

9-25-2017

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 25, 2017

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2017 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://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, September 25, 2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1190.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1190

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.

Regular Meeting

UNI Faculty Senate

09/25/17 (3:30-4:53)

Scholar Space (301), Rod Library

Mtg. #1797

SUMMARY MINUTES

No members of the Press were present.

President Nook reported from the Board of Regents which today approved a State request of \$12 million for Regents universities, including \$2 million for UNI to be appropriated as student financial aid. He added that Regent's TIER efficiencies work has resulted in savings of \$56-57 million, including \$16 million at UNI, with most at UNI (\$10 million) a result of bond negotiations savings. Further, **Nook** reported that three male finalists vie for the position of Assistant for the President for Federal and Board Relations, and explained some of the administrative duties of that position.

Provost Wohlpert had no comments at this time.

Faculty Chair Kidd reminded the group of the Fall Faculty meeting next Monday, where award-winning faculty will be recognized to a larger audience, and hear from UNI leaders.

Chair Walter announced that Sheila **Benson** has filled the position on the IAF Committee. (The Intercollegiate Academics Committee)

Minutes for Approval: Sept. 11, 2017 – Minutes, Summary (**Gould/Choi**) Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1347 (Skaar/Mattingly) Reconsideration of University Writing Committee Proposal
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/reconsideration-university-writing-committee-proposal> Docketed in regular order.

1348 (Gould/Choi) Strategic Plan Metrics

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/strategic-plan-metrics>

Docketed in regular order.

1349 (McCandless/Hakes) Draft policy for Posthumous degree and in memoriam certificates.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/draft-policy-posthumous-degree-and-memoriam-certificates> Docketed in regular order.

New Business: None

Consideration of Docketed Items

1336/1226 Presentation of the Civic Action Plan, Strategic Plan - Docketed for September 25th, a 10 minute-presentation then comments. (See Transcript, Pages 16-34.)

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/presentation-civic-action-plan-strategic-plan>

1339/1229 Review of Policy 6.10 Academic Freedom and Shared Governance

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/review-policy-610-academic-freedom-and-shared-governance>

1341/1231 Emeritus Nomination, Posthumous, Harry Brod

** (Schraffenberger/Skaar). Motion passed. One abstention.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-nomination-posthumous-harry-brod> (See Transcript, Pages 34-48.)

1346/1234 Emeritus Requests for Mike Klassen-Marketing, Cynthia Goatley-Theatre and Frank Thompson-Finance

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-requests-mike-klassen-marketing-cynthia-goatley>

** Request for Mike Klassen tabled until next meeting.

** Request for Cynthia Goatley (Campbell/Gould) Passed. All aye.

** Request for Frank Thompson (Mattingly/Hakes) Passed. All aye.

Adjournment: (Gould/Skaar) All aye.

Full transcript of 50 pages with 0 addendum follows

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
Faculty Senate Meeting #1797
Sept. 25, 2017 (3:30-4:43)
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library**

PRESENT: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, James **Mattingly**, Amanda **McCandless**, Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Chair Michael **Walter**. Also President Mark **Nook**, Provost John **Vallentine**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd** and Tristan **Bernhard**, NISG representative.

ABSENT: Senators John **Burnight**, Steve **O’Kane**, Gloria **Stafford**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Leigh **Zeitz**, Interim Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**.

GUESTS: Julianne **Gassman**, Deirdre **Heistad**, Joyce **Morrow**.

Chair **Walter**: It looks like we just barely have a quorum. Just barely—a little embarrassing but we’re there, so let me call this September 25th meeting to the order of the Faculty Senate. Do we have Press in the house? Press identification? Members of the Fourth Estate? None. Okay so, President **Nook**, I think you are on.

President **Nook** - Just a couple of quick notes. Today was a Board of Regents meeting. It was a little bit unusual. It was the second one of the month, and it was set up for really just one purpose, and that was to approve a request for the State appropriation. They did approve a request of \$16 million dollars for the State appropriation; \$4 million of that is for the Hearing and Blind Schools, and then there’s \$12 million that is for the Regental Universities; \$5 million

each for ISU and U of I and \$2 million for us. It's a starting place. The thing that's a little bit unique about this request is that all of the \$12 million they're requesting in Student Financial Aid, and so it would come to us as a...they're actually asking for it to be appropriated as Financial Aid. It is at least a request for some dollars, and we'll see what happens from there.

The other thing that did happen at the meeting today is that each of the three presidents was asked to talk about the efficiencies that have been gained through the TIER work. And so I made a presentation on that, as did the other presidents. There's a total of about \$56 to 57 million dollars-worth of savings since TIER was implemented in 2014. We have about \$16 million that we put on the table, so \$10 million of that's in bond savings, by renegotiating our bonds—something pretty straightforward. Let's hear it for low interest rates. It really helps out a lot.

The other thing that I wanted to just mention is we have an ongoing search. It will actually be done soon. We've had the interviews for the Assistant for the President for Federal and Board Relations. This is the Pat **Gaedelmann** position. I just want to make everyone aware of it, that it has been going on. The position will do three things: One is federal relations work. A lot of time out in D.C. helping us find out where money is available both for faculty in terms of NSF, NIH, Department of Ed, Department of Defense) and then other government work that we have as well. Things like financial aid; all the financial aid funds, regulation changes, what might happen to the TEACH grants, whether or not the Higher Ed Act gets reauthorized—those sorts of things. The second piece then is relations with the Board. It's really making

sure we're getting everything the Board in the format that it needs in the time. They become a liaison for us really in terms of the paperwork and overseeing that. He'll also...it will be a 'he' as we know there were three people that were finalists and they're all males, so it will be a 'he.' The other portion would be to help with the budget in the President's Office. That's not very large, but we need a little help with that, and then do some of the presentation work, and keep up on emails and things like that that come in sort of at the more public level for the University. Any questions on either of those?

Walter: Questions, anyone? I have a minor question. When the State appropriation comes to the University as Financial Aid, does that include Student Loans or is that all basically just tuition discounts, et cetera?

Nook: This would come in as aid, real aid, not as Loan Aid. I've never thought of loans as aid in this would be scholarships, grants, that sort of thing.

Walter: As a parent, I do.

Nook: Yes. Yes. [Laughter] From my perspective as a parent, it depends on who ends up paying that loan off. [Laughter]

Campbell: Another question, just for general interest: How much of the Student Aid comes from University funds that we provide, as opposed to Foundation funds?

Wohlpart: Wow.

Nook: I don't know off the top of my head. I know that we make about \$16 million dollars a year available in scholarship and grant aid.

Campbell: But that includes the Foundation?

Wohlpert: No, that's out of the General Fund.

Nook: I think that's out of the General Fund. I don't think that includes the Foundation at all. But I don't know what we've got for Foundation scholarships right now.

Wohlpert: Joyce? (**Morrow**)

Morrow: Usually around—I want to say around \$3 to \$5 million comes from the Foundation for scholarships, but the rest, about \$14-\$15 million, come from the State and appropriation dollars. Well, tuition—you can't call it tuition-set aside anymore, so it wouldn't be that terminology, but whether it's appropriation or tuition dollars, it's usually around \$15 million and I want to say another \$3 to \$5 from Foundation.

