

11-10-1986

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 10, 1986

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1986 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 10, 1986" (1986). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 534.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/534

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

FACULTY SENATE
November 10, 1986
1371

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Comments from Vice President and Provost Martin.
2. Nancy Hinshaw was introduced as the newly elected Senator representing the non-voting faculty.

CALENDAR

3. 429 Report from the Educational Policies Commission (Appendix A). Approved motion to docket in regular order. Docket 369.
4. 430 Report from the University Writing Committee. (See Appendix B). Approved motion to docket in regular order. Docket 370.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

5. The Chair voiced the appreciation of the Senate to Professor Judith Finkel Harrington for taking the Senate minutes of October 27.
6. Professor Robert Wyatt, representing the School of Business, was appointed to serve on the committee to study the desirability and feasibility of re-organizing the academic units into an undergraduate college and confederation of professional schools.

DOCKET

7. 427 367 Letter to Chair of the Senate Boots from the Chair of the English Senate concerning Senate action taken on September 24, 1986. See Senate Minutes 1369. Accepted motion to received the letter from the English Senate.
8. 428 368 Annual Report from the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council. See Senate Minutes 1369. Approved motion to table this report until a report from Athletic Director Bowsby pursuant to drug policies for athletes is received.
9. 429 369 Report from the Educational Policies Commission, see Appendix A. Approved motion to accept the report.

The Senate was called to order at 3:31 p.m. on November 10, 1986, in the Board Room of Gilchrist Hall by Chairperson Boots.

Present: Baum, Boots, Doody, Duncan, Erickson, Goulet, Henderson, Hinshaw, Intemann, Kelly, Krogmann, McCormick, Peterson, Romanin, Story, Wood, Yoder, Amend (ex officio).

Alternates: J. F. Harrington for Glenn.

Absent: Chadney.

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Anne Phillips of the Waterloo Courier and Elizabeth Bingham of the Northern Iowan were in attendance.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Comments from Vice President and Provost Martin.

"The Master of Philosophy degree proposal has been submitted to the Board of Regents for the November docket. It should be routinely referred to the Interinstitutional Education Committee which might make a recommendation as early as December; but, if not, given the holiday, it might be February before the Board would make a decision. We are rather hopeful that the new degree will be approved, but there seems to be increasing resistance to new programs. The MFA degree was withdrawn by Iowa State University after a negative recommendation from the Interinstitutional Committee, and the Board did reject a Ph.D. in Public Policy at Iowa State based in part on concerns of the Interinstitutional Committee. There seems to be considerable sensitivity by the Board to complaints about duplication in the Regents Universities.

"The most recent Carnegie report is rather obviously aimed at the private liberal arts colleges, but what it recommends about general education does seem to compliment our new program."

2. The Chair welcomed Nancy Hinshaw as the newly elected Senator representing non-voting faculty.

CALENDAR

3. 429 Report from the Educational Policies Commission. See Appendix A.

Baum moved, Henderson seconded, to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 369.

4. 430 Report from the University Writing Committee. See Appendix B.

Wood moved, Doody seconded, to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 370.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

5. The Chair voiced the appreciation of the Senate to Professor Judith Finkel Harrington for taking the minutes of the Senate meeting of October 27. The Chair commended Professor Harrington on her willingness to be of assistance and acknowledged the quality of her efforts.

6. The Chair inquired of Senator Goulet if a replacement for the vacant position on the committee to study the desirability and feasibility of reorganizing the academic units into an undergraduate college and confederation of professional schools had been determined. Goulet moved, and it was seconded, the nomination of Professor Robert Wyatt to serve in this capacity. Motion passed.

DOCKET

Chairperson Boots relinquished the chair to Vice Chairperson Kelly.

7. 427 367 Letter to Chair of the Senate Boots from the Chair of the English Senate concerning Senate action taken on September 24, 1986. See Senate Minutes 1369.

Vice Chairperson Kelly provided background information and asked the Senate as to how they would like to dispose of this matter.

Doody moved, Henderson seconded, for the Senate to receive the letter from the English Senate.

Professor Theodore Hovet rose to address the Senate. He stated this was an action by the Department of English to express dissatisfaction on removing the 18 hour elective proposal. The Senate felt that there had been insufficient time for the faculty as a whole to consider this issue and to relay their feelings to the Faculty Senate. He stated they were concerned that the issue of time caused an action to be taken that perhaps lacked due process. He stated that the constraints of time should not be used as an argument to act on an issue.

Professor Krogmann pointed out that the 18 hour proposal was never part of the General Education Program. She stated she felt the General Education Committee was very solicitous of input and that this concern was not brought forward during the hearing with the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

Professor Boots reassumed the chair.

8. 428 368 Annual Report from the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Council. See Senate Minutes 1369.

Kelly moved, Peterson seconded, for acceptance of the report as stated.

Professor Krogmann noted that several reviews had been conducted and inquired if the committee was satisfied or if additional action was needed.

Professor Jack Wilkinson rose to address the Senate. He spoke briefly to the report and stated he would reply to questions. He indicated that the drug education program may include a five- or six-week non-credit course on drug education for UNI athletes. In the areas of correspondence, academic progress and graduation rate he stated that it was necessary to get the reporting documents in shape.

Senator Goulet inquired as to athletes who enroll in correspondence study. Registrar Leahy responded citing it was very unusual, noting that during last year only two students participated in correspondence study while none are participating this year. He indicated that the NCAA allows for correspondence study within certain constraints and that the University is maintaining proper control in this area.

The Chair inquired about the concern of annual evaluation for academic status. Professor Wilkinson indicated that the presidents of all Division I and Division IA schools were required to submit such reports for the first time this year. This will now be done annually and will be part of the committee's agenda.

Senator Romanin inquired if we were bound to have a policy on drug testing for athletes. Professor Wilkinson indicated that UNI will be promoting the idea of drug education versus drug testing based on the cost and reliability involved in testing. He stated that until these concerns are satisfied UNI will continue with its education program.

UNISA Vice President Pieper inquired as to the change in policy relative to promotional items. Professor Wilkinson stated that any promotional materials must be approved by the management team for any group whether they be on or off campus. He indicated that there had been no policy previously.

Senator Peterson inquired if the committee felt they had received good cooperation from the athletic department. Professor Wilkinson stated that there had been very good cooperation between the committee and the management team.

Chairperson Boots inquired about the policy of not scheduling athletic events during final examinations. Professor Wilkinson indicated some fine tuning might be needed, but it is basically working well. Chairperson Boots inquired about the nature of the fine tuning. Professor Wilkinson said there needed to be an open line of communication between individual professors and the athletic department.

Senator Goulet, speaking relative to drug education policies, indicated that student athletes may be considered differently from other students based on the aid that is provided. He stated that he hopes the University has a policy to address these concerns.

Committee member Pat Wilkinson stated that the UNI policy is designed to provide assistance for the athlete versus punishing the athlete.

Senator Romanin inquired if we should be treating athletes different from other students who are on scholarships who represent the University in other areas. He stated that there are rights to be considered and procedures that would need to be developed.

Professor Wilkinson indicated that there is a drug review board whose deliberations are not reported to the committee and therefore the policies the review board uses are not known to the committee.

Committee member Pat Wilkinson stressed that the drug education program is good and has been helpful, and progress continues to be made.

Senator Peterson inquired if the Senate could ask Athletic Director Bowsby to communicate to the Senate the policies used by the athletic department relative to drug usage.

Henderson moved, Krogmann seconded, to table. Motion passed.

9. 429 369 Report of the Educational Policies Commission.

Krogmann moved, Goulet seconded, to move into the committee of the whole. Motion passed.

Henderson moved, Goulet seconded, to rise from the committee of the whole. Motion passed.

Henderson moved, Kelly seconded, the acceptance of the Educational Policies Commission Report. Motion passed.

Baum moved, Peterson seconded, to adjourn. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 4:55 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, Tuesday, November 18, 1986.

4. XIUGSTIA



EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION

REPORT TO SENATE

31 October 1986

Educational policies affect all facets of the University; thus, each policy connects parts of the institution in ways not readily apparent. It is also the nature of any policy to address general situations which arise. Further, policies are not meant to, nor can they, resolve special or unique situations. Policies within a bureaucratic institution have inertia - which under varying conditions may be either good or bad. Educational policies at UNI are no exception, otherwise they would change at every whim and chaos would overtake the institution. However, to combat the negative side of this inertia, bodies such as the University Faculty Senate and the Educational Policies Commission have the charge to examine, and if necessary change, policies when times require it be done. Ideally, an optimum balance should exist between the lack of stability on the one hand and fossilization on the other. In its review of the policies before it, the EPC has taken a somewhat conservative stand with respect to change. Policy change should be made only after a convincing argument can be sustained for the net benefit to the University. In another way of looking at this philosophy, the burden of proof should be on those who wish to change.

The Educational Policies Commission was given the charge in the fall of 1985 to examine the policy which establishes the dates that allows students to drop courses well into the semester without receiving a "W" and "P". The EPC had discussions on this topic in 1985, but never made a decision as to what to recommend to the Senate. At the beginning of this semester (Fall 86) the EPC was reorganized and enlarged and asked to make a recommendation to the Senate on this matter.

Because the policies regarding all changes in registration after the beginning of classes are intimately related, the Commission took under review this suite of policies which establish:

1. Last date one can add a course after the beginning of the semester
2. Last date one can withdraw from a course without a "W"
3. Last date one can withdraw from a course without an "P"
4. Last date one can change from or to an "AUDIT"
5. Last date one can change to or from non-graded basis

On September 30, the EPC conducted an open hearing to receive testimony from all interested parties. Written comments were received from eight persons, in addition to Murray Austin's original petition and one letter received after the last meeting. Five persons outside the EPC spoke at the hearing. The minutes of the hearing and copies of the letters are filed with the Senate secretary. Of the five dates affected by the policies under review, only the last dates students can add, drop without a "W", and drop

without an "P" seem to generate any particular concern.

One week after the hearing, the Commission met to discuss the information before it. This meeting was a free-wheeling discussion with no intent to take action, and all members provided a wealth of opinion and viewpoints. At a later meeting held on October 14, 1986, the Commission entertained a number of motions.

Most persons agree that students should be able to add or drop a course immediately after the beginning of classes if he/she finds the course to be quite different from what was expected. On the other hand, nearly everyone agrees that being able to drop a course without penalty after the final examination would be ludicrous. The difficulty comes in establishing just where between these two extremes these dates should be established. There are no events which would make the establishment of these dates in any way objective. Persons have very different opinions on what these dates ought to be, depending on their particular circumstances, educational philosophies, and role they play in the University. Changing these dates lessens some strains but increases others. The Commission heard arguments to make the policies more liberal and ones to make them more restrictive. Some of the reasons presented dealt with specific circumstances which might be better handled in ways other than through policy change. There simply was not a convincing line of argument presented to encourage a particular change in any of the policies regarding these dates. The burden of proof was not met. Therefore, the Commission recommends at this time ~~to change~~ the policies regarding the dates of changes in registration after the beginning of classes not be changed.

Respectfully submitted by

Lynn A. Brant, Chair

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTION

In April 1985, the University Faculty Senate passed a proposal to create an ad hoc University Writing Committee to consider three charges:

- 1) Requirement of a lower-division writing course.
- 2) Implementation of upper-division writing emphasis courses for each major.
- 3) Establishment of a standing University Writing Committee to address concerns about the place of writing in the total University.

SOURCES

In studying the three charges, committee members turned to a variety of sources:

- 1) Relevant university documents.
- 2) Recent research on writing and writing pedagogy.
- 3) An open hearing (February 1986) for all UNI faculty.
- 4) Two surveys (1981 and 1983) of UNI faculty attitudes and practices related to student writing.
- 5) Survey (spring 1986) of UNI faculty who had attended a writing across the curriculum workshop.
- 6) Consultative sessions (spring 1986) with UNI department heads and deans.
- 7) Writing programs at other universities and colleges.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following principles have guided the Committee's thinking:

1. It is the responsibility of the University to help its students develop their writing abilities. This responsibility grows out of UNI's commitment to exemplary undergraduate education. Well-educated students must be able to write as well as to read, listen, and talk. True literacy requires writing ability. (See Appendix A, Writing at UNI: The Current Program.)
2. Writing is central to learning, teaching, and research. Like thinking and learning, writing is not the province of a single course nor the responsibility of one department. Because writing helps students to gather, focus, and clarify their thoughts as well as to communicate them, writing is everyone's responsibility. (See Appendix C, Writing in the 1980's: Research and Instruction.)
3. Sustained writing practice is necessary for the development of writing ability. A freshman course lays a foundation for the development of writing ability, but a single course is not enough. Students need to write often for varied purposes and audiences using the materials of their chosen fields. (See Appendix D, Writing across the Curriculum: Beyond the Freshman Course.)
4. The faculty members of each department are the best judges of the kinds of writing their students need within a discipline. Instructors know its vocabulary, formats, and assumptions. They also know the kinds of writing their majors will need in the workplace after graduation. (See Appendix D, Writing across the Curriculum: Beyond the Freshman Course.)
5. Although most instructors are not trained to teach writing, they can use many options for working with student writing that do not require expertise in grammar nor laborious hours of marking papers. Faculty development workshops and seminars can help instructors explore these options and discipline-specific applications. (See Appendix E, Faculty Support and Development.)

October 31, 1986

Professor Myra Boots, Chair
University Faculty Senate
UNI

Dear Myra:

As chair of the ad hoc University Writing Committee, I am submitting a final report on the three-part charge given us by the University Faculty Senate in 1985. Committee members were encouraged by the Senate's acceptance of our interim report last April. We believe that the related recommendations in this report will enable UNI to create a university-wide writing program of distinction.

Writing is central to learning, teaching, and research. It serves as a tool for clarifying our thinking, for communicating our thoughts to others, and for cultivating life-long learning. Writing belongs in course work at all levels across the disciplines. It should be as normal a part of our students' educational experience as reading a textbook or listening to a lecture. In the judgment of the Committee, now is the time to implement a cohesive writing program that enhances educational excellence.

UNI has the faculty, the commitment, and the resources to develop an outstanding writing program. We can build on our traditional commitment to helping students develop their writing abilities and on the dedication of many faculty members who work with student writing. Integrating writing into undergraduate education is both achievable and affordable.

We believe that we have now completed the charge given us by the Faculty Senate in 1985; thus, we respectfully ask to be discharged. Members of the Committee will be present to respond to questions that may arise when the Faculty Senate considers the report.

Sincerely,



Mac Eblen, Chair
ad hoc University Writing Committee

6. To strengthen the writing component in our students' educational experience, we can and should use existing institutional structures. Present curriculum channels and available means for faculty development can be used to strengthen writing across the entire curriculum. (See Appendix F, A Structure to Implement a University-Wide Writing Program.)

7. The Writing Competency Examination (instituted in 1978) was not intended to be either a substitute for writing instruction nor a permanent means for evaluating writing competence. It is now feasible for UNI to restore required writing instruction and to phase out the Writing Competency Examination. (See Appendix A, Writing at UNI: The Current Program.)

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE ACTION

Last April the Faculty Senate accepted the Committee's first recommendation, namely:

Recommendation 1.

The institution of a three-hour freshman writing course for the new General Education Program and the phase-out of the Writing Competency Examination with implementation of the new course.

The Senate's approval of this recommendation is a major step toward helping our students develop their writing abilities. Although a freshman writing course provides an introduction to college writing, one course alone does not give students adequate guidance and writing experience. Writing competence develops gradually just as understanding of the content of an academic major develops through time. Students need to write using the vocabulary, assumptions, rules of evidence, and formats of their major discipline to communicate their ideas.

UNI now has a unique opportunity to develop a cohesive university-wide writing program. By building on the current sound work of many faculty members and the new freshman course, UNI can develop a writing program to provide our students with sustained writing experiences throughout their college education. Such a program not only promotes genuine competence in writing for our students but also enriches their education. To institute an integrated writing program, the Committee recommends three additional steps that complement the initial recommendation accepted by the Senate.

RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 2.

All students develop their writing ability within their chosen major by meeting the following criteria:

- a. Engage in exploratory writing to help refine understanding of course content.
- b. Practice the stages of writing from gathering material, planning, and drafting through revising and editing.
- c. Receive responses from readers to written work while it is in progress.
- d. Prepare formal writing to communicate in edited American English to different audiences for different purposes.

(See Appendices D and E for explanatory and supporting material.)

Recommendation 3.

Academic departments determine the writing competency of their majors for graduation.

(See Appendices D and E for explanatory and supporting material.)

Recommendation 4.

UNI establish a structure to develop a cohesive, university-wide writing program to include:

a. A standing University Writing Committee with membership representing the same constituencies as the present ad hoc University Writing Committee (one member from each of the five undergraduate divisions to be chosen by each division's curricular body, one chosen by the English Department, one by the office of the Vice President and Provost, one by the Office of Learning and Instruction, and a student chosen by UNISA).

b. Create a half-time position of Writing Adviser, the Writing Adviser to chair the University Writing Committee.

- c. Charge the University Writing Committee and Writing Adviser to
1. advise departments about the criteria for writing experiences within academic majors,
 2. report annually to the University Faculty Senate,
 3. make an evaluation at the end of the third year to determine whether to continue, modify, or eliminate this committee and position.
- (See Appendix F for explanatory and supporting material.)

Many UNI faculty members are doing excellent work with student writing; students in some departments may now be meeting the criteria in recommendation two. On the other hand, many of our students have slight writing experience. To work towards writing competence for all students, UNI needs a systematic way to encourage and advise departments on the many options for integrating writing into upper division courses.

Because writing varies greatly across disciplines, the Committee recognizes that the faculty members of a department are the best judges of the writing needed by their majors, both for course work and after graduation. Departments must have autonomy to determine what writing experiences are most appropriate for their students and what determines writing competence for an academic major.

In the judgment of the Committee, some institutional structure and an assignment of time and responsibility to an individual are essential to developing a truly university-wide writing program. Left to chance and volunteer work, a program to help students develop their writing abilities will not grow. Just as writing ability develops gradually, so do institutional goals evolve gradually. The Committee believes that three years allows a reasonable time to implement and evaluate the university-wide program outlined above.

Writing belongs in course work at all levels across the disciplines. Writing can be and should be as natural a part of our students' educational experience as reading a textbook, carrying out laboratory work, or listening to a lecture. Now is the time to work towards that goal, a goal that enhances educational excellence for UNI students.