

10-10-1983

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 10, 1983

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1983 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, October 10, 1983" (1983). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 442.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/442

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.

Senate Minutes
October 10, 1983
1321

CALENDAR

1. 351 A report of the Academic Master Plan Committee (sent to Senators dated October 4, 1983) (see Appendix A). Docketed in regular order. Docket 292.
2. 352 A request for emeritus status from a retiring UNI faculty member. Docketed out of regular order at the end of the meeting in executive session. Docket 293.
3. 353 A report of the University Committee on Curricula on Portfolio Assessment. Docketed because of exceptional circumstances for the beginning of the October 24 meeting (see Appendix B). Docket 294.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

4. Senator George Glenn elected to the General Education Committee.
5. A correction to the published faculty roster for 1983-84.
6. Established a Faculty Roster Appeals Committee as proposed by the Senate Chair.
7. Adopted the statement from the Chair regarding the relationship between the membership on the voting faculty of the university and voting membership in a department, school, or college of the university (see Appendix C).

DOCKET

8. 348 289 Approved a study committee to obtain information on the various types of instructional and faculty development resources and needs which exist at the University of Northern Iowa.
9. 350 291 Approved an ad hoc committee to study the Athletic Policy Advisory Committee and develop a report back to the Senate which would include a specific and concrete proposal for Senate action.

The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:17 p.m., October 10, 1983, in the Board Room by Chairperson Remington.

Present: Baum, Boots, Dowell, Elmer, Erickson, Evenson, Glenn, Goulet, Hallberg, Heller, Kelly, Krogmann, Patton, Peterson, Remington, Richter, Sandstrom, Story, Hovet (ex officio).

Alternates: Tarr for Dua

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. John Zobeck from the Northern Iowan was in attendance.

Chairperson Remington announced that Vice President Martin was at a meeting in Des Moines and would not be in attendance.

CALENDAR

1. 351 A report to the Academic Master Plan Committee (sent to Senators, dated October 4, 1983) (see Appendix A).

Krogmann/Erickson moved to docket in regular order. Motion passed.

2. 352 Request for emeritus status. Kelly/Boots moved to docket to the end of the meeting in executive session. Motion passed.

3. 353 A report of the University Committee on Curricula on Portfolio Assessment (see Appendix B).

The Chair asked Dr. Lott if he cared to speak to the calendar item.

Dr. Lott said they would appreciate action at the next meeting of the Senate as the catalog was being prepared for printing and they would like to include this in the catalog.

Erickson/Peterson moved to docket because of special circumstances for the beginning of the October 24 meeting. Motion passed.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

4. The Senate had been requested to appoint a senator to the General Education Committee. Two senators expressed an interest in being on the committee--George Glenn and Peter Goulet.

Krogmann/Boots moved to elect a senator by secret written ballot.

The Chair suggested Senate business continue while the election was conducted and named the Chair of the Faculty, Senator Hovet, as a teller for the election.

5. Faculty Chair Hovet announced some corrections to the published faculty roster for 1983-84.

Page 17--Economics:

Voting Faculty: Add Janet Rives (spring semester).

Page 18--History:

John Kamerick should be under voting faculty with an * for on leave--academic year.

Page 19--Sociology and Anthropology:

Gene Noack should be Virgil Noack.

Page 23--Office of University Continuing Education and Special Programs.

Keith Anderson and Bernard Fox should be listed under non-voting faculty.

Page 5--Educational Psychology and Foundations.

Sherry Kavich should be Lawrence Kavich.

6. The Senate had before it a proposal from the Senate Chair for procedures to handle appeals from the Faculty Chair's rulings on the 1983-84 roster of the voting faculty.

Boots/Evenson moved to accept the Chair's proposal. The proposal is that the Senate Vice Chair serve as ex officio chair of the committee, with the understanding that it will be the Vice Chair's responsibility to solicit the service of two more senators to complete the membership of a three person committee. None of the three committee members will be from the same college or school.

Motion passed.

7. The Senate had before it a statement of the Chair (see Appendix C) regarding the relationship between membership on voting faculty of the university and a voting membership in a department, school, or college of the university. The Chair had drafted the statement in response to several inquiries which had been sent to the Chair of the Faculty.

Hallberg/Kelly moved to adopt the statement as the will of the Senate.

Evenson said the Senate should not remotely be involved in this business. He agrees with the statement's theory but feels that the Senate should have absolutely nothing to do with collegiate or departmental voting rights, and should make no statement on the matter.

Krogmann said the queries perhaps indicated the need for a statement.

The Chair suggested the item should be considered and the Senate then indicate its signing off of the issue.

Motion passed.

The Chair announced Senator Glenn was elected to the General Education Committee.

DOCKET

8. 348 289 A proposal for the establishment of an Instructional Development Center at UNI.

Krogmann/Heller moved to create a study committee to obtain information on the various types of instructional development centers or faculty development centers which currently exist and to report to the Senate its findings and recommendations.

Sandstrom said many people had expressed a desire to sign the document as supporters but were not available as of August 1. He also asked Wayne King and Robert Hardman to speak to the proposal as two people who were already involved in providing such services.

Professor Hardman spoke in favor of the proposal. He stated it was not a new concept. He said the Media Center has a long-standing goal of being supportive of the faculty and he would strongly support this new proposal.

Professor King said he felt the Learning Skills Center was not just useful to students. It already worked with the faculty in finding ways and means to help students study and learn course concepts.

Goulet said he was not opposed to the concept but opposed to the bureaucracy to set it up. He suggested a study of the resources already available. Then if a center is needed, there would be time enough. He felt it was a very expensive idea.

Dowell echoed the same sentiments. He felt the price tag was considerable and there was already quite a bit of information available.

Professor Harrington said the students and faculty are concerned about quality teaching. She felt this was not a frivolous motion and was strongly in favor of it.

Evenson spoke against the motion because of the expense. He said the hiring of a director and additional staff when there was a freeze on salaries and programs did not seem reasonable. He also said poor teachers won't use the facility. Good teachers will spend time with the students and look for ways to improve their teaching. He said avenues were available on campus if you looked for them.

Sandstrom said he was not aware of all of the materials available. He said the service would not be useful to just the worst teachers but also to the best.

Krogmann suggested that a survey of the faculty could be taken to see its needs.

Glenn said he would support finding out what we have got and what our needs are.

Hovet/Boots moved a substitute motion, that the University Faculty Senate resolve to create a study committee to obtain information on the various types of instructional and faculty development resources and needs which currently exist at the University of Northern Iowa and to report back to the Senate its findings and recommendations.

Baum questioned the extent to which current resources are being used.

Sandstrom said he was content with the substitute motion. His only question would be how the committee would be created.

The Chair said he presumed the Senate would give directions.

Motion to substitute passed. Question on substitute motion was called. Substitute motion passed.

Boots/Glenn moved that the Committee on Committees appoint a committee with one member from each college and school.

Hallberg suggested the Senate delay until the senators can study the matter and come back with suggestions at the next meeting.

Hallberg/Kelly moved to postpone action until the next meeting.

Sandstrom said he thought perhaps the Committee on Committees could give the Senate a list of names.

Motion to postpone passed.

9. 350 291 A request to the Senate for the creation of a new Athletic Policy Advisory Committee to replace the current one.

The Chair announced he had received a letter from President Curris suggesting the Senate (or a representative group thereof) may wish to consult with the membership of the Athletic Policy Advisory Committee.

The Chair also received a letter from Senator Goulet with a related proposal for consideration at the meeting today. Both letters had been circulated to the Senate members prior to the meeting, along with a proposal from the Chair.

Goulet/Sandstrom moved to accept the recommendation made by the Chair. "I would recommend that the Senate name an ad hoc committee, which committee would undertake as its charge--mindful of the petitions signed by the eleven faculty members who presented their concerns to the Senate, and mindful of the concerns expressed in Senator Goulet's 3 October memo to me the following responsibilities:

"To hold at least one meeting to which faculty members currently serving on the Athletic Policy Board are invited, for the purpose of consulting with them regarding current practice on the board.

"To seek at least one joint meeting with the present Athletic Policy Board.

"To hold at least one publically announced meeting open to all members of the UNI faculty in order to permit all voices of faculty opinion to be heard by the committee, and to hold as many more such meetings as seen necessary for all viewpoints to be expressed.

"To meet with President Curris in order to gain his perspective on the nature and function of the Athletic Policy Board, and his perceptions of how such a board should be composed and of how it should function.

"To take any further steps which it thinks appropriate to gather such information as it thinks would be helpful in formulating its recommendation(s).

"While the preceding steps would be taken in any order which the committee thought best, these steps should culminate in the committees developing a report to be docketed by the Senate, which report will include a specific and concrete proposal for Senate action on the matter of the Athletic Policy Board."

Sandstrom said the suggestion for enlarging the Athletic Policy Committee was because it touches the entire campus community not just the athletic department. He was also concerned about the conspicuous absence of faculty and coaching staff and wondered if P & S people might be invited to the open meeting.

The Chair asked if he wanted to recommend the P & S people be invited as a friendly addition to the motion.

Sandstrom said he did.

Goulet agreed to the friendly amendment and Sandstrom was the seconder and also agreed.

Krogmann said she hoped the committee would discuss other weaknesses such as the fact that the committee seldom met and meetings were called by the chair. Supporting materials for items to be discussed were seldom available early enough to study before the meeting.

Professor Austin, one of the signers of the original letter, said the faculty must take the responsibility and take over some control of the athletics.

Professor Anderson said we "committee" everything to death. Faculty should be the predominate factor on the committee and the committee should not be a rubber stamp for anyone.

Krogmann said she hoped the committee was not too restrictive on listening to concerns, she would like to have the problems discussed in a broad way.

Professor Ross said he served on the committee many years ago. He felt it was a waste of his time. All the committee was looking for was some legitimacy to decisions made by the director and coaches. It's time to take a look at the whole structure.

Motion passed.

Sandstrom/Kelly moved to delay consideration of the committee's structure until the next meeting.

Professor Geadelmann said that she and Jack Wilkinson were on the search committee for a new athletic director. They would begin screening the first of November. She asked that the Senate keep them apprised of their concerns.

Motion passed.

Kelly said he appreciated the response of the people who signed the document to come to the meeting and be available to discuss their concerns.

Boots/Hovet moved to go into executive session. Motion passed.

Hallberg/Patton moved to rise from executive session. Motion passed.

Kelly/Sandstrom moved to grant emeritus status to Charles Wheeler from the English Language and Literature Department. Motion passed.

Sandstrom/Hallberg moved the Senate adjourn. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Engen
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, Wednesday, October 19, 1983.



University of Northern Iowa

Vice President and Provost

Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614
Telephone (319) 373-2517

APPENDIX A

October 4, 1983

President Curris

University Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Colleagues:

Attached is the biennial report of the Academic Master Plan Committee, which was approved on September 28, 1983. We commend the recommendations of this report to you and we solicit your support for them. The Academic Master Plan Committee is convinced that the adoption of these recommendations is in accordance with the mission of the institution and will contribute to its vitality and excellence.

Sincerely,

James G. Martin
Vice President and Provost

JGM:dw

Attachment

- c: Council of Deans
- Department Heads
- Vice President Hausmeier
- Dr. Richard Stinchfield
- Academic Master Plan Committee

APPENDIX A (cont.)

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE

University of Northern Iowa
1983

1. Undergraduate Education in the Arts and Sciences

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the university make a special effort during the next four years to enrich undergraduate education in the arts and sciences.

The university has experienced some significant achievements in graduate and professional education during the last several years--including doctoral programs in Education and Industrial Technology and the MBA program. There has been a major shift in undergraduate interest in the direction of programs that lead obviously and directly to employment, such as in Accounting and Computer Science. There has been commendable growth and vitality in these areas but this seems an appropriate juncture in the institution's evolution and planning to make a concerted effort to invigorate undergraduate instruction in the arts and sciences, including general education.

More specifically, the committee endorses the following approaches to accomplish this recommendation.

- a. Course offerings should be reviewed for intellectual depth and challenge, especially with respect to the long-range benefit of such courses, rather than short-term interest to students and "relevance."
- b. Courses should be taught by faculty who are strongly interested in them and well prepared to offer them.
- c. Faculty should be selected by departments for offering undergraduate general education courses with a degree of rigor comparable to that employed by the Graduate Council for offering graduate courses.
- d. Courses should be taught by faculty who are professionally active in the area of the content of the course if at all possible.
- e. Attention should also be given to matching students with the style of instruction they prefer. In other words, students who prefer the lecture method should be enrolled in classes where the instructor also prefers that method.
- f. In view of the latitude permitted in our General Education Program, faculty advisers should take special care to ensure that students are graduated with a reasonable balance of courses in their General Education Program and that other electives abet students liberal education program rather than narrow specialization.
- g. Faculty and students in areas such as Business, Industrial Technology, Computer Science, and Music need the strong support of their colleagues in the arts and sciences in encouraging more liberal arts courses at the expense of additional courses in majors.

2. Bachelor of Science Degree

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the university propose a Bachelor of Science degree. The College of Natural Sciences has already explored the idea since the Bachelor of Science degree is a traditional degree in the scientific disciplines. Departments and colleges should review their degree programs and decide whether the B.A. or B.S. would be a more appropriate degree. The University Curriculum Committee should consider the question of a foreign language requirement for the B.A. degree.

3. Optional General Education Program

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the General Education Committee should design an optional general education program, one that is traditional and prescriptive, in order to provide a more rigorous general education program for students who prefer and could be encouraged to undertake it.

4. The Honors Program

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the scope and thrust of the Honors Program be reviewed and revised so that it is more visible and more attractive. We believe a revitalized Honors Program would be particularly appealing to prospective students of unusual ability. (This recommendation is harmoniously related to the recommendation concerning the enrichment of the undergraduate program in the arts and sciences.) Admission to the program should be based on outstanding scholarly ability and achievement. Students in the Honors Program should be encouraged to elect the alternate general education program.

To further this goal it is recommended that the Individual Studies Board make specific recommendations for the furtherance of this objective in consultation with the Office of Educational and Student Services.

The committee should seek the advice of current and former students in the Honors Program about its improvement and expansion. The committee should give special attention to:

- a. The resumption of a traditional honors program component;
- b. The possibility of designating a traditional program as "University Honors";
- c. Changing the designation of the Individual Studies Board to University Honors Committee.

5. Attracting High School Students of Exceptional Ability

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the university explore a means of attracting high school students of exceptional ability by a variety of means, including the following possibilities:

- a. Advanced placement classes in the metropolitan areas of Iowa through UNI Continuing Education and Special Programs.
- b. Through special gifted programs for junior high and high school students through continuing education.

This recommendation is consonant with a recommendation in the last report of the Academic Master Plan Committee concerning the attraction of gifted students by scholarships and other means.

6. Computer-Based Information Banks on Curricula and Faculty Research

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that UNI develop computer-based information banks on curricula and faculty research. Such data banks should be on the main computer with centralized access to faculty, administration and students. The development, management and annual updating of such files is recommended to be the responsibility of the Graduate College, in consultation with the University Senate, University Curriculum Committee, Graduate Council, Academic Master Plan Committee, and academic departments. Student access is suggested to be at the Academic Advising Center and the main library. Faculty access is suggested to be at the Graduate College Office and/or each academic college (or school).

The curricula information bank is envisioned to serve the following purposes:

- a. To assist in new course or program development and course or program revision by expediting and encouraging communication among departments with overlapping interests.
- b. To assist in students' selection of courses for the General Education Program and for "free" electives (above those required by General Education and Major and/or Minor studies).
- c. To encourage students to develop "tailored," complementary, interdisciplinary study united by "themes" of interest.

The curricula data bank would be based on "key" words describing course content for each course offered at UNI. The entering of a key word would result in a print-out of course numbers (and perhaps faculty members

APPENDIX A (cont.)

involved in each course) matched to that key word. Further descriptive information would then be easily obtained through the catalog and/or department or faculty involved.

The research information data bank is envisioned to serve the following purposes:

- a. To assist and encourage communication among faculty members across departments and colleges (or schools).
- b. To promote and enable interdisciplinary research based on related interests.

The research bank would be based on "key" words describing faculty interests and past and current research projects for every participating faculty member and administrator. Participation should be encouraged, but would be voluntary.

7. Strengthen and Promote UNI's Program Certificates

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that the university make a concerted effort to strengthen and promote the Program Certificates.

The following background on the Program Certificates has been abstracted from the University Senate minutes #1134 on May 12, 1975.

*The Program Certificates Committee, commissioned by the Senate, advocated permitting maximum flexibility in the construction of programs relating to their purpose, development, and populations served.

*The purpose of the Program Certificates is to provide an alternative to programs which lead to a degree, a major, or a minor.

*The number of courses and/or experiences required for a Program Certificate could vary greatly among programs.

APPENDIX A (cont.)

*The Registrar's Office would serve as the centralized registry but the developers of the Program Certificate would be responsible for the production of brochures and printed certificates.

*The developers of Program Certificates might wish to work with Extension and/or Continuing Education [Continuing Education and Special Programs].

There are 20 Program Certificates in existence. Between 1977 and June of 1982 there were 48 Program Certificates awarded in the following areas:

modern languages (level 1 and level 2), Translation, Latin American Studies, and Gerontology.

The following procedures are suggested to accomplish the purposes specified in this recommendation.

- a. The University Senate should establish a committee to review the existing Program Certificates for the current programs' viability, advising and promotional mechanisms, and to recommend deletion of non-viable programs.
- b. Distribution of information on Program Certificates should be available in centralized locations (such as Academic Advising Services, the Registrar's Office, Continuing Education and Special Programs) as well as in the departments responsible for each Program Certificate.
- c. Information should also appear in the UNI catalog, including course requirements and the department responsible for each Program Certificate.
- d. Students should be required to "declare" their intentions to pursue a Program Certificate through the department responsible for the Program Certificate.

- e. The department responsible for the development of a Program Certificate should also be responsible for student advising, administration, and promotion. Each department should designate particular faculty, a committee, or an administrator for primary contact and that person's (or persons') names should be publicized or made readily available.
- f. For those Program Certificates that may be attractive to prospective freshmen or transfers or to other groups in the community, the department responsible should be required to communicate regularly with Admissions, Continuing Education and Special Programs, and other such appropriate administrative branches of the university.
- g. The development of new Program Certificates should be actively encouraged by faculty, students, or other interested groups.

8. Construction of a Performing Arts Facility

The Academic Master Plan Committee recommends that UNI develop a financial plan for the construction of a facility for the performing arts as a replacement to the Old Auditorium. This plan should include:

- a. A general estimate of the cost of a facility of reasonable size.
- b. Source of funds, including existing university resources, use of building fees for bond retirement, and an estimated private fund-raising goal.
- c. A timetable for financial arrangements and construction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Dr. Emil W. Bock, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
- Dr. John T. Fecik, College of Natural Sciences
- Dr. Len A. Froyen, College of Education
- Ms. Lynda L. Goulet, School of Business
- Mr. James A. Hoolber, College of Education
- Dr. Gerald W. Intemann, College of Natural Sciences
- Dr. Thomas W. Keefe, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Ms. Aurelia Klink, School of Business
- Dr. James G. Macmillan, College of Natural Sciences
- Dr. Donna Maier, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Dr. Karl E. Odwarka, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
- Mr. Michael O. Rod, School of Business
- Dr. Donald E. Shepardon, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Dr. Carolyn L. Shields, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
- Dr. John E. Tarr, College of Education
- Ms. Paggly L. Post, Student
- Vice President and Provost James G. Martin, Chair

October, 1983



University of Northern Iowa

Office of Academic Affairs

Cedar Falls, Iowa 50814
Telephone (319) 273-2517

October 6, 1983

APPENDIX B

Dr. Thomas Remington, Chair
University Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Tom:

Last May the University Faculty Senate referred the report of the Experiential Learning Committee to the University Committee on Curricula. The Committee on Curricula met yesterday on this matter. Three members of the Experiential Learning Committee, including the Chair, were present and provided helpful information to the committee.

In general the Curriculum Committee believes the Experiential Learning Committee has developed an excellent plan for portfolio assessment of prior learning which includes procedures that will assure that granting credit for experiential learning is reviewed in a reasonable and consistent method.

However, the Curriculum Committee is recommending some minor changes which are shown below. This is a restatement of the Experiential Learning Committee's report (also found in Appendix B of the May 9, 1983, Senate minutes) with some words or phrases lined out and underlined words or phrases added in accordance with the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee.

Most of the changes in wording are intended to clarify the intent of these procedures and policies. The committee is recommending that No. 3 be deleted. It was noted that faculty members engage in a wide variety of educational activities for which extra pay is not given. These include such things as thesis committees, independent study, departmental credit by examination, departmental curriculum development and the like. It seemed inappropriate to single out one such activity for additional pay.

It would be helpful if the Senate could complete its action on this matter by the end of October. As you know, the new 1984-86 general catalog is going to the printers soon and it would be best to include any changes that might be made in Open Credit.

Recommendations of the University Curriculum Committee:

- 1. That portfolio assessment be included in "Open Credit" and that the catalog description of Open Credit (p. 50) be reworded as follows:

OPEN CREDIT SYSTEM - This type of undergraduate credit is designed for special projects such as a paper, experiment, portfolio, or work of art. There is no specific time period set for completion of a project; however, the student must be registered for credit at this University during the semester "open credit" is requested and open credit will be recorded only after the student has satisfactorily completed 12 hours of credit at this institution.

A project may be submitted any time during the semester up to the last date to add a second half semester course for credit. There is no guarantee

Dr. Thomas Remington
Page 2
October 6, 1983

APPENDIX B (cont.)

of credit prior to or upon submittal of the project. The project is submitted to an ad hoc faculty committee of three faculty members recommended by the student and approved by the head of the academic department or discipline in which the project falls; two faculty members are chosen from the academic area or discipline of the project and one from any area. The student may not submit a project evaluated by one committee to a second committee for re-evaluation. The student may resubmit a project to the original committee at the committee's discretion or with its encouragement.

The number of open credit hours assigned to a project will reflect the academic evaluation of the project; credit will be awarded for work judged to be of at least C level quality. No letter grades are given. The range of credit is from 0 to 6 hours per project. A student may apply a maximum of 18 hours of open credit toward graduation requirements. Open credit is normally elective but upon the recommendation of the ad hoc committee it may be approved for requirements in General Education with the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs or for major credit with departmental approval.

Students should contact the Special Programs Office or the appropriate departmental office for advice in planning submitting projects. Application forms may be secured from the Office of the Registrar.

- 2. That the Registrar assign a course number for open credit.
- 3. That the members of the ad hoc faculty committee share as compensation a minimum of \$150 per project evaluated.
- 4. That the fee for open credit be the equivalent of 2 semester hours of resident undergraduate credit to be charged at the time of application. (Catalog p. 45)
- 5. That a central file of portfolios special projects open to the faculty be maintained in the Special Programs Office.
- 6. That Open Credit be included in the limitation of 32 hours of credit by examination. (Catalog p. 41)
- 7. That departments who wish to award open credit shall adopt written procedures and written criteria general guidelines for portfolios special projects assessment. Copies of the procedures and criteria guidelines shall be filed in the central file of portfolios special projects.
- 8. That after 3 years the Senate appoint a committee to review the viability of the procedures for assessing experiential learning.

Sincerely,

Fred W. Lott
Fred W. Lott, Chair
University Committee on Curricula

cc: Faculty Senate
University Committee on Curricula
Experiential Learning Committee

APPENDIX C

TO: Members, UNI Faculty Senate

FROM: Tom Remington, Senate Chair

RE: Relationship of voting membership on university faculty to voting membership in a department, college, or school of the university

Faculty Chair Hovet informs me that, since the publication of the new faculty roster, she has received several queries regarding the effect, if any, the new definition of the voting faculty has on voting eligibility within departments and colleges.

It is my understanding--and I have so informed Faculty Chair Hovet--that the stipulations regarding membership on the voting faculty were recommended by the Senate and adopted by the University Faculty to affect only the governance of the University Faculty as a whole.

I do not believe that either the Senate or the University Faculty intended to dictate to departments, schools or colleges what criteria those units must use in establishing qualifications or status within their own units. My presumption has always been that any given academic unit has the right to define its own membership as it thinks best. Surely it would be unwise for the Senate to presume to instruct a given college or department as to who (for example) is qualified to vote in elections to college or departmental senates, or to sit on collegiate or departmental committees.

Thus, it is my understanding that departments, schools, and colleges of the University are free to establish their own criteria for membership and voting rights within their own units, and to determine their own memberships. The roster of membership on the voting faculty of the University affects only University elections and votes at University Faculty meetings.

A logical consequence of this understanding is that it is quite possible for someone to be eligible to vote on matters within a given department, school, or college, but simultaneously not to be eligible to vote in University elections or at University Faculty meetings. I see no paradox or contradiction in such a case.