Nook: I know the budget for this year is just a little over \$16 million.

Campbell: Right.

Nook: Again, that General Fund for scholarships.

Morrow: Right. And this is on top of that.

Nook: Yeah.

Wohlpert: And we are unusual as a state, in having to carve those funds out of our State appropriation.

Nook: Yes.

Wohlpert: In most states, there is a State appropriation for that kind of aid.

Nook: In Wisconsin, we could not touch these dollars for scholarships. We had a little bit of a state pot, but we couldn't touch them for scholarships.

Walter: Thank you Senator. That's a good question. I hadn't thought of it myself.

Kidd: Is this to create that kind of—like a state fund for scholarships somewhat like the private school scholarships—this appropriation?

Nook: I don't think that's quite a right way to look at it. What they are saying is that they are asking the State to allocate it to us as scholarship. So, we'd get our—what we're currently getting as a regular allocation, and then this would sort of be a line item scholarship allocation.

Kidd: So is this the complete then allocation? Basically take whatever we've got this year, we're going to get the same thing next year, plus this...

Nook: \$2 million.

Kidd: That's all they're asking for?

Nook: That's all they're asking for.

Kidd: That's depressing. It just is I guess. I was hoping for more. I'm allowed to say that.

Wohlpert: We are being recorded this time. [Laughter] Next question?

Kidd: Sorry about that. I got all distracted. Oh gosh, I forgot already.

Walter: See what happens when you get old?

Kidd: I'm very old and very tired, and very depressed, I guess.

Walter: Provost **Wohlpert**, I believe you're next.

Wohlpert: I am just back from a week in the Boundary Waters and the only report I have is that the waters are clear, the skies are dark, and the fall colors are starting to come in. I've got nothing else. Give me a week or so. I will say the one dog, Leo, follows us at our heels as we pack up because he doesn't want to get left behind. But for this time, he stayed in his bed and didn't budge. He didn't get out of bed for breakfast. He didn't follow us when we went out to the car. He didn't follow us. He was like, 'The next lodgers that come in have a dog.' We picked him up and carried him.

Kidd: Next Monday will be the Fall Faculty meeting. We want to recognize award winners who've already been recognized, and recognize them in a larger audience, and also new faculty, and we get to hear remarks from our President and Provost and Senate Chair, and Union President because hopefully, they'll have something to tell us about exciting and happy news, unlike State appropriations.

Wohlpert: Oh, dear.

Nook: How much time is it? Twenty to thirty minutes? Is that right?

Kidd: No.

Wohlpert: Ten minutes each.

Nook: Okay.

Kidd: I'm sorry.

Vallentine: You have that much good news?

Nook: I went on for almost thirty minutes of good news last Monday, so yeah, I think I can get there.

Walter: I don't have anything particularly to say at this point, but I would like to restart the tradition of having our guests introduce themselves. Julianne **Gassman** is here to make a presentation, and ...

Morrow: Joyce **Morrow**, Office of the Registrar.

Walter: Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else?

Morrow: I may have a grad student show up.

Walter: Okay fine. I suppose what I need now is a motion to approve the minutes for September 11th. Now you're aware that there kind of weren't any because we had a little electronic glitch. These things happen. Fortunately, we recorded all the votes and we had a quorum, and everything was officially okay. But if you have comments about the minutes as they're posted, continue to give them to us, because your memory may jog over something you said or something was misrepresented, or whatever. So let's just consider those open for a while if that's okay. So, if I could have a motion to approve those minutes?

Gould: So moved.

Walter: So moved by Senator **Gould**, second by Senator **Choi**. All in favor of approving the minutes for September 11th, please indicate by 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' I remembered this time. The motion passes. So Considering Calendar Items for Docketing, we're going to start out with Calendar Item 1347, Reconsideration of University Writing Committee Proposal. Do I have a motion to...

Campbell: Can you go back to *e ii* Michael? [Refers to agenda item] Can we go back to *e ii*, your comment on the IAF Committee? Do you have a comment on that?

Walter: I don't. I'm working with an older draft here as well. I'm sorry that that's there. We've pretty much filled all those appointments. Those are just...

Campbell: Do we have a vote on our Athletics Representative?

Walter: Let's see. Who is that?

Campbell: Someone agreed to do that.

Walter: I think Gretchen (**Gould**).

Gould: I agreed to do it.

Walter: My oversight. So do I have a motion to vote on Gretchen (**Gould**) being our Athletics Representative?

Campbell: So moved.

Walter: Thank you Russ. Second? Senator **Fenech** seconds. So all in favor of having Gretchen (**Gould**) be the representative on that athletics committee, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? Motion passes. Thank you Gretchen. I don't think I have anything else listed under my comments there. Oh, sorry. We do have the Intercollegiate Athletics Fund Travel Committee. Amy (**Petersen**) remind me of the last name of Sheila who is...

Petersen: **Benson**.

Walter: **Benson**. Thank you. Do we have to vote on that, or is that not a Senate Committee? I think I just have to thank the person for volunteering. Some of

these we're kind of dealing with a number of different committees. They aren't really standing Senate committees, but they're asking us to help staff them, so sometimes just thank you; sometimes a vote. Is that clear Phil East a couple of semesters ago, and it's getting bigger and bigger, but in any case, Sheila (**Benson**) has agreed to fill that particular spot, so we thank her. So I don't think we have to vote for that. Contrary opinions on that?

Campbell: If they ask the Senate to provide someone, I think we should vote on it.

Walter: It doesn't have to be a Senator. I think they just...

Campbell: But if they ask the Senate to provide...

Walter: They ask us to suggest.

Campbell: If they ask us to suggest names and they select, we don't vote on it. If they ask us to provide someone, we should vote on it.

Walter: I think they make the assumption that we know everybody and that's not really true in my case.

Wohlpert: I just want to clarify. This is not an Athletic Committee, it's the Intercollegiate Academic Fund...It's a student fee that's collected to pay for student travel and things like that. Students apply for it a couple of times a year.

Walter: Okay, moving along here: The Writing Committee. What I need is a motion to move this from a Calendar Item to Docket Item; to docket it in regular order.

Gould: Is there any discussion to move this to the docket?

Walter: Do we have a motion to discuss this and/or vote on it? Senator **Skaar**. Second? Senator **Mattingly**. Thank you. All in favor of moving Calendar Item 1347, Reconsideration of the University Writing Committee Proposal to a regularly docketed item that would be 1345. Do you want to discuss it first? Okay. Any discussion points on that?

McCandless: I was reading the summary here and it talks about they're looking for guidance from the Senate. Can you tell those of us who are new a little bit of the background behind this. Why does this come up again? It sounds like this is something that was discussed in the past, at least from the summary that was listed. So does anyone...

Walter: Probably anyone in this room has more insight into this than I do. Anyone.

Wohlpart: President **Nook**?

Walter: Anyone except for President **Nook**.

Walter: Seriously, Tim (**Kidd**) do you have...

