the faculty doesn't depend on the Administration, right? It's independent of that. We get together as a faculty and

we make our decisions. But I do hear what you're saying about as representatives of the faculty passing this. That could suggest that the Faculty Constitution needs to be changed. As you know, what prompted this was in fact a recognition that across campus for some time, there had been academic units that aren't following the Faculty Constitution, and that periodically leads to people who are involved and engaged, getting elected to University committees and then we have to go back and hold new elections, because they're not eligible to be on the University committees. Our largest college grants voting rights to people who— it's Constitution, its bylaws, grants voting rights to people who are not voting members of the University faculty--namely term faculty members. And so I think that personally, I support some change to the Faculty Constitution that guarantees that those who have service obligations; those who are something more than just...I don't know what the language would look like. But in my mind, it's not necessarily the State Senator that we hire to teach a class once every other year, but faculty members who are truly members of the community, should have the ability to participate meaningfully in that community.

**Swan:** To follow up with that Scott, (**Peters**) the policies—and that's what this is before us, are the responsibility of the Administration to execute and make sure they're abided by. Whereas the Faculty Constitution is the responsibility of the faculty to manage that and guarantee that. So, with this policy, these decisions are being put ultimately in the hands of the Administration? Is that correct?

**Peters:** I don't know an answer to that question, honestly. Do you see language that you think could be changed that would resolve that?

**Swan:** I 'm not sure that that's necessarily a bad thing. There could be good things.

**Campbell:** As a policy, when we are passing this we are endorsing this, but it's the Administration which is going to approve it. They may do some wordsmithing before they approve it, and the President's cabinet is going to have to approve this. Whereas the Faculty Constitution I believe—that belongs to the faculty. Is that correct?

**Peters:** Correct.

**Campbell:** This is a University policy. It does not go into effect until the President's cabinet approves it.

**Wohlpart:** Yes, we can talk about process, which would be important to do. This would go to the Policy Review Committee. It will go to the Cabinet. It goes to EMT [Executive Management Team]. We are probably six months off from this being approved, at least. Maybe longer. Everything is a process, and I appreciate the fact that it's coming to you all first for your consideration. This not your last chance to comment on this. You actually will get other chances, because we put all policies up for University review.

**Hakes:** I am a bit confused. We opened the discussion as if this is just about spreading academic freedom across more of our faculty members. But then the discussion says what initiated this was getting voting rights for people. And you're going, "That's what I thought." You see, those two...that's what I thought. The objective is under the guise of academic freedom for everybody. We're going

to...it won't happen immediately, but it will open up the discussion for voting rights for term people, which is what it seems to me.

**Peters:** I would object to the characterization of it as "under the guise of academic freedom." It's expanding the ability of people who do labor and teach our students, and participate in our shared governance to voice their opinions is not a guise. That's a value. And it's a fundamental value that I would hope we would all share.

**Hakes:** It's what initiated...

**Peters:** What initiated it...

**Hakes:** What initiated was the fact that we had people sitting on committees that were either violating the Constitution, and we wanted to get that fixed. I'm just saying...I'm just repeating back to you what you said.

**Peters:** I would say that's close to what I just said, which is what initiated it was a recognition that our current policies do not protect the ways that in many cases our faculty currently participate in shared governance.

**Pike:** So it does seem to me that there is a conflict in the policy that's being presented to us. In the last paragraph, after Roman Numeral One, Academic Freedom, there is a sentence that says, "All faculty, regardless of rank or appointment, shall be entitled to protection of their academic freedom," and then "and shall be provided the opportunity to fully participate in shared governance." Then Roman Numeral Two says, talks about a commitment, "shall strive to integrate all faculty," but it doesn't really say how that should be done.



And I think that's where the issue is. There's some conflict. In one place it proscribes how that should be done, and this paragraph just says, "We should strive to do that." And thinking about the potential conflict with the Faculty Constitution. Does that make sense, that there's sort of a conflict there?

**Peters:** I understand what you're saying. That paragraph you point to, the first paragraph under "Policy." I can't remember for sure... Yeah, that was not in the...that may not have been in the draft the last time I came to you. My notes are a little incomplete here, but I feel like that might have been inserted as a result of our first discussion with you.

**Pike:** It does look like it comes from the recommendation of the AAUP report. I'm just pointing out there's a little bit of a contradiction there in terms of whether we want to talk about striving and being open; how we're going to accomplish that goal as specified.

**Hesse:** Is strive consistent with the terms of our contract?

**Pike:** Right, but again that other paragraph says they should all be voting. They should all participate. "Shall be provided the opportunity to fully participate in shared governance."

**Hesse:** It doesn't say voting rights.

**Wohlpart:** That's not voting rights. How you determine shared governance is up to you.

**Pike:** Maybe that's where the confusion is.

**Wohlpart:** If I could make a comment: One of the things that I actually talked about when I interviewed and in the first year that I was here, was that we don't really have a robust enough understanding of shared governance on this campus, in my opinion. I think we cross the lines in all sorts of ways with shared governance. I would encourage—I think this is such a healthy conversation, but I don't think you all are going to get to where you need to be today, because I think what you're talking about is a potential culture shift, which is awesome that you're talking about that, but this is not a place to shift culture. And a policy's not a place to shift culture. So I would encourage you all to, and I hate to do this to Scott (**Peters**) because he's worked really hard on this, is to have maybe a more robust conversation outside of Robert's Rules, where you guys can really talk about where you're headed.

**Peters:** The problem with that is we have a major Catch 22, and that is that the culture shift discussion is fundamentally about the kind of things that Senator **Hakes** and I have been talking about. But that discussion is almost moot if people who currently aren't recognized under the Faculty Constitution as voting members have no protection for their participation in the first place. So it becomes a sort of chicken and egg question. Something just occurred to me, and I don't know why it never occurred to me in the months that we've worked on this in different committees, but rather than the language in Roman Numeral Two about, "integrating all faculty into shared governance of the University, consistent with the terms of their contract," I wonder if there could be language in there that says something like, "integrating all faculty recognized by the Faculty Constitution as voting members." That would give the protection to all voting

members in University Policy, and then would allow the broader discussion of who should be a voting member to happen. I don't know what Senator **Hesse** or Senator **Koch** thinks of that possibility. I don't know. It's honestly something that just occurred to me.

**Hesse:** I'm not a fan of this. I support the policy. I'm not a fan of what was just proposed. I was involved in an early draft of this and then I left the group. And the context for this is, we talk about academic freedom, academic responsibility and shared governance, but we really don't have any set policies or clear explanations about what these terms actually mean. So what we did is we tried to grab what we had from any resources available at UNI, look at other schools, look at AAUP and combine them all together in a document which we have right here. The topic of extending voting rights is a very, very important topic, but that's a separate topic than this. This is just a policy statement on academic freedom, academic responsibility, and shared governance. In particular, protecting people who choose to serve on committees who have adjunct or part time status. Roman Numeral Two there, Shared Governance. And so I'm concerned that the discussion's getting blurred between this policy and extending voting rights. I would consider those to be definitely separate issues. The voting rights extension will be probably discussed in the future, but the key thing is—it's in the future.

**Peters:** Actually, your comment just struck home another point that we've kind of overlooked, and that's that even if the faculty were to keep the current definition of "voting faculty," there still are circumstances, as on the Senate, where non-voting faculty participate in shared governance. There are non-voting faculty members in various committees.

**Hesse:** There's at least one committee on one campus where adjuncts are a majority of the members on the committee. The world is changed, and so this is designed not to extend voting rights, but to extend some protections for the people who choose to serve UNI, and often involve going beyond what their contract stipulates.

**Campbell:** I'm just thinking that I think it's too proactive for some people. Again, under policy, "Shall be entitled to protected academic freedom, shall be provided the opportunity to fully participate in shared governance." I think you wanted something more like, "Which will protect them when participating in shared governance." And down under Two, "Shall strive to integrate all faculty into shared governance." Again, that is a more powerful statement than many people would like at this point in time. "Shall protect faculty while serving in shared governance," rather than "Striving to" bring them into shared governance.

**Swan:** I think that part of the issue, and you were hitting on it very nicely, is that some of the words, such as "full participants." When we read that, what does that mean? To a lot of people that would mean—oh, well--voting. That if you don't vote, you're not given the opportunity to fully participate. Although under our current system of shared governance as constructed by the Faculty Constitution, non-voting faculty members do fully participate when they engage the role as a non-voting faculty member. I think that's part of what you're understanding. You're understanding the fullness of the history of UNI, and the governing documents and this sort of thing, that's why you think of this, but lots of other people don't see a non-voting faculty member fully participating as non-voting faculty member,

as full participants, because some people see voting as necessary to the definition of full participation. I think that's erroneous, but other people don't, right? And that's part of the differences, and why we have to keep having discussions like this. When you're talking, it sounds like you're presenting this as saying, and Senator Hesse has said this, that voting is a separate issue. And that's why I can see, voting is a separate issue, because non-voting faculty members currently fully participate as non-voting faculty members. If we wanted to change that shared governance system we could, but we don't have to. But other people don't understand it that way. So I think that's part of the issue, is how people think about full participation.

**Peters:** In light of those comments, I would encourage people—I can't offer amendments, I'm not a member of this body. You guys are. You can make decisions, so if you want to pass something that affirms our commitment to academic freedom and shared governance, by all means, make amendments, and less pass something.

**Gould:** Yes. Yes.

**Swan:** Would you be open to receiving wording from people, and we would handle this first thing at our next meeting with the new wording that comes to you?

**Peters:** I would be willing to do that, sure.

**Swan:** So that's one possibility, but we could change things too now, as you suggested.

**Gould:** Did you want to make a motion?

**Swan:** I can't tell what other people want.

**Gould:** What would you guys like to do moving forward?

**Campbell:** I would move to table, because I think the wordsmithing is not going to get done at this meeting.

**Swan:** Wait, so shall we, because Professor **Peters** has worked on this for years, and tabling can be indefinite. Could we make a motion saying, "This will be the first thing under docketed business at our next meeting, with the new wording that's been proposed that he's worked with and integrated? Does that sound okay? I prefer that to tabling it.

**Hesse:** Can we get agreement on new wording in two weeks?

**Swan:** I hate to make it longer. I'm thinking of Professor **Peters** and how many years he's actually been working with this, but I don't know. Professor **Peters**, can we get this done in two weeks, do you think? Really a week--isn't it? Because we send things out a week ahead for consideration.

**Wohlpart:** I just also want to make the point really quickly that you all are not approving this policy. You don't have the authority to approve policies. That's actually the President and the EMT. What you're doing is sending this forward into the policy process, where you will have lots of opportunity to have more feedback. That will happen in the fall semester. You all know now some of the concepts that are in here, that perhaps rub up against your Constitution. You

should look back at your Constitution in the fall, and see if they fall in line. That will engender some conversation about new language that you could propose as this goes through the policy process. You all are not approving this. It's not done today. You don't have the authority to do that. You're saying, "This is great work. Let's move it forward into the policy process." That's all you're doing.

**Kidd:** I would say, get it done right now. I don't want to wait until after this semester, to be honest. We don't want to go forward without this policy passed in some form if we can help it. But if you want to discuss a couple of words, not major changes, but a bit of the wording, I won't mind.

**Pike:** I'm going to propose a small amendment. I somewhat disagree with you. I have no problem with this paragraph as it talks about "striving to integrate." That's a great thing. That's a goal. Maybe just a couple of words to clarify protection to those in that paragraph about fully participate, "the protection is extended to all those who are participating in shared governance," for their participation. Some small clarification there...

**Gould:** Which section are you...?

**Pike:** The paragraph right above that, "As further defined below—All faculty, regardless of their protection of academic freedom and shall be provided that protection as they participate in shared governance." Does that? It's a small change. Does that clarify at all that it's about the protection, and we can decide later about the extent to which we want to look at the Faculty Constitution about participating and voting.

**Funderburk:** Listening to this on the side, it strikes me that you're hung up primarily on the word 'fully.' So if you're trying to move this forward, you could just delete the word 'fully.' "Shall be provided the opportunity to participate in shared governance," if you're trying to wordsmith that.

**Hakes:** I didn't know this was a document about providing opportunities for shared governance. It's saying, "If you're involved in shared governance, you deserve the protections of academic freedom." Those are separate things. One has been stated, very proactive as to what we imagine the future, as opposed to just saying, "If you're called to serve on a committee, you should be protected." That's a different thing between saying you have full rights to fully participate and be on...I don't know where you're going with that. And there's no reason to even go there if you're objective was to protect academic freedom of people called upon in touchy spots to serve on committees, to be able to say what they need to say, then let's say that. I don't think taking that word 'fully' out is even close.

**Swan:** It helps.

**Hakes:** We're not providing opportunities, we're saying, "If you're called upon, you deserve protection. Isn't that what we originally thought we're dealing with? Unless we're trying to do something else, too.

**Zeitz:** So what you're saying is that if somebody says, "No," they're not going to be receiving any kind of...

**Hakes:** So if they say "no" about what?



**Zeitz:** So in other words, if they're called to serve, and they say "No, I don't want to serve." Is that what we're talking about with academic freedom here?

**Hakes:** I'm talking about when they're serving, they can say what they want to say.

**Zeitz:** I see.

**Hakes:** I'm thinking...I just think about how carefully...The reason this bothers me is, I think of how carefully we hire assistant professors, and how carefully we place them into situations where they could have a problem. And then I know how different that is from when we hire adjuncts, and how...You see what I'm saying? I cannot help but think that there is greater protection in a sense, being provided to someone instantly, than the way we take care of someone whose an assistant professor rank. I find this to be so out of balance, that all I'm saying is that if we're going to have someone serve, and it's part of their contract to serve sometimes, then they should be granted academic freedom. But I don't know that we should go further and say, "that position has rights" to anything yet. I don't know why we're even going there.

**Pike:** I'm going to try and bring this to a close. If I could make a motion that we approve this policy as presented with one change, that instead of "shall be provided the opportunity to fully," change that to "during participation in shared governance." So it says it basically just says they're entitled to protection of their academic freedom during participation in shared governance, and shall be expected to fulfill their academic and ethical responsibilities," and just move it forward from here.

**Peters:** May I suggest just one additional word?

**Pike:** Sure.

**Peters:** “entitled to protection of their academic freedom, protection during their participation in shared governance,” to make sure that it’s clear that academic freedom is not only about shared governance.

**Pike:** Can I make that motion?

**Gould:** You can make the motion. Can I have a second? So moved by Senator **Zeitz**. Okay, all in favor...

**Swan:** Now we discuss the amendment.

**Gould:** Okay. Discussion on the amendment.

**Campbell:** I have a question for Senator **Hakes**. I’m still looking at Roman Numeral Two: Shared Governance, and are you bothered by that, “shall strive to integrate all faculty into the shared governance”?

**Hakes:** Yes. I don’t think that this was what about. I thought that this was about extending academic freedom to those that are called upon to serve. That’s what it was originally proposed. People are called upon, sometimes contractually, to be involved in service obligations that are contractually required of them, and they don’t have academic freedom protection. That’s the way it was sold to us from Day One. That’s what we’re dealing with. I see. If it’s in your contract that you have to participate on these, then yes—that makes sense. It didn’t have anything to do with advancing other issues. So yeah, I would have a problem with that, too.

But I agree with the first step. Again, you can pass this without me. I'm just saying how this was approached at the beginning had nothing to do with making statements about inclusion, and it all had to do with in fact--that was the example given--that people who are adjuncts have contracts that require them to serve in certain ways that can be touchy. That's the way it was brought to us, and that's the way it was brought to us. That's the way it was.

**Kidd:** Just a question: I thought I could change the wording just to reflect the proposed amendment. Could you please repeat that Scott (**Peters**)?

**Peters:** I think Senator **Pike**'s amendment was...

**Pike:** "A protection while participating in shared governance." Wasn't that it? And the rest of that was taken out.

[Faculty Chair **Kidd** reworks proposal on computer]

**Pike:** I think that's what Scott asked--was to clarify..." protection of their academic freedom," I think that was the suggestion from Scott (**Peters**) after mine was to add a comma.

**Zeit:** Replace the comma with an 'and.'

**Skaar:** Didn't Scott (**Peters**) suggest replacing 'and' with "during shared governance"?

**Zeit:** Shouldn't it be "protection of their academic freedom while participating in shared governance"? So get rid of 'and' 'protection' and 'while'.

**Pike:** Well then that limits it to only protecting it while they're participating in shared governance.

**Campbell:** It's available other places.

**Wohlpart:** At the head of your policy you're now limiting academic freedom to just participation in shared governance.

**Cobb:** I do hope that everybody knows that there are so many chances—do you know how the policy review process works? Jim mentioned it, but it's just like saying, "Now Scott, you can put this forward." Then it's posted, and somebody can really figure out the perfect wording for it, and all those go back to Scott. They get sent to policy review.

**Peters:** They'll go to Gretchen (**Gould**) because it's the Senate's policy

**Cobb:** And then there's another chance for the Faculty Senate to actually approve or send forward the policy that has to be done at the University level, but-- I agree with Tim (**Kidd**) that it's nice to get it forward, but there are so many chances, and I just thought I should say that.

**Gould:** Thank you. Scott (**Peters**)?

**Swan:** I had a procedure question with that then. So could we pass this as general ideas that lots of the faculty think might be good, but not endorsing the verbiage as it's going forward to send it through this process that you're talking about, that then would come back to the Faculty Senate to be approved or rejected after that? So we could have that motion, which is quite different than most people

have been thinking about it, even Professor **Peters**. But that might be a good way to move forward today.

**Burnight:** This is so sad. [Laughter] Could we just for purposes of grammatical sentence, could we just have a comma after freedom, and then just say, “including protection while participating in shared governance”?

**Pike:** While he’s typing that, I did have a motion on the floor to approve this. I would accept a friendly amendment to change the wording to what you suggest. I’ll make the motion that we are passing this along into the policy approval process for further review farther down the road. And then, I would look for a second.

**Gould:** It has been moved by Senator **Pike** and seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter** that we are moving to put this into the policy review process.

**Swan:** And just for the recorder, what has happened is that the person who sponsored a motion to amend has removed that, and he has replaced it with this motion. Is that clear to the recorder for the minutes? Good.

**Gould:** All in favor of the motion put forth on the floor, please say, “aye,” all opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes.

**Swan:** Very good Professor **Peters**. This really has been many years of a lot of work with a lot of people, so I commend you and thank you.

**Gould:** So we have five minutes left, unless there is a motion to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes or even less, five minutes?

**Swan:** We can't do what we need to do in five minutes obviously.

**Pike:** Let's get going and see how far we get.

**Dhanwada:** There's still two items left to be discussed.

**Gould:** Associate Dean **Funderburk**, sorry. [Laughter] Let's start on this conversation.

**Funderburk:** Have you been able to pull these up? Have you seen these learning outcomes? They've been out there. The very condensed version is that we've recommended three University-level learning outcomes that amount to critical thinking, communication, and program content knowledge. These have been endorsed with this wording from all College Senates. They've been reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee, the Council of Department Heads, the...

**Peters:** they've been reviewed in writing. We got some feedback from the University Writing Committee, and they were also sent in writing to the deans and the assistant council.

**Funderburk:** this is about as vetted as anything I've ever seen come to the Senate thus far. With the idea being that our committee went after the low hanging fruit—the things we thought everybody would be able to agree on, and easily relate their program's learning outcomes to these, because at some point, each

department will have to say, “How are we addressing this?” and what does this mean to us? So that’s what I have to present.

**Pike:** I just want to make sure, because I remember in College Faculty Senate, one of our discussions was, these are University-level, so our department could for example say, “We want to more specifically define what critical thinking is for us and implement that as an objective.” So again, these are just general, University-level, University-wide, so...nothing’s going to constrain at the College or School level?

**Funderburk:** We struggled to make the wording as broad as possible so every department could do whatever they felt was the right thing in their particular area.

**Pike:** Consistent with, and potentially in addition to these.

**Funderburk:** Exactly.

**Wohlpert:** That will be the next step, is to ask departments to in fact flesh out what this means, as Jeff (**Funderburk**) said, to your program.

**Swan:** So, something like imagination, would that go under program content for certain disciplines who very much engage in imagination, techniques of imagination—developing that?

**Funderburk:** I could see that as program content under some areas. With my Acting Art Department Head on, it’s probably under visual communication with me at the moment.

**Peters:** Or, let me just throw this out as well, which is that programs are free to decide that they have their own outcomes that they wish to assess, above and beyond the three that they're required to--the three that all departments will be required to.

**Swan:** Can one or more of those additional ones be more important than any or all of these?

**Peters:** I don't know the answer to that.

**Wohlpart:** They're all the same. Faculty will get to decide. Everybody will do critical thinking, communication and then each program will say, "Here's the knowledge that's important in history, philosophy, elementary ed. Here's the skills important in my discipline."

**Zeitz:** What's the reason for creating these? With all the standards and everything that we have to contend with, and all of them have all this stuff in it, why is it done on a University-level as well?

**Wohlpart:** Higher Learning Commission is expecting this. It's required.

**Funderburk:** Because of our condensed version, that was the first slide in my PowerPoint. "Here's why."

**Pike:** Since it's about 4:59, can I make a motion to extend the meeting for five minutes?



**Gould:** I have a motion by Senator **Pike** seconded by Senator **Swan** that we extend the meeting for five minutes. All in favor, please say “aye,” all opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes. We will extend meeting for five minutes.

**Swan:** One last question: For example, under communications at the end, “as appropriate for their disciplines,” so that could be really quite small, is that correct? Even though it’s one of the three major competencies, for a discipline, that could be very, very small? They would have to do something, but it could be small?

**Funderburk:** I’m not saying this is true. Let’s say my area was ceramics, maybe I’m satisfied with the writing required at the LAC level, so my focus is on a much more rigorous visual communication standard than perhaps your area would be.

**Swan:** And to continue with that though with the ceramics, often that’s not to communicate anything. It’s to express without necessarily communication in the art, and so that’s why it could be even smaller for them. Is that true? So it’s appropriate for their discipline?

**Funderburk:** Exactly. That’s what we’re trying to get at. I think it’s clear that oral and written are required for every single program. That’s in the LAC, so clearly we have a standard there. We don’t have a visual communication standard, but that’s...

**Swan:** So the LAC can fulfill this for many programs then?

**Wohlpart:** It cannot.

**Peters:** In response to Provost **Wohlpert**, I would say that was one piece of feedback we got from College Senates, was that people will need more clarification on where the LAC fits into these, or how the LAC fits overall into University-wide assessment.

**Wohlpert:** One of the things you must do when you go through accreditation is demonstrate that your graduates meet your university learning outcomes. And many of our students come to us from other institutions, perhaps with an AA. So all you get them for is your major. So whatever it is that you do in your major, your learning outcomes will have to meet the University-wide learning outcomes. That's the reason for making these broad. You cannot rely on the liberal Arts Core, because you don't know that your students will take the Liberal Arts Core. Nor will you know what they had gotten in their Liberal Arts Core if they have an Associate's degree. But how you define them, in your major, will be up to you.

**Skaar:** And this is for graduate students and undergraduates?

**Wohlpert:** It will be for all programs. That is correct. All programs.

**Zeitz:** Will we have to be defining how it's being assessed?

**Wohlpert:** Yes, which we're already doing--but yes. This will give us a format for that.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Peters:** We expected when we drew these up that most programs that are already doing assessment will probably be able to point to specific outcomes that they've already identified and fit them within these, and then they may have

some beyond these as well. But we did not anticipate, in fact we designed this intentionally as much as we could, so that if programs were already doing assessment, they would be able to see what they're doing in the requirements.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Swan:** So a lot of programs integrate the LAC into their programs already and we're now saying that's not possible? We can't do that?

**Wohlpart:** That is correct.

**Swan:** So what is the LAC for now, for our graduates?

**Wohlpart:** The way that learning should be done is developmentally. The Liberal Arts Core will also have to take this on as a program, and say, "Our learning outcomes for the Liberal Arts Core, is X, Y, and Z," and will have to include critical thinking and communication, and then other things that the faculty will decide, and presumably that will create a foundational set of knowledge that you will then build on in your majors.

**Swan:** You said we can't use the LAC anymore.

**Wohlpart:** You cannot use the learning outcomes that are developed in the LAC in your majors. You will have to assess critical thinking, communication, and whatever program knowledge and skills you say, at whatever level.

**Gould:** Seeing that it is 5:03, does anybody want to put a motion forth whether or not to table it, to vote on it, continue discussion at the next meeting?

**Zeitz:** I move we vote on it.

**Gould:** Do I have a second? Moved by Senator **Zeitz** and seconded by Senator **Burnight** to approve the University-wide Student Learning Outcomes. All in favor, please say “aye,” all opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes. Can I have a motion to adjourn? Can I have a motion to extend for the B.A./B.S thirty-two hour requirement? It’s been moved by Senator **Burnight** to extend the meeting ten minutes and seconded by Vice-Chair **Walter**. All in favor, please say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes. Ira, (**Simet**) please come up.

**Simet:** Thanks for adding some time to get to this one. As we mentioned at the last meeting, we’ve discovered there’s a big difference between double majors and double degrees in terms of requirements imposed by the University, and that difference is a 32-hour addition if you were pursuing a double degree, which would be in the example that we were most aware of, a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science. We tried to do a little research to see what the justification was for the additional 32 hours. It goes back a long way, and we couldn’t find any of our own documents that spoke to that. So we’re deciding it might be the residue of a residency requirement, which we typically have for a second degree, when students come back having completed one. Or, the other possibility is that the faculty felt at some time that 32 hours was the minimum content needed for what you would call a degree. Whichever of those it is, we looked to some other universities for some guidance about this. Iowa State has the same requirement as we do essentially, but the University of Iowa requires no additional hours. So you can see, there are two extremes. And looking at the ten peer institutions as

indicated by the Regents, there are four or five who have requirements similar to ours. One or two that have no requirement whatsoever, and one or two that don't even grant double degrees--it doesn't even appear in their catalog, which we took as license to go ahead and make a proposal for what we thought was right, and what we think we should do is to eliminate the 32 additional hours for people doing concurrent double degree. This doesn't apply to people who are going to finish a degree, and then a year or two later decide they'd like another degree, and they would come back and harvest some extra hours they had left over and use those. If that case happens, then what's already in the books is separate, and they'll have to go for a second degree completely independently. We're talking about students who are trying to get both degrees at the same time Colin (**Weeks**) and I have been working on this. Even at a random look—we didn't even have to hunt very hard, we found many examples where you could finish a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Science, the pair we were looking at, completely underneath the umbrella of the 126 hours that are required for the B.S., for example. So those 32 hours wouldn't even contribute to either of the degrees you'd been working on. So we thought that kind of defeated the purpose of 32 extra hours as a content of a degree, because the content of the degree is already there. And certainly anybody doing concurrent degrees has met the residency requirement, so we thought the 32 hours looked like a surplus requirement that we shouldn't impose anymore, and that's why we brought this proposal to you, to see how you feel about eliminating the 32-hour, I like to call it the surcharge--for students trying to do something a little more ambitious and effectively being punished for it.

**Gould:** And you have vetted this with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Registrar's Office?

**Simet:** Yes. From the Registrar's Office, Diane **Wallace** is here to support that, and we've also gone around to all the Collegiate Senates. We heard no objections. In fact, we heard murmurs of support. The only objections we heard were kind of logistical objections to the structured proposal actually, to make sure that all of the peer institutions were represented, things like that. But most people thought it was a good idea.

**Swan:** So eliminating these hours, the requirements--so what's the more ambitious thing that the student is doing in getting the two degrees? I understand that with the hours we have, it's very ambitious. But now, what's the more ambitious thing?

**Simet:** We see—I think most people see a Bachelor of Science for example, as a more rigorous degree than a Bachelor of Arts. Certainly in our department, there are additional courses. It's longer by six hours. There are all kinds of arguments that the B.S. is a more rigorous degree, and yet under the terms of this, you can get two B.S.'s more easily than a B.S. and a B.A. We think that's backwards. So that was one of the justifications.

**Swan:** So your B.S. student will now be able to also get a B.A. for doing nothing else? Just putting it together?

**Simet:** Well, if they've completed the requirements for that B.A.—now they can't do it in our department. The one we see most often is a B.S. in Biology and BA in Chemistry. So they have to complete the requirements for both. They don't get off the hook for that. But with double counting and with overlap of courses, it's now possible to finish a pair of degrees and still be within the 126 hours. So we don't see that there's a justification for 32 additional hours, which wouldn't even be in those two disciplines.

**Swan:** Right now you said it's easier to get two B.S.'s or two B.A.'s and you're just trying to ...I see.

**Zeitz:** What you're saying is that you're double dipping on the LACs? On the Liberal Arts Courses?

**Simet:** Most students already do that if they're doing a double major or a double degree. This 32-hours is additional to everything that's already proscribed to them--the LAC and all the requirements for their two degrees. They can still do that in under 126 hours. So we don't see a justification for another 32.

**Zeitz:** I agree with you. I just want to make sure I understand.

**Campbell:** Ira, did you look back to the time when we first approved the B.S. degree to see if there was anything from that time which referred to why it was put in?

**Simet:** All of the documents that I could find about the B.S. were strictly focused on the B.S. and didn't even address the possibility of this type of double degree. I

think the notion at the time was that students would substitute a B.S. for a B.A., so they could access the more rigorous curriculum, and so there's no talk about this at all.

**Campbell:** But that was in the catalog immediately after the B.S. was approved?

**Simet:** The wording of this did not appear in the catalog for a while, or maybe Diane (**Wallace**) can correct me on that. The formal wording didn't show up until recently. It was a policy, but it wasn't formalized until recently, when a number of students who were seeking to do it began to grow. Then...

**Dhanwada:** I just want to say that this is actually impacting a lot of students, and it's prohibiting them from completing, because they are almost done, or they are done, and because they have to do the additional 32 hours to get another degree which is good for them as they move forward, they are now choosing not to, because it's going to take them an extra year. This is in favor of students as well. Students are foregoing an entire degree because we're asking them to do 32 additional credits.

**Walter:** I move that we put the proposal to a vote immediately.

**Gould:** It has been moved by Vice-Chair **Walter**, and seconded by Senator **Pike** that we vote on the proposal to eliminate the additional 32-hour credit requirement for undergraduates seeking a concurrent undergraduate double degree. All in favor, please say "aye," all opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. May I have a motion to adjourn? So moved by Senator **Burnight**.



Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt  
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate