

11-13-2017

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2017

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2017 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

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

---

## Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1196.

[http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/1196](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1196)

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](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

Regular Meeting  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE**  
**11/13/2017 (3:31 – 4:36)**  
**Meeting #1799**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**1. Courtesy Announcements**

No members of the Press were present.

Provost **Wohlpert** made several announcements: The Higher Learning Commission Team has been assembled, that an Educator Preparation Approval Team is on campus, that after Thanksgiving four candidates will be interviewed for the position of Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and that persons interested in serving on a task for regarding Food Insecurity among students at UNI should contact his office. Provost **Wohlpert** continues to meet with department heads and department members. (See Transcript pp. 4-6)

Chair **Walter** and Vice-Chair **Petersen** showed the new Faculty Senate website and invite faculty feedback about it.

2. **Summary Minutes/Full Transcript** October 23, 2017 (**Zeitz/Schraffenberger**) Passed. All aye.

**3. Docketed from the Calendar**

- a. **1354 Emeritus Request - Russell B. Campbell, Assoc. Professor, Mathematics (O’Kane/Zeitz)** Passed.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-russell-campbell-mathematics>

- b. **1355 2018-2019 Curriculum Proposals - College of Social & Behavioral Sciences (Stafford/Gould)** Passed.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/2018-2019-curriculum-proposals-college-social-behavioral>

- c. **1356 2018-2019 Curriculum Proposals - College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences (Campbell/Choi)** Passed.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/2018%E2%80%922019-curriculum-proposals-college-humanities-arts>

- d. **1357 Emeritus Request – Margaret G Holland, Assoc. Professor, Philosophy & World Religions (Burnight/Hesse)** Passed.

<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-%E2%80%93-margaret-g-holland-assoc-professor>

4. No New Business

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

**Cal# 1351/ Docket 1239 – Nov 13th Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal**

**\*\* (Schaffenberger/O’Kane) Passed.** One opposed, one abstention. **(See transcript pp. 10-24).**  
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/academic-forgiveness-policy-proposal>

**Cal# 1352/Docket 1240 - Preparing for HLC: General Education Revision at UNI**

**\*\* (O’Kane/Skaar) Passed.** One abstention. **(See transcript pp. 10-24).**  
<https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/preparing-hlc-general-education-review-and-revision-uni>

**Cal # 1353/1243 College of Education, 2018-2019 Curriculum proposals and Interdisciplinary proposals. (See transcript pp. 29-32).**

**\*\* (Neibert/Skaar) Passed. All aye.** <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-education-2018-2019-curriculum-proposals-and>

**Cal # 1354/1242- Emeritus Request Russell B. Campbell, Assoc. Professor Mathematics**

**\*\* (Zeitz/Choi) Passed. One abstention (Campbell)** <https://senate.uni.edu/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-russellcampbell-mathematics>

6. Adjournment (Burnight/by Acclamation.) Passed.

**Next Meeting:**

Monday, November 27

Rod Library (301)

3:30 p.m.

**Full Transcript follows of 36 pages and 0 addendum**

**Regular Meeting**  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**November 13, 2017**  
**Mtg. 1799**

**PRESENT:** Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Lou **Fenech**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, James **Mattingly**, Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Steve **O’Kane**, Vice-Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Faculty Senate Chair Michael **Walter**, Senator Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Interim Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, and NISG Representative Tristan **Bernhard**.

**NOT PRESENT:** Senators Bill **Koch** and Mitchell **Strauss**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, UNI President Mark **Nook**.

**GUESTS:** Mary **Baumann**, Chris **Curran**, David **Marchesani**, Joyce **Morrow**, Allyson **Rafanello**, Windee **Weiss**.

**CALL TO ORDER AND CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

**Walter:** Shall we call the meeting to order? I want to start off with a question: Why is everybody sitting on this side of the room? I’d like to call for Press Identification. Any members of the Fourth Estate here? Seeing none, we would go on to comments from President **Nook**, except that he’s not here, so we’ll jump to comments from Provost **Wohlpert**.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST WOHLPART**

**Wohlpert:** Sure. The Higher Learning Commission Teams are being assembled. Many of you have volunteered. Thank you for that. So as the Steering Committee is meeting with Co-Chairs, they have been reviewing who has volunteered for

those different groups and they will be reaching out I think in the next week or two, right?

**Walter:** Somebody you know, or you yourself volunteered for a particular committee, we do tend to shuffle you onto committees where there's a better fit or a real need, so don't take it personally. Just step up when you can.

**Wohlpert:** Thank you for that. It's going to be a fantastic process. We have our Educator Preparation Approval Team on campus this week. They will be here. They got here yesterday and did a nice reception with them last night at the President's house. They'll be here through Thursday. This is a really big week for us. The Self Study report was about 260 pages. Their questions back to us was 20 pages. Our response was 60 pages, and now we will have four full days of meetings to talk through all of the things that they will have questions about. Really exciting week. Really a great group of folks: Nine faculty from across institutions in Iowa, and three folks from the Department of Education. Really, really exciting. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs position is down to four candidates and Michael, (**Walter**) you're on the committee, along with...

**Walter:** I am. Things are moving right along. After Thanksgiving we'll start those interviews.

**Wohlpert:** For those two weeks afterwards, we have four: Tuesday/Thursday; Tuesday/Thursday. So if you and I think we'll have some open forums. We will allow candidates to meet with their departments, because this is a tenured faculty position, so the faculty in the department will get to weigh in. But, please

also provide feedback to Michael (**Walter**) if you have questions or suggestions as we put information out there. We will be looking at putting together a Food Insecurity Task Force to investigate food insecurity on the part of our students, and what we might be able to do about it. So if you have an interest in that, let me know. I'm not sure exactly where that will go, or what we will do with that, but we do know that it is an issue. The last thing I'll say is, if you remember when I came two years ago, that first year I went out and met with every academic department on campus. I didn't do that last year because I had a different role. This year I'm meeting with half of the departments and I'll meet with the other half of the departments next year, and the President is joining me for those meetings. So that's been really wonderful. Almost every department has signed up for a time for us to visit. I've also been meeting with groups of department heads, so four or five department heads at a time. I've gone through almost all those meetings. I have one more meeting to do, and one of the things I will say—a couple things I'll say: One is we asked them to talk about something they would celebrate, and they always celebrate the faculty; the amazing work of the faculty and the way in which there is so much that is happening in our academic departments that is worthy of national attention and national prominence, and we just don't sing our praises, and that's frustrating to them. But they always talk about the amazing faculty, and then they also talk about the fact that we don't have enough faculty resources. So this is also the concern that they share across the board, is that we have got to start investing more in faculty resources. So, I wanted you all to know that that is something that is heard. When we get to that conversation, we talk about some of the things that we do that we need to try and figure out ways to do more of: interdisciplinary collaboration, dual majors,

opportunities for students to think about degrees in very different disciplines, because that's the thing that will make them interesting and marketable and things like that. So as we talk about the fact that there are dwindling faculty resources, and that we need to give students these opportunities, one of the things that we do talk about on a regular basis is the Gen Ed Review, which I know we'll talk about today, and the strong desire on the part of the department heads or support for reducing that, so that we take that—that we alleviate some of the pressure that on the departments that don't have enough resources to do all of the things to do all of the things that you have been asked to do. So we will probably talk about that a little bit more in a while. So, I think that's all I had. Questions?

**Schraffenberger:** What if you'd like to serve on the Food Insecurity Task Force?

**Wohlpart:** If you'd like to serve, send me your name or nominate someone, that would be awesome. I'd love to have names. Paula **Knudson**, VP for Student Affairs & I are going to create a charge and head that up. It will probably unfold next semester, and we won't have time to get together this semester, but we'll see.

**Walter:** Other questions? Sounds like a worthwhile effort. May I ask our guests to introduce themselves? We have about five or six people. Any order, just tell us who you are, and why you're here.

**Raffanelo:** My name is Allyson **Raffanelo**, and I serve as the Assistant Dean of Students, and I'm here with the Academic Forgiveness Policy.

**Curran:** I'm Chris **Curran**. I'm an Administrative Fellow in the Provost's Office and I'm also here for the Proposal on Academic Forgiveness.

**Weiss:** I'm Windee **Weiss**. I'm one of the Associate Deans for the College of Education and I'm here for the Curriculum Proposal for the College of Ed.

**Baumann:** Mary **Baumann**, Associate Registrar. I'm here for the Academic Forgiveness Policy.

**Morrow:** Joyce **Morrow**, Registrar. I'm just here for the Academic Forgiveness Policy, plus I just like to come every other Monday. [Laughter]

**Walter:** We're glad to see you.

**Wohlpert:** Did you all hear that? Did we get that in the minutes?

**Marchesani:** David **Marchesani**, Director, Office of Academic Advising. I'm here for the Academic Forgiveness Policy.

**Walter:** Good. Great. Okay, the Minutes for October 23<sup>rd</sup> have been posted. You know what, Amy (**Petersen**), shall we put up the new website?

**Petersen:** Sure.

**Walter:** Here's the thing. This is a touchscreen and I don't know what I'm doing. I'm going to turn this over to...

**Gould:** I don't know exactly what I'm doing, but I'll try. Do not grade me on this.

**Petersen:** I emailed it to Michael (**Walter**) earlier today.

[Discussion of working the touch screen and website address, followed by oohs and aahs showing new website.]

**Walter:** That's the kind of response we wanted. Somebody put a lot of work into this [Applause]. Duane **Purdy's** the man. Most of you don't know the back side of this, where we put this up and make all the connections, some of which failed, but the backside is pretty messy. But it's better than it was, considerably better.

**Gould:** But we wanted to get the public facing side kind of cleaned up.

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

**Walter:** Anyway, that seems to be considerably better. So, the minutes have been posted. I assume you have read them. What I would ask for is a motion to approve the October 23<sup>rd</sup> minutes. Senator **Zeitz** moves. Senator **Schraffenberger** seconds. All in favor of approving the October 23 minutes, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain, 'abstain.' The motion passes.

Welcome Peter **Neibert** from COE, new representative. Hi, Pete. Welcome.

### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

**Walter:** So we have items to consider for docketing here, and the first is a heartbreaker. This is the emeritus request by our own Russ **Campbell**. How are we going to replace you?

**Wohlpart:** Russ, that's a big spot.

**Zeitz:** He'll come back to every other meeting, right?

**O'Kane:** If we don't approve it, does he have to stay?

**Campbell:** We already discussed that in the case of a former department head, who the Senate thought they could block it from, and were unsuccessful.

**Walter:** Is that a challenge or a warning? Anyway, okay. So I guess I need a motion to accept this Calendar Item to be docketed in regular order. So moved by Senator **O'Kane**. Second by Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor of approving Calendar Item 1354, Emeritus Request for Russell B. **Campbell**, Mathematics, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed? Abstain? The motion passes. The next Calendar Item for consideration is Item 1355. Item 1355 is Curriculum Proposals, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. These items, we have actually several different curricular items. For those of you who are relatively new to this, like me, I had to ask the Provost several times why these don't fall onto the regular Board of Regents 'hurry up' schedule. But it turns out they are of a category that doesn't really require that. So we can basically evaluate these at our next meeting, or as they come up being regularly docketed. So, do I have a motion for moving Calendar Item 1355 in regular order as a docket item? Moved by Senator **Stafford**, seconded by Senator **Gould**. All those in favor of moving this to the docket in regular order, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? The motion passes. The next item, 1356 is 2018 Curriculum Proposals, College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences. Do I hear a motion to move Item 1356 as a regularly docketed item for our next meeting? Moved by Senator **Campbell**, second by Senator **Choi**. I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of this, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? The motion passes. Calendar Item 1357, an Emeritus Request for Margaret G. **Holland**, Associate Professor, Philosophy & World Religions. Do I hear a motion to move this to the docket? Moved by John

**Burnight**, seconded by Senator **Hesse**. All those in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? The motion passes. So, New Business: I can't think of any right offhand. I don't think anyone mentioned any to me on this. But we'll go ahead with regularly docketed Item 1239.

**Zeitz**: Were we going to mention something about the Focus Group? The Gallagher Bluedorn focus group that everybody missed?

**Campbell**: We were there.

**Walter**: Are you trying to make us feel guilty, or what's the deal?

**Zeitz**: Tell everybody how much they missed.

**Walter**: I didn't go.

**Campbell**: There were cupcakes.

**Zeitz**: Gretchen was there.

**Gould**: It was good. It was fun. They showed us several different clips, and served us lots of good food, like Scratch cupcakes.

**Walter**: We missed that. Senator **Skaar** and I sang in the Mozart Requiem. How many of you were there for that? That was fun, too. And we almost didn't miss any entrances. It was great. Okay, enough of that. Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**. Hopefully, you had enough people to have some kind of affect?

**Zeitz**: We filled the room.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

**Walter:** Great. Okay, thanks. This is on to Docket Item 1239, a November 13 scheduling for convenience sake: Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal. Does the team want to present? You have quite a squad here today, so that's good.

**Curran:** Do you prefer us back here?

**Walter:** It's a small room and we're not really accustomed to this, so you can walk around if you want.

**Curran:** I'm not a song and dance, and I won't bring out my accordion, but

**Walter:** I love accordions.

**Curran:** But you can pull up the pdf document if you'd like. If anybody would like a paper copy, we do have some available. Allyson (**Raffanelo**) has those here. We introduced ourselves earlier. We have a core team who worked on this, along with an advisory group. Sometimes, this might be called a Clemency Policy at other institutions. The Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal resulted from some inquiry that happened through Kristin **Woods** and some students in the Student Success Center, asking some questions about other Regents institutions had policies. Did we have one? Was this something we were looking at? The first page provided you with a little bit of history and who was involved in generating this proposal. On the next page, pretty much over the course of a year or so, it took us a little time but we like what we brought forward. What we have there is the proposal is our purpose. This proposal is for a unique group of students. Student—former students who've been separated from the University for over

four years. You might think for instance, of a John Deere employee, who at this point in their life would like to complete their degree. Separation for a number of other reasons in life, and they'd like to come back and finish their degree. So it's a very unique population of former students. Its purpose is really a streamlined process; a common process to restart their career. We identified, based on analyzing Regents policies, peer institutions--what we think would fit our Institution and fit our students on feedback that we received from our core group as well as our advisory group. So we identified some eligibility criteria, and you've been able to read through that and see some of the reasons, and we'll entertain questions: Separation for four years; former student. Some qualifications in terms of insuring that we really look at our academic records in terms of the grades. One semester of academic forgiveness would remain to keep it less complex and streamlined for students, would remain on the transcript, but would just not be represented in the restarted GPA. Once and if this policy does go through, once granted, they would need to complete a minimum of 12 hours here at UNI. We did speak to the semester selected. If that were done, there would not be any ethics violation. So you'll see on the third item on Academic Records, there was an amount of accountability, as well as maintaining the 180 hours required. Any hours from a semester of forgiveness would not be counted towards the 180, and departments would retain curricular decisions regarding any prerequisites; any type of decisions for more courses that might have met a...in a sequence of courses. If it met a prerequisite for a course later on, if that course needed to be addressed in a different way or student teaching or exit requirements.

**Campbell:** What was that 180 hours you are referring to?

**Curran:** The number of hours required for graduation.

**Campbell:** That's 120.

**Curran:** Excuse me, 120. You know that speaks to my other institution, which was a quarter system. So 120, absolutely. We did talk about LAC courses. We did provide you some information, and we'll keep this short. This does look at the other policies that we have that really don't fit this need, so you can look at that, as well as a comparison of the other Regents institutions, which both have a current policy. They're different, and have some different features, but all with the same intent: To support students who have been separated from completing their degree requirements, and encourage them to finish their degree here with the caveats of support. We did create to show you how we could communicate this to students in a checklist, as well as provided some Q & A's there. In summary, we'll entertain any questions that you have. A unique group. They've been gone for an extended period of time. Straightforward process. Maintaining academic integrity by the grades on the transcript. Limiting the amount of hours, and really putting a process of advisement and connections in place for these returning students.

**Walter:** It looks like you've decided on a minimum of four year's absence, right?

**Curran:** Yes.

**Walter:** What about the other end? If someone's gone for 15 years and they try to invoke this. Is there—I don't know how often that actually comes up, but...

**Curran:** We haven't had it at our end yet, but there are times where if this fits a student whose been gone 15 years, I think we'd have to look at if there are recency requirements or any types of those aspects, but I would say that would be a departmental decision, as they are for some of the departmental courses. A good question, Michael (**Walter**). We put the period of four or more. And maybe there is a student who has been gone for 15 years. They did very poorly one of the two semesters they were here, and went on to another life and would like to come back and finish their undergraduate degree. That semester would be eligible under our current policy as proposed. Departmental requirements in terms of recency would enter as would exit requirements or others would need to be considered.

**Walter:** Program changes probably would have taken place.

**Curran:** Absolutely.

**O'Kane:** Would a reader of a person's transcript who did this, know which semester was involved and even know whether or not there was some sort of forgiveness?

**Morrow:** Yes. We'll put a code before the grades. We were thinking of—we don't know what it's going to be. Right now when you were calling it clemency, we thought we'd put a "C" before each of those grades and then we'll have to recode the system and redo our transcripts. There's a little bit of work to all that, but it can be done and it will pull the GPA out of it.

**Zeitz:** Now this is supposed to be satisfying—I've had students where their last semester, they...their life fell apart. And what we're trying to do is saying, okay, let's erase that, and get you back in here and get going again?

**Curran:** Only if they've gone on to another area in life and they've been separated for four years. They want to come back and they've been in touch with you or a faculty member or the Office of Academic Advising and said, "I really want to come back now. My life's turned around and I want to finish." And this might be an option then for them. Absolutely.

**Zeitz:** Why the four years?

**Curran:** Usually because other processes in place may address—does that make sense—academic things we have: readmission, suspension—those types of processes are in place for a separation for a year. Four years tends to be a time where there's some maturation, some focus, some intent, and so we kept it in keeping with the other Regents institutions, within those time frames. It's a good question.

**Zeitz:** Thank you.

**Campbell:** I sent out an email to most of you, indicating my displeasure with this. I think it's ridiculous. I don't think it solves a problem. I think it's an embarrassment that you are claiming you are addressing a problem with that. With that in the background, I think the real problem is someone who, due to a slick STEM recruiter enrolls in Iowa State and before they know it, they have D's and F's in chemistry, physics and mathematics the first semester. Now, they discover they

really shouldn't be there. They want to transfer to UNI and start in music or psychology or something, and they have no way to get rid of those grades. It makes no sense for them to try to retake those courses, even if we have courses which would cover the courses they took at Iowa State, and there's no provision in there for removing the grades earned at a different institution.

**Curran:** No, we did not include other institutional grades; just completion of a degree that was started at UNI.

**Campbell:** Our object is to have access for this University, and I think if we want to have access, the mistake was listening to the STEM recruiter, going to Iowa State and how can we help that student? Can we do anything to help that student?

**Curran:** The intent of this academic policy—good questions, Russ—the intent of this policy it was really completion of a degree that was started here at UNI. And I do understand that there are some students who may do a degree or a major change from another institution—those type of things. We didn't address that. A student may be admitted to our Institution, and have applied and returned to another institution and have forgiveness. That may occur within the system of admissions, but that's not what we're really looking at with this.

**Campbell:** We really have no way to address that. Probably that is a separate matter that should be addressed if anyone is interested in it. But, I do have a question for the Registrar, just along this line of question of general interest: If a student, due to a learning disability is allowed to substitute a philosophy course

for General Education Category IC, are the F's they earned in the math courses is included in the GPA used to determine if they can graduate?

**Morrow:** I'm going to say yes at the top of my thoughts, but that's a real detailed little question there, and I think it would have to run through the Provost Office to take it away if we didn't include that in there. But, I'd have to a record analyst look at the curriculum to see exactly what's counted for that degree.

**Campbell:** Okay, because this is something many years ago that my department head was saying, 'Yes. There are waivers for the LAC requirements If they can demonstrate a true learning disability.' But he said at the time he thought we required them to flunk the math course a few times before we would let them make a substitution.

**Baumann:** Right now the way to change a grade is through the Provost's Office or through the instructor. So, let's say they get the waiver for the course. We can't change the grade without the Provost Office or the instructor saying so.

**Campbell:** No. It's not a question of changing the grade. It's a questions of do you remove the grade from the GPA computation?

**Wohlpart:** Russ, you're asking a really difficult question. I suggest asking it outside of this forum.

**Curran:** These are good questions. All the LAC today does go through the LAC committee in a review there, outside of we do a consult on that.

**Bernhard:** In my experience, particularly with freshmen. Sometimes they come into college not really quite ready. Maybe it's a major thing, too. Maybe they have a really rough semester, and a lot of times they'll leave college to sort of figure some stuff out. That maturation process, like you said. But, in my experience, that maturation process happens a lot quicker than four years. So I was just curious if there is like nation-wide precedence for the four years. Is that pretty common? Or, did you just look at the Regent Institutions?

**Rafanello:** We looked at not only Iowa and Iowa State, but also our peer institutions—so ten other institutions, and other schools that we had familiarity with. So we were better able to access their information online and get down to that nitty-gritty detail. I know a lot of what we saw ranged between three and five years. So that was part of the reason we went with four years.

**Walter:** Someone else has thought about this considerably, obviously.

**Curran:** We do have some supports within the current process. There is the readmission, there is the CAR committee. There are some other things for students earlier on in their career, versus this type of returning thing. It's a good question.

**Campbell:** Did you look at how many schools, or is it just your elite private schools that have the A, B, C, No Credit system, so this would not be an issue? Do you have a feel for that? If there are other schools that have the A, B, C, No credit?

**Curran:** We didn't come across that in the peer institutions that we looked at, so that was pretty much as you'll see on our chart how we summarized it within that field.

**Schraffenberger:** Has there been any conversation about graduate programs and possibly expanding this?

**Curran:** No. I'll leave that to Patrick (**Pease**). We have not discussed. We developed this as an undergraduate policy.

**Fenech:** Can you give me an idea of how many would students avail themselves of this policy per year on average?

**Curran:** Sure. We did a little informal conversation with one of our Regents institutions and at a larger institution, one of our peer institutions that's larger, approximately 30 a year. So it's not a huge population, but a targeted population. And we would have less than that.

**Schraffenberger:** Would there be an effort to find these students or is this simply allowing them to find us?

**Curran:** In the process, we do imagine, and therefore it is within the first year of returning to the University and it is prior coursework. So the entry would be the Office of Academic Advisement, so there's pretty much a one-stop. You can get the information that will connect you with the departments; departmental decisions or information. And so we see that there's information that will certainly be out to the advisor network, and information that will be here, within

the Office of Academic Advisement, so we saw that as a starting point. Trying to be really consistent with that information.

**Schraffenberger:** Well I guess what I mean is there going to be any effort of actually reaching out and recruiting students who might fall into this?

**Curran:** This didn't intend that within the process that we discussed today.

**Rafanello:** I think we didn't explore that opportunity because we first wanted to make sure we could get the policy through. But this conversation really did originate with Kristin **Woods** out of Student Success and Retention, and she has a vested interest, although she did not continue on in the core committee. I do think if passed, that would be a natural spot for us to return to, and ask for help or collaboration with. If there's an outreach that we can do to bring some students back; to get them a degree.

**Walter:** Other questions? It sounds like you've really done some research on this.

**Choi:** I just wanted to make sure that I've understood correctly. Maybe it's just me, but even without this policy, we do have a policy of retaking a course?

**Curran:** We do.

**Choi:** So, the difference between this one and the current one is that my understanding is that four or more years—that it is not an individual class, but a whole semester? Other than that, is there any other advantage?

**Curran:** It may be a more focused restart because sometimes the courses that you retake are one at a time that may have that impact for entry into a major, in terms of an impact for a restart GPA to enter into a potential major, so it may have the impact of it being more common--more streamlined. Does that make sense? And you're right. Essentially there is a process in place, but this makes it more streamlined and processed for students in terms of there's one semester— Let me begin my academic plan and move forward, versus a course here or a course here or when the next course may be scheduled.

**Rafanello:** I think you could also actually go back to process suggestion. A student who maybe starts in the hard sciences, and is here for a year and does mediocre, or maybe fails their final semester after studying the hard sciences, and leaves and decides to come back. The important part for them is the completion of their degree, so they have moved away from the hard sciences by clearing out those F's from the last semester, how are we helping them get into their new major and their coursework and move forward quicker?

**Bernhard:** Thanks for your work on this. I forgot to say that the first time. But did you come across any other institutions that were willing to forgive multiple semesters, or was it very consistently just the one?

**Rafanello:** They were all over the place. So our peer institutions, Iowa and Iowa State have different systems in place. We talked about what we could do as an institution that within our structures. How are we able to make sure that we were doing this consistently across campus for students? I think that's where you'll see some of the decisions that we came to about one semester only being allowed for

one semester. We debated at great length whether it should be one semester or two semesters. The option for a student to pick and choose up to a certain number of classes and really looked at structurally, what can we do? And the best that we believe we can do consistently for students is that one semester of forgiveness.

**O’Kane:** What would happen in the hypothetical situation where a student’s worse semester is several D’s and F’s, and an A?

**Curran:** We did talk about that at length. It is an intentional decision, so it is all of the courses within that one semesters.

**O’Kane:** That seems more fair.

**Curran:** We did talk about that at length, and we thought that was the most equitable and streamlined way to do that, without picking and choosing.

**McCandless:** Just for my own information, this is for primarily students who left for an academic problem, like they were failing their courses and they left. Let’s say someone left and they were in good academic standing. Had a good GPA but maybe for financial reasons, they had to leave. Are those people required to wait the four years to come back, or can they come back at any time if they were in good academic standing?

**Rafanello:** In good academic standing, they could come back at any point, and we do anticipate there could be a student who maybe wasn’t in great academic standing, but in okay academic standing, and separated for four years and has

gone on to work at John Deere or has a prosperous career, but now needs to come back and complete their degree in order to move their career forward. It may still be to their advantage to explore this as an opportunity. Does removing a semester worth of C's and D's move them forward academically quicker? While it does take away credits, does it help them GPA-wise?

**McCandless:** Thank you.

**Walter:** Any other questions on this? Comments? Thank you very much.

**Campbell:** I wanted to make a final comment that I am going to vote against this for the reasons I have stated. I think there's a real problem to be addressed of giving greater access in the spirit of the positive transcripts of a few schools, and so that's why I'm going to vote against this. I think it pretends to address a problem, and we'll see if anyone else wants to really investigate something at a larger scale.

**Walter:** So Senator **Campbell**, would you like to provide the motion for a vote?

**Campbell:** No. [Laughter]

**Wohlpart:** It doesn't mean you have to vote 'yes.'

**Walter:** Does anybody else—is anybody else willing to provide a motion for a vote? Senator **Schraffenberger**, seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. So all in favor of this Academic Forgiveness Policy Proposal we just heard about, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed? Russ (**Campbell**) is opposed. That's a 'nay.' Abstain? Abstentions? Senator **Choi**. It appears the motion passes. Thank you very much.

**Curran:** Thank you for your time.

**Walter:** Thank you for your robust preparation.

**Zeitz:** Thanks for doing that for the students. We need to support them in that way.

**Walter:** It's good. I don't know if I mentioned this to Senate before, but one of my closest friends and colleagues that I met at UC-Santa Barbara, a brilliant guy, bioinformatician, microbiologist; he was coming out at Santa Barbara many years ago, back in the 80's and blew a number of years that way. Once he figured out who he was, he went back in and is probably my most respected colleague. There you go. So, it's worth doing. I believe Provost **Wohlpert** will be chairing the next item: Docket Item #1352 Preparing for the HLC: General Education Revision at UNI.

**Wohlpert:** This has been a conversation for the last two years that has happened at the Liberal Arts Core Committee several times. We've talked about it here at Faculty Senate, department heads, deans—just across the campus on a repeated basis. This document has been in draft form for almost a year with lots of changes based on everything that I've heard. So, lots of feedback from faculty. Lots of feedback from department heads and other folks as we work through this. And the final version of it, I sat down with faculty leadership and we selected the individuals who would be on the committee. Actually, the Faculty Leadership selected those individuals from a list of about 40 people who had been nominated or suggested for this. Michael (**Walter**) asked a question before we started that I want to clarify. He said, "Is this part of the HLC Criterion Teams? And the answer

is 'no,' it's not part of those teams, but one of the things that will happen within those teams is they will investigate all the criteria and say, 'Here's places where UNI does a good job. Here's places that UNI hasn't done the work they need to do.' I'll give you a couple of examples. When we had our last accreditation visit seven years ago, we were expected to have done program assessment, and we hadn't done program assessment. We should have figured that out and started program assessment. The other one is we got dinged really heavily on our policies. You're supposed to have up-to-date policies. That's one of the criteria. And many of our policies hadn't been changed since the 70's—the 60's, 70's and 80's, and so they dinged us and said, 'You really need to do this.' So, part of what we will be doing with the HLC teams is to actually look at the criteria. Look at what we've done and look at what we need to get going, so that we can actually say when we get done with our HLC document that we're in fine stead with those things. So, one of the things that the HLC does call for is the review of your General Education Program, making certain that it's aligned with your vision and mission. So that's what this group of folks will do. Questions? Comments?

**Burnight:** I'm jumping right to Phase Two on the last page, where it talks about "aligning current courses and possibly new courses within a structure that allows students must be able to complete the program within 36 credit hours and the program must be delivered using current resources and work towards realizing efficiencies." So, that's a move from 45 to 36. I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about the rationale behind that?

**Wohlpart:** You know, it's interesting. When this was originally drafted, that wasn't in there, and it kept getting pushed by faculty and administrators to put that in

there, because of the way in which departments are stretched. Folks are telling me, “I don’t have the resources to do the things you’re asking me to do. What are we going to cut?” It’s interesting, as I’ve been meeting with department heads, one of the things they say is that we don’t want to cut the amazing things we do in our majors and in our programs. And that’s part of the reason they’re in favor of shrinking the Gen Ed programs. So, that’s not something I had originally intended to put in there, but it’s been very strongly encouraged to include it. Many Gen Ed programs at comprehensive regionals are 30-36 hours. That’s a general range for General Ed programs, so this would bring us in line with that. And I think the issue John (**Burnight**), for me is that departments don’t have the resources to do all of the things they’re being asked to do. So where are we going to find efficiencies to make sure that we don’t lose the really amazing things we want to hold on to? Is our Gen Ed program one of national prominence that we want to hold on to these 45 hours? I don’t think so. So is that a place where we could realize some efficiencies, and therefore continue to do some of the other amazing things that we’re doing?

**Schraffenberger:** As a member of this committee, or I guess I’m a draft member,

**Wohlpart:** It depends on how the vote goes today.

**Schraffenberger:** Without being approved, I find it interesting that one of the charges in Phase One is to come up with a ‘bold mission statement.’ I wonder if...what do you mean by bold? What has the committee—this team—been thinking about when they say it needs to be bold? I can imagine that committees come together to put together something that is safer, or...

**Wohlpart:** Again, this was language that was strongly encouraged to me. I heard you all say we really need to do something interesting and bold for our Gen Ed program. The Liberal Arts Core Committee was very strong in endorsing that kind of bold thinking, and I think that one of the things I've heard repeatedly is a very bold statement about support the Liberal Arts. Very strong statement about the way in which the Liberal Arts are the foundation of all of our programs. So, I think that that's the intention. What the committee comes up with will be up to the committee.

**McCandless:** Going back to the Liberal Arts Core decreasing from 45 to 36. Those nine credit hours, where do those go? Are we decreasing all of our degree programs by nine hours or...how will those hours be filled then?

**Wohlpart:** So let's remember that most of our degree programs are over 120 hours, and they shouldn't be if we want students to get done in four years. This will allow several things that I think are really interesting. One, hopefully it will allow our students to reduce their debt--get done in four years. And or, add a second major, a minor. So I'm hoping that those nine hours don't get filled. I hope you all don't rush back and say, "Now we can add nine more hours to our majors." I would actually encourage us to think about places where we can decrease our majors. We should do that as well, and find ways to encourage our students to think about getting a music degree and a physics degree.

**McCandless:** I'll work on that.

**Wohlpert:** Unless we create the pathways for students to think in these kind of interesting ways. How about an art program that deals with creativity, and a business program?

**McCandless:** Thank you.

**Wohlpert:** We could establish a real niche in that kind of way because of the remarkable things that are happening. Performance studies and chemistry? Well, they do that already for Halloween.

**Hesse:** On the last page it has draft committee members. Is that the committee for just this draft, or for Phase One and Phase Two?

**Wohlpert:** It would be the committee Phase One and Phase Two. You all could amend that by adding if you wanted, or subtracting. I hope you wouldn't subtract. So we've gone through—it's been two years of soliciting names and I think the original list had 40 people on it, and that got vetted by Michael (**Walter**), Amy (**Petersen**), and Tim (**Kidd**) and they selected individuals. We reached out and asked people if they would join. Some people said 'no' they couldn't, so we thought about others, and we asked others to join. But you all could certainly amend this list. Tristan (**Bernhard**) is here for another two years, so he's on the committee.

**Walter:** Comments or questions about this? What you require from us today is just a consult?

**Wohlpart:** No. This is a vote. You all are the ones launching this. This is curriculum. This if faculty. Faculty own this. So—and the way the Phase is set up is that the committee would work and come back here and go to the College Senates for approval with whatever it is they develop. Come here for approval and then go through the next step. This is a phased step and you all own this. This is not something that the administration owns.

**Walter:** So, it's up to the starting line. Senator **O'Kane** moves that we put this to a vote, and seconded by Senator **Skaar**. All in favor of approving this item, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? Senator **Burnight** abstains. The motion passes.

**Wohlpart:** Get ready to be bold. Tom (**Hesse**), if you have ideas about other members, I would suggest that you talk with the committee. There's no reason they couldn't be added.

[Technical talk/suggestions/laughter regarding touch-screen in use]

**Walter:** I will narrate the next item, because it's going to happen anyway. Okay, Docket Item #1353. All of you have this printed in front of you. I didn't anticipate this. [refers to touch screen] This is the College of Education 18-19 Curriculum Proposals and Interdisciplinary Proposals, and we have people representing for that presentation. Do we not?

**Pease:** I can run through this one. So this is the College of Ed packet. You saw from the docket items that these are coming through by college. This the--all of

these are at the end of the curricular cycle that you put proposals in for last year through, and the reason that Michael (**Walter**) was getting at is these are all remaining proposals that don't have to get approval all the way through the Board of Regents. So we did those earlier, and now we're just cycling through the more regular kinds of curricular changes that occur. So this College of Education packet, this is a big packet. It's a big college, and since these are all the way from course edits to program edits, there are quite a few items. Just to give you a quick rundown, Curriculum & Instruction had edited a couple of programs and five classes. Ed leadership and post-secondary education edited a minor, added five courses, and edited two other courses. Ed Psych and Foundations, made edits to the major and added a course. Teaching edited a course. KOS edited three programs and 40 courses, so good job working hard. Special Education had five edits on minors, certificates, a major, and some 37 added courses in a significant redesign of a program, and then there were—it's not just the College of Education, there are some interdisciplinary courses. So it's a couple of Capstones and three edited courses in Methods and Practice. We added these in here since there weren't many interdisciplinary. It was convenient on timing.

**O'Kane:** You said there's 37 courses being added to that?

**Pease:** Those actually weren't added actually, they were edited.

**O'Kane:** Okay. Because I was going to ask what was driving that?

**Pease:** Actually, I should point out that this is a mixture---what I just read off is a mixture of UCC and GCCC. So it's both undergraduate and graduate. The way the document's laid out for you, it actually splits out the undergraduate's separate

from graduate. In the summary I just threw them all back together. So those are edited courses, not added. I'm sorry.

**Campbell:** As you went through the whole process with all of these, what would you say were the most controversial? Were any of them at all controversial?

**Pease:** There was nothing that was really controversial. The only thing we really see, particularly with the programs that come in, a lot of times there are some things that aren't quite clean in the language, and so rather than these showing up and the UCC just approving them 'as is', there's a lot of back and forth in edits, so there might be a little bit of a change, and maybe the count might be wrong. There might be a hidden prerequisite that needs to be cleaned up and reported properly, and so there is a little bit of back-and-forth the UCC and the groups that come in, but all of that's worked out in the final copies that make it here for the approval represent that clear...

**Campbell:** So there were no mixed votes in the final issue?

**Pease:** No. There were no controversial votes. I think everything was unanimous. There were a few votes that were pending some minor corrections and those corrections were made.

**Wohlpart:** Just to be clear, Patrick (**Pease**), correct me if I'm wrong. Part of the reason these come later is they do not have to be approved by the Board of Regents anymore. In the past we did have to get them a list of added courses, deleted courses on an annual basis. They're no longer asking for that. So the

changes that we did earlier, that you all passed earlier are the ones that had to go through the Council of Provosts and ASAC, and then the Board.

**Pease:** Basically, new programs—things like that have to go all the way through to the Board. These kind of changes do not.

**Walter:** Comments, questions on this. Seeing none, do I have a motion for a vote? Motion and welcome, Senator **Neibert**, and second Senator **Skaar**. Okay. Let's vote on this. All in favor of Docket Item #1353, College of Education, 2018-2019 Curriculum Proposals and Interdisciplinary Proposals, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain? Motion passes.

So that brings us to about 4:30. We had moved a couple of items from Calendar to Docket, and we can probably address one or two of those in the time that we have remaining. I would mention, however, that the Taste of Culture Fair takes place until 6:00 today, and there's food involved. It's happening now, but it goes 'til 6:00. If everybody leapt up and ran out, I would take that personally.

**Campbell:** We are meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup>, and that's our last meeting for the semester?

**Walter:** Yeah...No, I think there's a December meeting.

**Gould:** There's one in December.

**Campbell:** It's finals week.

**Petersen:** It's on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

**Zeitz:** Well, it's on the list.

**Walter:** Okay. The 27<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup>. Right. So it looks like if we follow our calendar, to docketing order, the item that we have to deal with.

[Technical talk/suggestions/regarding touch-screen in use]

**Walter:** So what's going to happen here is Russ's (**Campbell's**) application is going to show up sideways. So if you would lie on your side at the table. The other thing I want to point out is If anybody's thinking about applying for emeritus status, just make sure that your department head doesn't confuse that signature with my signature. Notice the sweeping arrows? This has happened at least four out of five times on these requests that I get. They're not that complicated.

**Zeitz:** Maybe you should just move the line. [Laughter]

**Walter:** I don't have access to this form from an editing standpoint. It's not really that important, but apparently Russ (**Campbell**) has 20 years of service—meritorious service here at UNI and is now applying for emeritus status. It's sad to see you go.

**O'Kane:** How many years?

**Campbell:** 34 1/2.

**Walter:** I suggest if anyone wants to comment at this point...

**Stafford:** So what year?

**Campbell:** In '83 I started. Well, if no one is speaking, I would just mention: Teaching, Research, Service. Teaching: I have taught more student credit hours

than any tenured member of the department. Research: I have over 40 publications, most refereed, many even have citations, and Service: I am serving on this august body.

[Laughter]

**Walter:** Absolutely.

**Zeitz:** I haven't worked with Russ (**Campbell**) on an academic basis, but I've known him for many years in the church and also for other things. I've known him to be a strong voice. Opinionated. Incredibly intelligent, and the way he looks at things really opened up my eyes many times, because he grasps a different perspective that I didn't even begin to perceive. I've enjoyed working with him.

**Walter:** I respect his support for the Arts, even though you made a disparaging comment about music a few minutes ago that I'm going to let slide. What was it— if somebody wanted to go from chemistry to being a music major, most of those music majors are pretty sharp. I see Russ (**Campbell**) regularly at the concerts performances, the chamber music festival and the whole thing. Anyway, I've enjoyed working with Russ's help here, especially here being our Parliamentarian, since Jesse (**Swan**) left.

**Bernhard:** I had the privilege of being one of your students when I was a freshman, which I really appreciated, but even more so, I appreciate that whenever I go to a University event of any event of any kind, I can almost always find you there. So, how much you support all aspects of campus, I really appreciate as a student, being able to see my professors very active in the UNI community.

**Campbell:** I would like to mention to **Walter** and **Skaar** did you read the fine print on the program? I was also one of the donors.

[Laughter]

**Walter:** By the way, Russ is a donor to the Metropolitan Chorale. This is a shameless plug, but if anybody needs to sing, we need some baritones. Thank you for that. That's wonderful.

**Skaar:** I didn't see the program.

**Walter:** I tried to get one but I couldn't get one. I was going to say one other thing, but it will come to me at 3:00 in the morning. Okay, so I guess we should probably call for a vote on Russ's (**Campbell**) emeritus status. Moved by Senator **Zeitz**, seconded by Senator **Choi**. All in favor of approving the Emeritus Request for Russell B. **Campbell**, Associate Professor of Mathematics, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Opposed, 'nay.' Abstain?

**Campbell:** I'll abstain. [Laughter and applause.]

**Walter:** The motion sadly passes. [Laughter and applause] Russ, what is your particular mathematics specialization? You've got a lot of publications. It must be...

**Campbell:** It's mathematical population genetics, and so it's things in that area. It's sort of applied math.

**Walter:** I'm sure I've been told that. Okay. So that motion has passed. [Applause]

**Campbell:** I'm just waiting for that emeritus parking sticker. [Laughter]

**Walter:** I don't think there's any such thing. Is it really?

**Campbell:** That's the only benefit of being emeritus.

**Zeitz:** An office, too.

**Walter:** Speaking of offices, I would point out the tremendous job Russ did in getting the recognition for Wright Hall which is very, very strongly deserved. Great reception and a big to-do and then there was some mention of an abundance of donuts.

**Wohlpert:** And new chairs.

**Campbell:** The new chairs—really is great. It is. I figured I've used all my power so that's why it's time to retire. [Laughter]

**Walter:** Okay, so, we could move on the 2018-19 Curriculum Proposals, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, since that's the next thing in the order.

**O'Kane:** It might be better to have representatives here for that.

**Walter:** I was hoping you'd mention that actually, because there is this other food event going on. So, can I get a general sense? Do we want to hold off on that? Nodding heads will work, so now I need a motion to adjourn. Any other announcements, shameless plugs? If not, I think John **Burnight** just motioned to adjourn. We're done.

**Submitted by**  
Kathy Sundstedt  
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

**Next Meeting:**  
Monday, Nov. 27, 2017  
Rod Library Room 301  
3:30 p.m.