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ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Comments from Provost Marlin.

2. The Chair announced the awarding of Professor Emeritus to:
   Arnold Freitag - Industrial Technology
   Elizabeth Ann Martin - Library Science
   Jean A. Trout - Educational Psychology and Foundations.

3. Comments from Chairperson Longnecker.

REPORTS

4. Comments from the Chair on Calendar Item 496. Received the report from and discharged the Writing Enigma Committee. See Appendix A. Docketed out of regular order a motion from Senator Crownfield. Docket 441.

5. The Senate decided to take no action on changing the policy on incompleteds for undergraduate students. See Appendix B.

6. The Senate decided to allow the policy on administration of final examination as stated in each "schedule of classes" to stand as official notification to the faculty.

DOCKET

7. 441 Motion from Senator Crownfield relative to the Committee on the Writing Enigma. Approved as amended.

8. 500 440 Recommendation 3 of April, 1990, Report from the University Writing Committee. See Senate Minutes 1426. Approved as amended and attached to Docket Item 441.
The Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Board Room of Gilchrist Hall, by Chairperson Longnecker.

Present: Leander Brown, Phyllis Conklin, David Crownfield, David Duncan, Reginald Green, Randall Krieg, Roger Kueter, John Longnecker, Barbara Lounsberry, Charles Quirk, Ernest Raiklin, Erwin Richter, Ron Roberts, Nick Tieg, Patrick Wilkinson, Marc Yoder, ex officio

Absent: Robert Decker, Bill Henderson

The Chair introduced Dr. Randall Krieg of the Department of Economics as a new Senator representing the College of Business Administration.

Announcements

1. Comments from Provost Marlin.

Provost Marlin started by highlighting recent developments at the January Board of Regents' meeting.

1. The Strategic Planning documents for the colleges have been approved by the Board.

2. Approval to hire an architect to study the feasibility of a new residence facility was granted. She pointed out residence halls are self-supported through room charges rather than through state appropriations. A final report from the architect is expected in the next few months.

3. She stated the possibility of locating graduate education centers in southwest Iowa was discussed. There is a continuing perception that the Regents' universities do not provide citizens from that part of the State with access to graduate programs.

She next announced the deadlines for several campus programs. Applications for the computer competition is February 4. First priority will go to initial placements of equipment followed by upgrading existing equipment.

She announced the American Council of Teachers of Russian has entered into an agreement with UNI through which one UNI faculty member will be provided the opportunity to teach in the Soviet Union. Instruction will be in English and priority will be given to instructors of courses in American Studies. She stated UNI will continue to provide the individual's salary and benefits and the Council of Teachers of Russian will provide airfare, a stipend and housing in a residence hall facility. The deadline for applications is February 22, 1991.
She announced the competition available for four faculty members to attend Tufts' Environmental Institute this summer. The Institute will be held from May 20 through May 31. The deadline for application is February 15.

She stated the Outstanding Service and Teacher Awards are yet to be finalized but will hopefully be available later this semester.

Provost Marlin turned her attention to the fiscal situation. She stated that the State is looking for places to make budget cuts and that we have received inquiries as to the impact on the University if our budget were cut one or two percent. She stated we will fight to maintain what has previously been appropriated as our base has been reduced by $244,000. She indicated those economic development programs funded through lottery funds are particularly vulnerable agencies. She also stated the Governor has made no capital recommendations and recommended only $250,000 for UNI for enrollment growth.

She reiterated the importance of the faculty searches in progress. She predicted we may not have the opportunity for diversity in the future that exists today.

Provost Marlin stated she has moved back to Gilchrist Hall. As part of the remodeling a bookcase was added that she wishes to use to display books published by members of the UNI faculty. She encouraged each faculty member to send copies of their books to her office so they may be displayed.

Senator Lounsberry inquired if there was any chance that the $250,000 recommended for enrollment growth may be increased. Provost Marlin responded that the Governor's recommendations are often viewed as the baseline and that we will continue to try and increase this amount during the legislative session.

2. The Chair announced the awarding of Professor Emeritus status to Arnold Freitag - Industrial Technology, Elizabeth Ann Martin - Library Science, and Jean A. Trout - Educational Psychology and Foundations.

3. The Chair indicated an agreement has been reached with the Board of Regents staff on student outcome assessments. The agreement states we will need to be pilot testing assessment instruments during the Spring semester of 1992 with full implementation for the Fall semester of 1992.

He pointed out the Board has approved the policies on teaching assessment for Teaching Assistants and the policy on evaluation of the oral competency for each instructor.

The Chair reported on attending the Regents' ceremony for awards to faculty members. He stated he was extremely proud of the UNI people who were recognized.
The Chair stated he and Gene Lutz will be meeting with Executive Secretary Richey on February 6 to discuss what is an acceptable outcome assessment instrument.

Reports

4. Writing Enigma Committee.

See Appendix A.

The Chair read the following statement into the record.

Calendar Item 496 appearing on the Agenda of the Senate's February 26, 1990, meeting was a request from the University Writing Committee for the creation of a Review Board.

The Chair read from the request dated February 15, 1990, found in Senate minutes #1422, Appendix A, paragraphs 1 and 2:

... the University Writing Committee unanimously voted to recommend that the University Faculty Senate create a review board to examine the operation and administrative location of the Academic Achievement Writing Center. This review would be undertaken in order to determine what services are currently offered, who the current constituents are, and what student and faculty needs are currently being met.

The Committee also recommends that this review board determine, based on these findings, whether a separate writing center, housed in a separate administrative unit and without a remediation focus, may be needed, or whether the structure and mission of the current Academic Writing Center should be revised to meet current and future needs.

The University Senate did not docket the request but rather took its own action to form the Ad Hoc Committee for Clarification of Writing Enigma. The Chair interpreted from the remarks (as recorded in Senate Minutes #1422) of Senator Crownfield, the initiator of the action, that the mission of the Committee would be to "... discuss all of the issues involved, not whether to establish a Review Board" and presented that broad mission to the Committee.

You have in your hands the report of that committee with a request. The Chair genuinely regrets the extent of the apparent lack of cooperation received by that committee that causes it now to request to be discharged.

The first of two regrets is the amount of effort and time expended by the members of that committee; in the Chair's estimation, the Committee was
professionally and admirably attempting to carry out its assigned task and is deserving of the Senate's thanks.

The second regret is that, because of said apparent lack of cooperation, the Senate must deal with a matter on the docket for this meeting without the benefit of the expertise that the Senate hoped would be available from the Committee. If the Senate should later approve Recommendation 3 from the University Writing Committee, the administrative housing of elements of that recommendation would still be in question.

Professor Stephen Fortgang, Chair of the Writing Enigma Committee, addressed the Senate. He stated the report reflects their attempt to study and collect the facts. He suggested there was a difference of viewpoint as to the Committee's job which may have fostered a lack of communications. He stated the Committee did not view itself in the role of a referee to resolve a disagreement between two areas, rather they thought it was their responsibility to look at the larger picture on writing on campus.

Crownfield moved, Brown seconded, for the Faculty Senate to acknowledge the report and for the Senate to express its recognition of the appropriate conduct by the Committee, to thank the Committee, and to discharge the Committee. Motion passed.

Crownfield moved, Quirk seconded,

The Senate recommends the establishment of a program in support of student writing, not restricted to remedial writing problems, specifically including an emphasis on support of writing across the curriculum. This program should be administratively separate from the present Academic Achievement Center. Its location, the full scope of its task, the extent to which it absorbs, duplicates or replaces functions of the Academic Achievement Center, and other administrative issues shall be determined by the Provost after consultation with the Office of Academic Advising, the Department of English, and the University Writing Committee. The Provost is invited to inform the Senate of the disposition of the matter.

The Senate wishes in no way to weaken or impede the provision of remedial services or the support of educationally or otherwise disadvantaged students; the Senate also hopes there can be maximum cooperation and coordination between those charged with the proposed program and the staff of the Academic Achievement Center.

The Chair expressed the belief that unless the Senators decide otherwise, this item should be dealt with as a calendar item for docketing in or out of regular order.

Senator Brown expressed it was appropriate for the Senate to recommend a writing program and to allow the administration to make the organizational decisions on inter-relationships.
Senator Crownfield pointed out our current docket item is on the Writing Associates' Program and does not refer to any other review of the writing program. He reminded the Senate that about a year ago a suggestion was to have a review of the activities of the Writing Center relative to its focus and its administrative organizational placement. He stated the Senate created the Ad Hoc Committee to address these issues and just because the Committee could not complete its review does not diminish the concern of the faculty about this situation. He stated he did not list other agencies because he did not want any further delays if such agencies may choose not to respond.

Associate Vice President Means stated he felt the Center for Academic Achievement should be involved and that this unit is prepared to work with the faculty toward solving any problems identified with the writing program.

Teig moved, Quirk seconded, to docket out of regular order for today's meeting. Motion passed. Docket 441.

New/Old Business

5. The Senate had before it a request for consideration of a change of policy in awarding of incomplete grades to undergraduate students. See Appendix B.

The Chair indicated two courses of action were probably most appropriate: first, the matter could be referred to the Educational Policies Commission or; the Senate may choose to take no action.

The Senate chose to take no action in this matter.

6. The Chair indicated he was concerned that the policy on administration of final examinations was not distributed by the Office of Academic Affairs during the fall semester.

Provost Marlin stated some faculty had complained to her office about the periodic distribution of this policy statement. Responding to those complaints, the Office of Academic Affairs chose to cease distribution of the policy on the administration of final examinations.

Several Senators spoke in favor of distribution of this policy statement. They stated it served as a valuable reminder and as a tool when working with students' requests.

At this point, the Senate discovered the policy statement on administration of final examinations is contained in each schedule of classes in the section which indicates when tests are to be administered. The Senate decided this was sufficient notification to the University faculty.
Docket

7. Motion from Senator Crownfield relative to the Committee on the Writing Enigma.

Brown moved, Green seconded, to amend by adding after the Department of English, "the Student Support Services Program."

Senator Crownfield inquired as to the difference between Student Support Services Program and the Center for Academic Achievement. Associate Vice President Means stated the Student Support Services Program is federally funded and the Writing Center is under the jurisdiction of the Center for Academic Achievement. Senator Crownfield inquired as to the mandate of the Student Support Services Program. Director Frye stated it is a federal program for academic retention which serves clients who are referred to them by the faculty.

It was agreed by friendly amendment to add "the Student Support Services Program."

Associate Vice President Means suggested the Center for Academic Achievement should be added to this group.

Senator Crownfield stated the original Committee had been appointed to do the initial exploration of this topic, but due to a lack of response was unable to proceed further. Whether it was a question of authority or charge the Committee's progress was halted. He pointed out that since the Center for Academic Achievement reports to the Provost, she can seek their input if she so desires. Senator Crownfield stated he felt the faculty at large would oppose the inclusion of representatives of the Center for Academic Achievement on this new motion.

Associate Vice President Means stated the original Committee moved away from their charge and for the Center to participate at that time was to accept the wrongful information presented as being truthful. He pointed out the Center has worked with the University Writing Committee from its very beginning and that the Center is more than willing to work with any group on the question of writing at UNI.

Writing Specialist Jennie VerSteeg pointed out only approximately 25 percent of the students who came to her Center do so for remediation purposes. She pointed out she has nine student assistants to help her and that they have neither the space nor personnel to accomplish the goals of the Associates' Program. She stated there is a need for both what they are doing and for the Associates' Program. She reiterated that faculty and staff must take responsibility for the writing of our students.

Question on the motion was called. The motion as amended passed.
8. 550 400 Recommendation 3 of the April, 1990, Report from the University Writing Committee. See Senate Minutes 1426.

Senator Brown inquired as to how this item interfaces with the previous motion. Senator Crownfield stated the previous motion does not specify where the Associates' Program should be housed, but assumes it would be drawn into the general jurisdiction of the previously passed motion.

Senator Teig inquired if Appendix E of this report was part of this motion. Senator Crownfield suggested we should include this five-part process in the previous motion with the change of Student Services to the area of Provost review.

Crownfield moved, Teig seconded, to amend by including the five-step process found on page 15 of the University Writing Committee report with the replacement of "in the English Department or under Student Services" with "located in the program" referred to in Docket item 441.

Professor Wayne King inquired if this should be interpreted as a broader consideration than just the Writing Associates' Program. Senator Crownfield responded that the broad scope assumption is correct.

Question on the motion to amend was called. Motion to amend passed.

Question on the main motion as amended was called. The main motion as amended passed.

The Chair ruled there being no further business, the Senate stood adjourned. The Senate adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Patton
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, February 1, 1991.
December 20, 1990

Professor John Longnecker, Chair
Faculty Senate
Baker 194
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614-0506

Re: Ad Hoc Committee for Clarification of Writing Enigma

Dear Professor Longnecker:

Last March the Faculty Senate charged this committee to look into and clarify the writing enigma at UNI, following a dispute about the way current services are provided. It was presented to us as a disagreement between individuals, but it seemed to us to transcend individuals. For example, issues like whether a certain department had been invited to be represented on a search committee needed to be separated from and viewed secondarily to larger concerns like where a program ought properly to be housed.

At our earliest meetings, we discussed possible ways to begin our inquiry. We considered the option of inviting the interested parties to testify (in effect) as to what had happened; we rejected this option in favor of an approach beginning with written questions and responses. We agreed to follow a set of guidelines for committee conduct. (See Appendix A for letter defining these guidelines.) We determined that we would study the issues that underlay the "squabble." What we hoped was that the participants and other interested persons, once they had explored the larger dimensions with us, would redefine the disagreement, discuss it with us, and help arrive at a resolution that would improve writing at UNI.

The Committee first looked at the points of conflict and identified the underlying questions of institutional structure and policy. We then undertook to situate the current structures and policies in their historical context. After combing through Faculty Senate minutes, committee reports, and other documents, we constructed a history of the development of writing assistance at UNI and formulated a sequence of questions. Our belief was that answers to these questions would provide a substantial and legitimate basis for determining what writing assistance should be offered at UNI and under what policies and structures.

We wrote to seven individuals directly or indirectly involved in the disagreement, providing the historical and conceptual context we had developed and asking them to reply to our questions, using their best professional judgment. (See Appendix B.) We received two letters, neither of which specifically and fully answered our questions.

One letter, signed by Mr. Richard Frye, Dr. Wayne King, Dr. Charles 'Nelpa', and Dr. Jennie VerSteeg (see Appendix C), stated that we had defined our mission too broadly and insisted our function was to pursue the questions raised in the initial dispute only. It included the following paragraph:

As stated, we would still welcome the opportunity to address pertinent concerns. The request we received from you, however, addresses none of the concerns it seems you were charged to examine. We find no errors or omissions in your historical context, and we do feel the questions are worth asking. The task of answering them, however, seems more appropriately given to a University Task Force, should the need arise. The answers to your questions about the extent of student difficulties, access to assistance for all students, quality of existing services, etc., can only be answered after comprehensive research into the current writing program, research which is not in our power to undertake. After all, we are only part of a much larger writing program, and our answers to your quite sweeping questions would be at best myopic and at worst unintentionally misleading.

We received clarification from you assuring us that we were correctly interpreting our mission and sent a second request for individual letters from the four signatories (Appendix D). We received no response to this request by the suggested deadline. One of the four later called and offered to speak to the committee. We responded that this would be inconsistent with the approach we had outlined in our letters.

The second letter received by the Committee in response to our May 10 request, that from Professor Scott Cavelti (a portion of which constitutes Appendix E), only partially answered our questions. The rest of the letter contained allegations about persons and events that we had decided would receive consideration only after responses to our contextual questions had set a framework for such discussion.

No response was received from the outgoing acting head of the Department of English Language and Literature, Dr. Robert Wood. Early in the fall we requested and received a letter from the new head, Dr. Mary Rohrberger (Appendix F), in which she provided some observations based on her brief tenure at UNI. These thoughts, like Professor Cavelti's, would have received further study had we been successful in reaching the next stage of our work.
The University Faculty Senate charged the Committee to study the writing enigma. We sought to establish a substantive basis for our study. We regret to report that we were unsuccessful. We continue to be vitally interested in the improvement of writing on this campus and convinced that useful discussions about change should be grounded in judgments about policy and structure rather than personality and territory. We respectfully request that our committee be discharged.

Sincerely,

Stephen Fortgang, Chairperson
Karen Agee
Myra Boots
Marlan Kroglmann
Allen Rappaport
Daryl Smith
Ad Hoc Committee for Clarification of Writing Enigma

enclosures: Appendices
TO: Mr. John Longnecker, Chair  
FROM: Marlene Strathe  
DATE: January 8, 1991  
RE: Academic Policy Regarding Incompletes

As you will note from the attached, the Graduate Council approved a new policy regarding incompletes which now appears in the Catalog but will not be effective until fall 1991. As Mr. Leahy notes this differs from our treatment of undergraduates and some consideration should be given to a university policy. I do not believe this a matter for the Curriculum Committee and the Educational Policies Commission normally is convened only by Senate request. Thus, I ask you to bring this item to the attention of the Senate for disposition.

/c
Attachment

TO: Dr. Strathe  
FROM: Robert D. Leahy, Registrar  
DATE: 10/25/90

Last year the Graduate Council approved a new policy for graduate students receiving an incomplete (I). The time to make up the incomplete was changed to six weeks after the start of the Fall semester for incompletes awarded Spring and Summer and six weeks after the start of the Spring semester for those awarded in the Fall. The previous policy was an all University policy and allowed six months to make up the incompletes from the time it was awarded.

Another change was the requirement of having to complete a contract for each incomplete awarded, a copy of which was to be kept by the student and the instructor. The third copy was to be turned into the Registrar’s Office with final grades.

This change was to be effective Fall 1990, however, because of the delay of this change appearing in print in the University catalog the Graduate Council has delayed implementation until fall 1991. Attached is a sample of the form that was to be used this fall except it would have been a three part form.

While I support the changes made by the Graduate Council I am concerned that this is not an all University policy. When implemented there will be confusion as to when the contract is required and when the last date is to have the incomplete made up. I request that you submit, during this year, to either the Educational Policies Commission or the Curriculum Committee, a proposal to consider making this an all University policy. There may need to be some discussion with the Graduate Council if differences arise in order to achieve an all University policy.

There are too major issues. One, the date the incomplete is to be made up and the other, the use of the contract. Each semester over 600 incompletes are awarded and over fifty percent of these are not made up and turn to an “F.” I believe requiring a contract to be completed would result in fewer incompletes being awarded and a higher percent being made up. I think it is worth a try.

RDL
attachment
INCOMPLETE GRADE CONTRACT

The granting of "I" to a graduate student will occur with the filing of an "Incomplete Grade Contract" with the Registrar. This form is to be completed by the instructor of the course indicating: a) what must be done to satisfy the course requirements for a letter grade, and b) the agreed upon date by which the requirements must be completed. The form must be signed by the instructor, the student, and graduate coordinator (or department head). The time limit for completion will be six weeks after the start of the next academic year semester (6 weeks after the start of Fall for those issued in the Spring and Summer; 6 weeks after the start of Spring for those issued in the Fall). This form is to be submitted with the final class list and grade report and will be retained by the Registrar.

Student Name _______________________________ Date ________________

Student Number ________________________________

(To be completed by the instructor and submitted with the final class list and grade report)

Course Number _______ Section ______ Title ________________________________

Credit Hours _______ Special Assignment(s) to be completed: ________________________________

Deadline date for work to be completed if earlier than Graduate College deadline: ________________________________

This contract must be signed.

Student Signature ___________________________ Date ________________

Instructor Signature _________________________ Date ________________

Graduate Coordinator (or Department Head) ___________________________ Date ________________

Student Copy
Instructor Copy
Registrar