Kidd: Yeah. I can talk about this. It came up before I was Senate Chair, a couple of years ago even, so that's three years back. It started like four years back, I think. The original charge was to basically survey the faculty or the University for the

need—if there would be a need for additional writing-intensive courses to be required; to assess how faculty felt about student’s writing abilities and things like that. So, they came up with a recommendation when I was Senate Chair that there should be more writing courses in the General Education-LAC requirements or a graduation requirement, and then it was a matter of...I think it got lost in the ‘how to do’ that. So I think what they’re looking for is guidance mostly in the curricular process is what I would assume. Or, maybe they don’t know exactly what they want to do, but from when we talked to them—I talked to them last year, and it seemed like they had general ideas of what they wanted to do, but they weren’t sure how to go about it through the curriculum process, because it’s a big endeavor, right? We’re not talking about ‘Hey, we want to propose a course,’ we want to propose this. It’s kind of a big, holistic, endeavor to get the whole University to agree to something.

Walter: It sounds like they need some specifics. Based on their narrative there, it seems they don’t know—like they’re at sea.

Campbell: I remember we did do some wordsmithing as to whether they wanted significant writing in a course, or whether writing was the focus of the course, and we did some wordsmithing on that. I think got it down to something which we even felt the Mathematics Department would be comfortable with.

Walter: Even them.

Campbell: We don't do that much of the writing in the mathematics at the undergraduate level, and we certainly don't want to make writing the primary focus of a course, but we certainly want our people to be able to write. Just to remark: We've done some wordsmithing on that in past considerations. It may need more.

Walter: Does that satisfy your...

McCandless: Yeah. Again, when I read the proposal I wasn't exactly sure what 'seeking guidance' meant. But, I'm getting a clearer picture. Thank you.

Walter: So is that sufficient discussion to move on for a possible vote. Anyone else have any comments on this? So, all in favor of moving 1347 on to the regularly docketed items, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay', abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes, so that will be docket item 1235. The next item up is Strategic Plan Metrics—Looking at goals associated with UNI's Strategic Plan. Dr.

Vallentine, did you have a comment on this one particularly?

Vallentine: Amy (**Petersen**) will probably have more comments. Randy **Pilkington** has been working with Amy and also Becky **Hawbaker** in trying to come up with more metrics that are centered on what faculty believe should be measured within the Strategic Plan.

Petersen: We are hoping that you take a review of the document that we have uploaded, and provide additional feedback next week. Becky (**Hawbaker**) will be here as well. We can answer questions; have some conversation around measures

and metrics related to faculty and the Strategic Plan; the goals within the plan. I'm sorry—two weeks from now, the ninth.

Walter: Other comments or questions on this? So I need a motion to vote on 1348, Strategic Plan Metrics. Moved by Senator **Gould**, seconded by Senator **Choi**. Thank you. All in favor of moving Calendar Item 1348, Strategic Plan Metrics to Docket Item 1236, (basically regular order) please say 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay'. Abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes. Thank you. So we have the Draft Policy for Posthumous Degree and in Memoriam Certificates, which is Calendar Item 1349. Let's see. Does anyone have any insight on this which they'd like to offer? I don't recall exactly who put this up?

Wohlpert: It's coming from the Registrar's Office. The Registrar's Office is the one that gives the—awards the degrees. We haven't ever had a policy for this. We've had a practice and a set of guidelines. We wanted to get faculty input. We've done that. Joyce (**Morrow**) has led that conversation. This is bringing it to the Faculty Senate to approve this and give us feedback, and then we'll take it through the Policy Process.

Walter: It would give us two weeks to read up on this.

Campbell: And we will be able to modify it when it comes to us before we endorse it?

Wohlpert: That would be great. If we got feedback now, that we could modify it now, so this is a first reading of it truly.

Campbell: One feedback I had is you said people can petition to get a degree if they've been here less than six semesters—I don't remember what your count is, and I don't think that it's a good idea to have that, because that suggests that everyone should petition when you put it in the guidelines that you can petition for it.

Wohlpert: Okay thanks. The idea was that if you create a hard and fast rule, which we do, I think it's 90 hours or 100 hours, something like that—that somebody who has 89 hours or a really good reason and the faculty want to advocate for it, that you would want to have an opportunity for a petition...

Campbell: Just saying that you can petition, it comes across that everyone should petition, so I don't know...

Wohlpert: You're right, Russ (Campbell) and so one of things we have to do is get into a practice of saying 'no.'

Campbell: Or, get into a practice of saying 'exceptions can be made.' Say it far less positively than that.

Wohlpert: That's helpful.

Walter: Good. So everyone will have a chance to read this, and it will be up on the Senate website and we'll be able to discuss this in two weeks from now, if I can get a motion to vote on Calendar Item 1349 to docket it, please? Senator

McCandless. Second, Senator **Hakes.** Okay all in favor of moving Calendar Item 1349 Draft Policy for Posthumous Degree and in Memoriam Certificates, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay,' abstain by 'abstain.' The motion passes, so that would be Docket Item 1237. New Business? I don't have any in particular

and I hope I have the correct draft of the agenda. There is none listed there. Is that okay with everyone? I hope I didn't miss anything. Sometimes that happens. Alright, so Consideration of Docketed Items. This is our guest Julianne **Gassman**. She was here two weeks ago—two Senate sessions ago—and made a very brief presentation on this. Thanks, President **Nook**. [President **Nook** leaves] This is Calendar Item 1336, Docket Item 1226: Presentation of Civic Action Plan, Strategic Plan docketed for today a ten-minute presentation and then comments. Now, what I'm hoping, Julianne, is that this actually works because you sent me a website instead of a PowerPoint presentation, so the clicks may not work as smoothly as you want. Let's give it a shot. It won't download. I couldn't get it. It froze the whole system, and I had to reboot basically. Let's just avoid trouble.

Gassman: You'll just miss my fancy clips.

Walter: Just give me a nod when you want me to move forward.

Gassman: So I just wanted to—hopefully you've all had a chance to read the Civic Action Plan and I'm excited to have a discussion about it. The Civic Action Plan is embedded in our Strategic Plan. I won't read our vision and mission statements for you, but if you go to the next slide, you know that our unifying goal is student success, and then there are three supporting goals, one of them being a focus on community engagement. That supports student success. The Civic Action Plan is actually serving as the implementation of the community engagement goal, Number Three in our Strategic Plan. I wanted to give just a little bit of a background because all of this has come together very nicely. But actually, before we started to develop our new Strategic Plan, because we are a member of Campus Compact—Campus Compact nationwide put a call out to all of their

member institutions to sign a commitment to develop a Civic Action Plan, so that we would redefine our public purpose in Higher Education. That actually preceded the work we did on our Strategic Plan, and actually in the state of Iowa there are 22 member organizations in Iowa's Campus Compact, and we were the first state where every university president said, "Yes. We will make this commitment to develop a Civic Action Plan." And in that Civic Action Plan we made a commitment to these five civic action statements. One being around thinking about how we can co-create mutually respectful and beneficial partnerships. How we might prepare students for life for engaged citizenship; How we will think about responsibilities within the context of our community, and what we need to do in our community to contribute to the health and well-being of the community. Also, think about the capacity we have in Higher Education to address social and economic inequalities, as well as just sort of make that commitment that we have in Higher Education to the public purposes of the institution. So, we made that commitment, and said that we would develop a Civic Action Plan, and then we actually embarked on developing our Strategic Plan.

And so if you look at our Strategic Plan, keeping the unifying goal of student success always in mind, and thinking about our goal around community engagement, the University identified four strategic initiatives. Those strategic initiatives were developed, and they align very nicely with the commitment we made around the five statements that we committed to when we said we would develop a Civic Action Plan. I thought it was important that you all know and hopefully the message is out there as we ask for feedback from faculty across campus that it was a very thoughtful process. The Civic Action plan is linked to our

Strategic Plan. It was also very fortunate maybe that the call from Campus Compact came right when we were developing a Strategic Plan. That really elevates the Civic Action Plan, whereas it may not otherwise have been so embedded into the work that we're doing at the University.

The next few slides really just go over each of the goals, and I pulled out what is highlighted in each of the areas. So in the first goal, we really think about community engagement and what that means for students, focusing both on curricular kinds of things, and embedding community engagement activity into all majors across campus. What it looks like to map and promote co-and extracurricular community engagement activities for our students, and then to also recognize and celebrate their work. If you look in the plan, there are some thoughts about recognizing students in graduation, developing a co-curricular transcript—those kinds of things. But the first goal is really around students, and the benefit of community engagement activities and service learning for the students.

The next goal really focuses on faculty and staff, and first is giving them the support and helping them develop service learning courses. If we're going to develop this work inside our curriculum, that really comes through service learning courses. Some of you know that we have been implementing a Service Learning Institute. We've actually done that for the past few years, and along with that we will put into place a process for designating service learning courses, so that students can intentionally take a course because of the service learning component. We also would like to work on aligning community engagement activity and teaching scholarship service, hiring practices, and tenure and promotion. And much of that is doing an inventory of where we're at, and then

thinking about how we can move forward in those areas in our plan, as well as recognize and reward faculty and staff for community engagement and service learning work.

The third goal: The committee really I thought did a really nice job of thinking about what all of this means for our community partners: The capacity of our community partners, and how they can be identified as a partner of the Institution. And so, this was really thought about it in two ways: One, to have a Community Engagement Advisory Board, as well as thinking about what that network of formal community partners looks like for the University. And this is the plan to sort of think about how all this is going to look in the future.

And then the fourth goal is really thinking about what that—I think ‘front door’—everybody says ‘front door’—I think there’s two pieces to it: The front door and the outreach of this work at the Institution. So, having a presence in the community, so people know who to call and who to ask their questions to, as well as the outreach that I think we need to have, so we can be invited to the table as we talk about critical issues in our community.

Providing on-going support for the capacity of partnerships and the network we will build, as well as a lot of focus on telling our story and marketing the public relations around this work. That really gives an overview; kind of a broad focus of each goal area. I suppose at this time, I’d like to open in up for thoughts, comments.

Kidd: Could you go back to Goal One, please? Honestly, I like a lot of this. Especially I like the idea that the students are recognized; the recognition. I like the idea of having the central—it’s one thing we’ve talked about: Who do we talk

to, right? The only thing that I really see that I'm really kind of worried about is how to embed it in every major? What does that mean? Use my major—physics, right. And I can see how you can stretch and make that some community service work, but not every student experience, but every major. How does that work?

Gassman: Well I think that we have a couple of purposes, and that go to the public purpose of Higher Education. We're preparing students for careers or their professional endeavors, but we're also preparing students to be citizens in their communities. I think there is room inside every major to think about what that means, and what that looks like. Right?

Kidd: Can you help me out with mine, because I really don't see it.

Gassman: So here's what I would say. We will, and we will help there in helping every major, and I think that we're going to be able to provide resources about how that can happen. I think there are a lot of examples within this context in a lot of places where I think we can. And here's what I would say, "If we really, really, can't, that's alright." But I still think we need to say that how do we think about the civic engagement of majors across campus? To not just say, "This is the civic responsibility of all of these majors, but...it doesn't really quite fit, right?"

Kidd: What I mean is I can see how you can say 'every student on campus' like that might be a goal, is to have every student pass some kind of community—if that's a goal of the University. But, I think to say to a specific major, "Hey, you're going to incorporate community service in your classes." I'll say, "I'm teaching quantum mechanics. How is this class going to be really involved?" Yeah. I could

have my students go out and do outreach of some sort, at a high school or elementary school, right? However, do I have time to do that? I'm going to be quite honest. I think as a student organization, I support the Physics Club, or whatever—to do these activities. I've gotten grants for students to do these activities. But as far as classes, I don't know if I'd be comfortable even teaching that class, because I don't know how—you know, I'm a physics person—and I don't know how to teach that class, right? I don't know how to teach community engagement.

Gassman: One of the things that I think that I don't think that we're moving toward every single class being a service learning class.

Kidd: It could be even one. Like how do I teach that? I don't know how to.

Gassman: Right.

Wohlpart: And that's why we have the Service Learning Institute in the summers, to help faculty move to that. One of the things I think the wording is that it would be embedded in the major. It doesn't have to be in the class necessarily, although service learning classes is one possibility. So Tim (**Kidd**), I'm thinking about physics majors helping out with robotics competition.

Kidd: Well yeah, exactly.

Wohlpart: Huge, huge civic engagement. What an amazing opportunity for them. Great piece on their resume. That would count for this.

Kidd: I can see lots of ways to do it, but please don't try to tell a class. Does that make sense?

Gassman: Right.

Wohlpert: That's not going to happen. That's not going to happen.

Gassman: I think that here the intention is that the faculty understand that within every major—here's your roadmap to your opportunities. And it may be co-or extra-curricular activities, rather than in the curriculum or in a class.

Kidd: And I would just offer—have a general route also. Does that make sense? Like a have a route which – hey maybe this area is not aligned with these areas, but we always have an opportunity somehow throughout the University.

Wohlpert: That's very helpful.

Campbell: Maybe if you could change that first thing, 'community engagement embedded in every major,' to 'community engagement offered in every major.' Every major should find opportunities appropriate to the major which maybe the robotics. It may be tutoring math in Waterloo or something. We are having this writing across the curriculum or writing committee proposal, and the departments are going to have to be busy designating courses containing intensive writing experiences, and they're not going to want to have this other

burden really at the same time. So I think it is nice to find courses within the curriculum which entails civic engagement, and I think it's nice to ask majors to find an opportunity that their students can do, but to actually require a civic engagement experience in each major—maybe we'll slip it into the LAC someplace, but I agree with Dr. **Kidd**, that I certainly do not want to require all math majors to do a civic engagement experience within mathematics.

Wohlpert: That's good. Good feedback.

Gassman: I will say that is my wordsmithing. The actual plan is worded a little bit differently. It doesn't say, 'embedded in every major.' I will say that's just my interpretation and summarizing it.

Wohlpert: Wishful thinking, Julianne? (**Gassman**)

Gassman: Anyway, it's worded differently on the actual plan but I will look at that. Yes.

Schraffenberger: Could I also say, I went through the Service Learning Institute and ideally what happens is that it's not about making extra time to do extra things. It's actually enhancing the curriculum. There is a lot of work on the front end where you try to have a partnership with somebody out in the community or some organization, and then it becomes part of what you're teaching, not just some extra volunteer committee. Some people call it "community based" education, rather than service learning. There are many different ways you can think of it. One hopes it doesn't become a burden that's sort of tacked on to your

syllabus. But that's what the Service Learning Institute is about: Is kind of going through and making those partnerships, and having those decisions be very thoughtful.

Gassman: We're hopefully providing the support that faculty need when they want to think about this, so the things that actually become difficult are 'who do I partner with?' Well, let us figure that out, and then we actually form that partnership and try to do it that way—what Jeremy (**Schraffenberger**) described, and not have this be the extra thing. So, yeah, thank you.

Schraffenberger: I don't think it's compulsory for faculty, either. I think that really ideally there's a call for anyone who's interested among the faculty and then you may not have any idea Tim (**Kidd**) like, 'What am I going to do with physics?' Well, let's brainstorm and see what the possibilities are; what other people have done in similar disciplines, and then working together, finding the right community to partner in the right place and the right approach.

Kidd: Physics Education—I can see lots of different ways. Physics, less so.

McCandless: I had a question about the Goal Two, the objective two: Departments, Centers and Institutes across campus will incorporate community engagement within their hiring practices. And then the next point: Retain or promote. Could you talk a little bit about how departments and universities would do this?

Gassman: Yes. The thought there, and the discussion within it—the committee that developed it—is not—we want to embed this in the culture of who we are, that we think about that public person--that public purpose of Higher Education. When we're hiring, whomever we are hiring, is there a way that we can think about incorporating questions, or being thoughtful about this, if say this will define who we are at UNI? We're certainly not going to get into it the very weeds of hiring anyone, but rather bringing it up as a hiring practice to think about this when they do. Regarding tenure and promotion, this plan identifies that we would like PAC committees to think about their reward structures regarding community engagement work. Some committees have a reward structure that rewards this work differently than others. I think actually overall, across campus, we're not as advanced as some universities. You just said, "That's so much work," to do all that kind of work, and so what does the reward structure look like when someone has a scholarship of engagement, and how does that work in tenure and promotion? One of the things I hope we don't do is embrace community engagement work, hold it up as a piece of our Strategic Plan, and then punish faculty who really get behind it, because it doesn't fit some traditional tenure and promotion structures. Right? So I don't know what that means for PACS and ...

Wohlpart: I do want to say that we have a Faculty Advisory Committee that's looking at this, and will be embedding community engagement in the work that we do: service, scholarship, and ways that we need to broaden that.

Hakes: We can adjust for in our own tenure and promotion guidelines and so on, but we should be very aware that candidates coming out of graduate school for

their first employment are smart enough to know that community engagement doesn't travel. It doesn't travel. So if you have two options: going to a university that's talking about community engagement—don't worry, we locally count it, but that's not that person's first...they don't know that is going to be their landing spot—they might be looking to move. And they had an option to go to another university where the word 'community engagement' never came up. Which job are they going to take? No doubt, this is a scared person who's 27, 28 years old. They never, ever—no one's ever taken their first job fresh out of graduate school planning that that's where they're going to live and die. Not even one. They're just getting out there, and community engagement does not travel. So we can do all these things we want, I'm just trying to put that warning out there: I wouldn't parade that around in an interview with a fresh Ph.D. that's 27 years old. I would run for the hills. I mean I couldn't run fast enough. I've had three or four posts—I do stuff that travels. If it don't travel, I don't do. I'm just telling it. That's the real world. And in physics or in every field, there's stuff that travels, and we can get all high and mighty about our local thing. Wait 15 years, and look what our local plans did to the crop of people that... Well, we only got people that want to engage in community service, well then that's what you'll get and you may not be pleased with the outcome. I just want you to rein that in a little bit, and be very careful. All I know is in my field, you wouldn't even get through the interview. You say those words and they say, "Thank you very much. I've enjoyed talking with you." They're out of there. And if they didn't run, I'd be nervous about that. I'd be real scared. They're kind of clueless then, they're not really interested in their field. I'm just saying that it doesn't travel, even if we make all sorts of rules about our local tenuring—'Don't worry. We count it.' When they're 27 years old, they

don't care. They're not even planning on getting tenure here the first day. They're just getting out of graduate school, and they need time and funding and all the things necessary to either stay if they choose, or to travel if they want. I just want everybody to think about that. I think we're just blind to it. I don't know if anybody's even aware.

Wohlpart: David (**Hakes**), there are lots of people thinking about this very deeply.

Hakes: Yeah. Okay. We're going to chase the very people we want...

Schraffenberger: I think you're underestimating some of the stuff going on in service learning in Higher Education, in grad school even where there are publications about this that get the same amount of credit for tenure as other things that are more pure.

Hakes: Maybe.

Skaar: Similar to this, I'm wondering for someone in Education, this what we do. So I have no negative comments about it, except that often times we feel like it isn't weighted the same in tenure and promotion. And so I understand Senator **Hakes'** and in his discipline how that may look. But for us, we're often doing that engagement without getting credit for it. And then how does that work when we're having an Action Plan? How do we impose some of these ideas upon PAC committees where I've been here, this is my seventh year, and I feel like we've

talked about this a zillion times in just the seven years that we've done this, and I don't see our PAC committee is achieving.

Wohlpert: If I could remind everybody, we are going through a process to overhaul faculty evaluation right now. We have a Faculty Evaluation Committee, Amy's (**Petersen**) on it. John (**Vallentine**) is on it, that's going to write University standards, processes and criteria in each college and we're going to do this collaboratively. It's no longer going to be administrators writing their criteria. Faculty writing their criteria, which may have no alignment, and sometimes it's hidden. This will now be transparent, collaborative,

Petersen: And aligned.

Wohlpert: It will be inclusive and aligned. We will be letting everybody know, "Here's who we are. Here's how we stand, and here's the process."

Skaar: In that process, I assume—I haven't heard a ton about any of this.

Wohlpert: They just met.

Skaar: Right. There will be wiggle-room for Senator **Hakes** and his discipline and our discipline. Obviously, that looks different.

Choi: I'm still concerned about how the faculty is compensated. For example, in the Psychology Department—I'm in the Psychology Department—in the

Psychology program we have internship programs for the students and a lot of community engagement opportunities for the students. And faculty members who supervised those students were compensated by receiving Non-Standard teaching credits or merit pay. But now, with all the budget cut issues, there's no merit for doing it, and teaching credit reduction has also decreased, so there's basically no compensation. So, if this is emphasized in the future, whereas in the past if you do that, then you got extra credits or extra merit. But now, it's something you have to do, and if you are behind, then you're punished. Does that make sense?

Walter: Only a possible disadvantage as opposed to an advantage. We have to be very careful how we implement this.

Choi: I'm wondering how we can be, if that the faculty effort is recognized without punishment for those people who are behind?

Bernhard: It's obviously really important to talk about how this will affect faculty, too, but I know this started kind of as something really to improve what education looks like at UNI. So I just wanted to reiterate how important this whole concept is. I'm also an Education major, and I could tell you I have friends that are in Ed programs across the state and even in other states, too. I participate in Camp Adventure—there's a lot of Ed majors in there, so through that I've been able to compare our Ed program to a lot of others, and how much our Ed program gets students like in the real world in classrooms, in front of students is enormous for being ready to enter the workforce when we graduate. I can't imagine how

helpful this will be for other majors as well. So, I think that's really important to reiterate as well.

Kidd: Just a comment on that. Again, for Education, this is a necessity. For Physics, it's not.

Wohlpart: Tim, (**Kidd**) I can tell you stories of students—engineering majors—at FTC who did a year-long Civic Action Project and they went and did an interview, that was the thing the employers were interested in.

Kidd: Working with both engineers and scientists in general, I can tell you what the HR departments say, because I interviewed them when they asked me questions. I actually asked them. I said, "Hey, what are you guys looking for?" They're looking for student engagement, right? They're looking for students who are active and yes, that is a bonus. Absolutely. However, what's a bigger bonus? Internship at a company. That's better. If you have both, then you're amazing. But you have to look at each field and these different ways in how they look at things. For some fields, this is a huge priority for the field. Other fields, it's not. Absolutely not. Now, that doesn't mean that for a University we can't have a general priority. But to assume what is important for the careers of a given field that's not your own, I think that's a bit misguided.

Bernhard: Yeah and I wasn't insinuating that this will have an equal effect across majors of course, but it's also not a zero-sum game: I would say where you either have to have community engagement as part of your curriculum, or you have to

have an internship. This supplements education, and I think will encourage students to get further engaged through internships. So I think it will be a really big benefit regardless of majors. It will affect certain majors more of course, but I think across the board there will be positives.

Gassman: I think internships should be identified as one of those high-impact practices that would fall under community engagement. This isn't like...

Kidd: An internship's not community engagement. An internship is with a company or laboratory. It's not community engagement. It's an internship. It's an experiential learning experience, but it's not community engagement for everybody.

Schraffenberger: I just want to make a comment that I think part of the reason for doing this is to tell our stories as a university beyond the walls of the university. There's also—this presentation makes it clear that we tell the story within the walls. I honestly think that when I first heard of 'service learning' before I went through the Service Learning Institute, I probably had preconceived notions, and I would have been in Senator **Hakes'** and Faculty Chair **Kidd's** side on some of these questions, but I think a bigger conversation about service learning could clarify what we're talking about. This isn't just going out and doing community service. This isn't just volunteerism. This is something that's actually pedagogically sound. So, maybe this isn't the moment to have the larger, longer conversation, but I like that we're talking about this now, here, and I hope that we continue talking about this in other meetings elsewhere on campus.

Walter: Thank you. That's a very constructive comment. I agree. Having this depth of conversation here is really what I like to tell people about when I try to sell them to volunteer for this. In all honesty, it's a selling point. It's good.

Wohlpart: It's part of your community engagement.

Walter: That's right. On campus. Other comments on this?

Wohlpart: I'll make one final comment, and that this is connected to our Quality Initiative. Again, one of the things I've been trying to do is align as many things as we possibly can so we're not going in sixteen directions: Strategic Plan, Civic Action Plan, Quality Initiative, Higher Learning Initiative—all one thing. Not separate things.

Walter: So, Dr. **Gassman**, if I can ask you to send me that PowerPoint, so that I can actually download it. It basically crashed the system. Send me not just the website, but the actual PowerPoint to my address, and I'll try to redo this, and put it up there so everybody can look at it.

Koch: I hope this is appropriate, because I'm thinking in terms of critique of community, as well as engagement with community. There's a sense that the society can be better. That the culture can be sick, and we've got to critique that and not be engaged with it, and maybe provide some remedies for some engagements between people; that we should improve. So it's the analysis of the

culture from a perspective of liberal education. That could be a part of it, not just getting sucked into the culture.

Walter: Thank you. Unless we have other comments on this, we can move on to the next docketed item. Let's see. That's Docket Number 1229...

Wohlpart: So the next item is Academic Freedom and Shared Governance, a policy which has already been approved by the Faculty Senate, but I promised I'd bring it back here for one final conversation. It's gone through the University process, but before it has a rubber stamp on it, I promised that it would come here. You will see a few changes to this, and these changes are in response to language from two places: One is Higher Learning Commission expectations, and the second is that several faculty suggested adding quotes from AAUP that kind of amplify in fact where this information came from. So, much of the information in here is from AAUP, but we actually quoted it in several places. So, it's been approved. Are there any final questions, thoughts, before we say it can go to EMT and be done?

Walter: Any comments on this at all? Going once. Going twice. That issue is closed. Thank you.

Walter: Next, Docketed Item Number 1231 concerns the emeritus issue for Dr. Harry **Brod**, Professor of Sociology and Humanities. A little bit of background on this. My interpretation is based on several person's comments on this. Dr. **Fenech** had some comments on this. He's since withdrawn the petition due to

inaccuracies with the facts. But, aside from that, the impression I got, and I don't know how many of you got the same idea, but from several people I got the idea that here at UNI the emeritus status is—I don't mean to trivialize it too much—is a little bit too trivial for somebody of Dr. **Brod**'s status as an academic; as a writer. His specialty is Gender Studies, if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct?

Fenech: Masculinity Studies.

Walter: Masculinity Studies. And I never met the guy, so I could launch into a pitch about a faculty dining room at this point, but I'm going to avoid that. I wish I had met him. I wish I had had a conversation with him, and was able to talk with him a little bit, and I really regret that he passed on before I had a chance to do that. But, I think we had an assumption aboard that the emeritus status couldn't be conferred posthumously, but in fact we do have some precedent for that, and Gretchen (**Gould**) would you like to say a little about that?

Gould: Yes. I did a little bit of research. We—Faculty Senate passed that precedent back in 1993.

Walter: Just read it?

Gould: Do you want me to read the whole thing?

Walter: Whatever part of it you think is important, as long as we all know that this is in writing.

Gould: The important thing is that it's in writing. There has been a precedent. We have had faculty who have received posthumous emeritus status. And it's also indicated in our University Policy 4.21 that posthumous nominations can be submitted.

Walter: Dr. Marybeth **Stalp** came in and read a statement which I've posted along with this particular issue. There's a couple of items on here. This has been up long enough for everyone to have read it. Does anyone have any comments on this before this goes to a vote?

Fenech: I'd like to comment. Originally my department and I, we had discussed this issue. And I agree—I don't think this is an honor honestly, and with all due respect, I think the policy from 1993 is wrong. I don't think this status should be given posthumously. Emeritus status, and emerita status, excuse me, is an active status. It is a status which allows retired faculty the privilege of being on campus. Of parking, of things of that nature, and it allows---it's like a gym membership, and that's what I liken it to: It is a gym membership of sorts, and the only criteria for getting this 'gym membership' is to retire. And so offering it posthumously is—I have a hard time getting my head around it. And the only reason I'm saying this is I'm — frankly, I don't know the fellow who is up for it. I don't know, but in my department there was concern because as many of you likely know, we've had two faculty members who died while they were teaching, and nobody put forward their names because we didn't know. I would do so, but one of our faculty members made it clear that if he did die while teaching, he didn't want

emeritus status at all. So that is my comment. I know you're itching to say something, and I'm dying to hear what you have to say.

Gould: I know. I understand where you're coming from. It's also—emeritus is an honor. Like if you look up the definition, it's an honor, so in some ways a posthumous emeritus status is kind of an honor to the faculty member for their family.

Fenech: I'm sorry. I don't think it is an honor. You acquire an honor. It's like for example the posthumous degrees, and I'm looking forward very much to the discussion on posthumous degrees, and memorials. There was a nice overlap there, thank you. But as I said, I liken it and others, and very few schools I know because I've asked colleagues in Canada and the United States, if this status is conferred, and nobody has responded in the affirmative.

Gould: Which is interesting, because when I did some searching, it seems like a lot of universities do have the posthumous emeritus status.

Fenech: I don't understand the purpose. I don't understand what the purpose of it is.

Walter: I tend to agree with you on that, Lou, (**Fenech**) except for one thing: You could probably apply this to someone who has recently passed on in rather short notice, provided that it zipped through the Faculty Senate if you can imagine such a thing. The other thing about the emeritus status, is I think around here, I've only

been here twenty years, and I've only reviewed a few cases, but right there on the document where my signature goes, it's "Ten Years of Meritorious Service." So you really have to have been here, and you have to have testimony that applies to that. But still, it seems a little shallow for someone as loved as Dr. **Brod** so, and we do tend to give it away a little easily around here, according to various opinions I've heard around here recently.

Fenech: In my three years here, I think there's been one abstention when they've come up. There may be another one.

Mattingly: Normally, when we have emeritus status—when we give someone emeritus status, and keep in mind this only my second Faculty Senate meeting. When I say normally, I mean in my very short tenure, but when this normally happens, somebody has to apply for it, right? Who applied for Harry (**Brod**)—Dr. **Brod**, if may I ask?

Fenech: Is that public information?

Gould: It's on the document.

Hesse: It's the department chair I think.

Gould: It starts with the department head. The process.

Walter: And then it's probably sent to me, and then I put it up—because I have access to the page.

Hesse: It says Marybeth **Stalp** at the bottom.

Schraffenberger: Marybeth's signature is on the page.

Fenech: That's who did it.

Mattingly: I think this is a symbolic thing I think for people he left behind, like his wife who was also a faculty member here.

Walter: So, a gesture.

Mattingly: It's a gesture, and I believe there may be consequences if we chose not to give him an emeritus status. I think there would be hard feelings with the people he left behind.

Walter: We don't need that. It doesn't really cost us anything.

Mattingly: Exactly. I'm certainly disposed to—predisposed to...

Fenech: And that's one of the reasons why I bring it up: Because it doesn't cost us anything. It's the principle for me and my department.

Schraffenberger: I think that's too narrow a definition of the word 'emeritus,' honestly. I think that you're right: It's to maintain library privileges, but it is actually an honor, a status—a symbol as well. I think it's become that more and more lately, honestly. And all we're doing is saying, 'You did good work.' That's my understanding.

Bernhard: I was just going to add I did some research on it because I was curious. It does look like there's pretty good representation across different universities that have criteria for posthumous emeritus. So I think at other universities it does happen, even if it's not a majority. I can't speak to that. It certainly exists at other places. And to echo off his point, and obviously I know the least amount about this, compared to you guys, but it doesn't seem like to me that there's any real con to awarding it, but the fact that it's now been brought forth now, it kind of requires a call to action in my opinion, because now—it clearly got to us because someone really cared about this happening, and so if it comes to the Faculty Senate and was voted down, that's a really negative sentiment to me, I guess. I would like how that...

Fenech: But it's not negative towards the individual. It is the status itself. That's what I'm talking about. I don't know this individual. It is the status itself, right? I don't see the purpose of awarding posthumous status to anybody—to Einstein, if it were. But I'm glad we're discussing this.

Walter: This is again a great example of good discussion.

Campbell: Can I put another spin on it? An emeritus professor is one who is supposed to be still active; still contributing—maybe a dollar a year—it doesn't matter. So, one could be saying, even though Dr. **Brod** died, his work is such a major thing that it is still contributing to this University even after he has died, because the people he's mentored, the works he's written that are still being read. So that could be a perspective to saying that he is living on, even after he died. That's an alternate perspective which would favor granting of the status—saying he truly is still contributing to this University.

Walter: It's a recognition. The functional value of it—what doors are open to him doesn't make any difference.

Schraffenberger: It's almost as though you're more interested in the word 'status' than 'emeritus.' Are you allowed to bestow different statuses upon someone whose died if they're not still standing, so to speak?

Koch: Didn't you mention something in your proposal earlier about different labels or different names?

Fenech: Yes, I did. In the final paragraph, I said perhaps we should get together as a faculty or as a Senate to properly honor those who have died while they are teaching; some kind of distinction apart from emeritus. I mentioned for example in my original petition which is now withdrawn, that certain faculty members whom I consulted at other universities have lectureships in their name, or plaques or something of that nature. And particularly when you're dealing with a faculty

member who is as well-known—not to me, unfortunately—but as well-known as Harry **Brod** was, perhaps, something of that nature. We can discuss instituting something like that.

Walter: Let me encourage you to add that as a supporting document to Docket Number 1237 Draft Policy for Posthumous Degree and in Memoriam Certificates. Now, I'm not really sure if that was supposed to apply to faculty or students or what, but if you want to forward me some language to support that, please do.

Fenech: I'd be happy to. I'd be happy to.

Walter: Please do. I'd absolutely encourage that.

Vallentine: I'm not a veteran of the Senate, in fact this is just my third meeting. But I've written more of these recommendations for faculty, and I really thought I'd better write this very strongly when I was writing them in support of faculty, because I think there is a meritorious aspect of it—if the person has done the work. I think the question is if the person has done absolutely no work, would you then just grant it because they're retiring? I would hope that would be 'no,' because I spent a lot of time writing those letters, and I know that other people have written the recommendation letters in the past thinking that Faculty Senate really scrutinizes these to make sure that the level is high. I have had people I think they do light up. They think it's an honor when they receive it, and I've had a couple that it's for the library and the parking. But many of them will never park here again or never visit the library again, but they did consider it to be an honor.

It's an interesting thought process that goes through faculty member's minds I think when they retire, because it's not always the easiest decision for some to make. But they really do appreciate the honor and you wouldn't necessarily know that around the campus until they walk in your office and they're really proud when they hear that the Faculty Senate has confirmed it. They maybe think that it's more scrutinized that what it has been.

Walter: Those letters end up on my desk. I do look at them carefully to make sure that the period of meritorious service is applied and I post them. I don't edit them at all. Okay, so with that, unless anyone has any further comments, can I hear a motion to vote on Docket Item 1232 Posthumous Emeritus Nominate for Harry **Brod**, Professor of Sociology and Humanities?

Campbell: Can I ask, do you know who the previous people who were awarded that status are or not?

Petersen: I pulled it up as we were sitting here talking. It was on your watch, Gretchen (**Gould**). October 10th of 2016 we approved James **Robinson**.

Fenech: That's great. I didn't know that.

Gould: And in doing my research, there were some back in the late 90's, early 2000's that I could find. I didn't have a lot of time to thoroughly research, but...

Fenech: I wasn't on Senate when that happened. I would have brought it up. James (**Robinson**) I knew.

Petersen: But is the issue here the nature of their approval and the quality, versus the person? So perhaps we're really interested in finding a different way of recognizing?

Fenech: That's what I was suggesting.

Walter: We'll have a way to discuss that. Again, I'm calling for a motion to vote on the Dr. **Brod** issue. **Schraffenberger**. Second? Senator **Skaar**. So all in favor of granting posthumous emeritus status to Dr. Harry **Brod**, please indicate by saying 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, say 'abstain.' Dr. **Fenech** abstains. The motion passes. Great discussion. This is why I show up, mostly.

Walter: We've got to take care of the rest of this. I apologize that I crammed all these in under one docket Number 1234, Emeritus Requests for Mike **Klassen** from Marketing, Cynthia **Goatley**, Theatre, and Frank **Thompson**, Finance. I know two out of three of those people. We are at this part to discuss all of these individually. Does anyone have any comments on any of these?

Campbell: I have a preliminary comment that I'm going to have to vote against Mike **Klassen**, not because I think he shouldn't get emeritus status, indeed, we have seen that the Faculty Senate does not have the power to deny emeritus status to a faculty member, although it had tried, but because when I looked at his application, I didn't think it was in order. It was not clear where his 20 years in

service was. If you can pull up his application? [Voices indicate it was **Thompson**, not **Klassen**] I think Frank's (**Thompson**) was more meticulous. It's 20 years of service, 10 at UNI. Where he's supposed to list his 20 years of service, he just says "one year" up there. You don't know when it began at UNI or how many years he was at UNI.

Walter: So it's incomplete.

Campbell: Right.

Walter: Perfectly justified.

Campbell: I think we should return it because that's going to be in the archives of the library and we would like better information.

Walter: Ten years basically, which is written.

Campbell: Ten at UNI. Twenty overall.

[Discussion]

Walter: Okay I just posted this today, so you could also argue since this just came in this morning, it came across my desk this morning—and I just posted this that it perhaps has not been up long enough because I think our limit is three or four days.

Gould: Three class days.

Walter: Three class days where all this supporting material has to be...

Campbell: Does that address 20 years in Higher Education?

Hakes: The original form requires 20 years in Higher Education.

Wohlpert: That form has not been filled out differently. It's not accurately filled out. It needs to be returned and filled out.

Walter: Return to sender. Alright. I will speak to Mike (**Klassen**) about that because he's a friend of mine.

Wohlpert: How long has he been here?

Walter: You know, I don't know. What I do know about Mike **Klassen**, he goes to my hometown and sends me pictures of how cool it is to be around in the surf. So there's a little resentment there.

Hakes: I'm not sure, but I'm thinking Mike's (**Klassen**) been here more than 20 years so he didn't bother to fill out that upper part. I've been here 25.

Campbell: Everyone else puts the starting and ending date.

Walter: Okay. Dates missing. I'll talk to him. And now...

Kidd: I suggest that we just table that one for now.

Walter: Is that satisfactory to everyone that we simply table this? Let's look at Cynthia **Goatley's** application. Does anyone have any comments on Dr. **Goatley's** application?

Wohlpert: This one is filled out properly.

Walter: Any comments about Dr. **Goatley's** emeritus status?

Campbell: I can just make an anecdote about her. I remember when we did *Mother Courage*—she was the one who directed *Mother Courage* last time it was here which was many years ago, and in the course of the play the person struck his axe into a log. He couldn't get it out, and she was laughing louder than anyone else.

Walter: She was directing it?

Campbell: Yes, she had directed it, and it was on opening night probably.

Walter: The axe wasn't supposed to stick?

Campbell: No. He couldn't get it out and she was behind laughing louder than anyone else in the aud.

Walter: Timing is everything.

Schraffenberger: She's starring in it right now; she is starring in *Mother Courage*.

Walter: On campus? Oh! How cool is that?

Fenech: This is just a grammatical question: Can a woman be given emeritus status? Isn't it emerita status?

Gould: It's emerita.

Fenech: It's emerita for women. And yet it says 'Request for faculty emeritus status.' I know, I'm being a stickler. I apologize.

Campbell: I think it is emeritus status, but her title is 'emerita.'

Walter: I'll take your word for it. Thank you, I think. Any other comments on Dr.

Goatley's application for emeritus status--emerita status? So I want to get comments, and then we can vote on them individually if that's okay with everybody. Frank **Thompson's** is here and he has been here quite a while. He's been here for quite some time. Any comments on Frank **Thompson**?

Kidd: I have worked with Frank (**Thompson**) on budgetary matters, and he's definitely an aggressive individual in advancing what he feels are the rights of faculty.

Walter: I absolutely agree.

Kidd: And he's really good at it getting into things, and I really appreciated him helping me out when I started the budget matters, because I didn't know what the heck I was doing. I probably still don't, but I'm a lot better than I would have been if no one would have been willing to give me a little bit help—or a lot of help in the beginning. He definitely will speak his mind and I really appreciate that.

Walter: I agree. On the budget committee, a real stickler for language and numbers.

Campbell: He was always a friend as we developed the Actuarial Program in the Mathematics Department. He was always a strong supporter of that in getting the Business College to give us the support we wanted and waive requirements when we wanted them waived. Also the administration has treated him nastily at times.

Hesse: I just wanted to follow up on what Tim (**Kidd**) said. Frank (**Thompson**) was extremely active in the United Faculty, the Union. He was president for multiple terms. He was President of the Iowa Conference for the AAUP, the statewide organization, and was Treasurer for the National Association of Conference for AAUP. But in his day-to-day work for the Union, he was the number cruncher. Anytime new insurance premiums came out, he'd be crunching the numbers and was very, very, reliable at doing that.

Walter: Thank you. Other comments about Dr. **Thompson**? So, do I have a motion on the emeritus request for Cynthia **Goatley**? Moved by Senator **Campbell**, second by Senator **Gould**. All in favor of granting emeritus status to Cynthia **Goatley**, please indicate by saying ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstain, ‘abstain.’ The motion passes. Now for Frank **Thompson**. Do I have a motion to grant emeritus status to Frank **Thompson**? So moved by Senator **Mattingly**, second by Senator **Hakes**. All in favor of granting emeritus status to Frank Thompson, please indicate by saying ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstains? The motion passes.

I have no shameless plugs today, nor any comments for the good of the order. Do I have a motion to adjourn? Moved by Senator **Gould**, second by Senator **Skaar**. Good conversations today, guys.

Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate