# University of Northern Iowa
# UNI ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate Documents                                                      Faculty Senate

10-8-2018

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 8, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

## Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 8, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1230.
https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1230

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
10/08/18 (3:29 – 4:19)
Mtg. #1812
SUMMARY MINUTES
Oak Room, Maucker Union

**Call for Press Identification:** No members of the press were present.

**Introduction of Guests**: Brenda **Bass**, John **Fritch**, Amy **Kogl**, Joyce **Morrow**, Doug **Shaw**.

**Courtesy Announcements**

United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker** reminded faculty of the October 15 United Faculty Recertification vote, noting that not voting equals a 'no' vote. She asked faculty to read emails from Michelle **Byers** about how to save money with insurance costs, and to get information and a free flu shot at the Benefits Fair on October 17th. (**See Pages 4-6**)

President **Nook** said that the Board of Regents meeting will be not be held in October this year but on November 15 and 16. He commented on visitors on campus from the Shanghai School of Engineering Science, and an upcoming Foundation Board meeting. (**See Pages 6-7**)

**Minutes for Approval Sept. 24, 2018 – Summary Minutes & Transcript**
**\*\*** (**Stafford/O'Kane**)  Passed. One abstention (**Smith**).

**Calendar Items for Docketing**

**\*\*** (**Zeitz/Skaar**) Bundled for Oct. 22 meeting. All aye.
1413  Emeritus request for Clare Struck, Department of Teaching
1414  Emeritus request for James Hanson, Social Work
1415  Emeritus request for Donald Briggs, Health, Recreation & Community Services

**Consideration of Docketed Items**

**1407  1281**  General Education Revision Committee  (**See Pages 9-23**)
**1410  1289**  Request for new membership in voting faculty-Thomas Hesse
　　　　　　\*\* (**Burnight/O'Kane**) All aye.

**Adjournment** (**Strauss/Zeitz**) 4:19 p.m. by acclamation.

**Next Meeting**: 3:30 p.m. Monday, **October 22, 2018**
　　　　　　301 Rod Library (Scholar Space) University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

*A complete transcript of 27 pages and 0 addendum follows.*

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the**

**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**October 10th, 2018**

**Present**: Senators Imam **Alam,** John **Burnight**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould,** Senators Tom **Hesse**, Kenneth **Hall**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly,** Amanda **McCandless**, Senators Steve **O'Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Mitchell **Strauss**, and Shahram **Varzavand**. Also: Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**, and NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**.

**Not Present**: Seong-in **Choi**.

**Guests**: Brenda **Bass**, John **Fritch**, Ana **Kogl**, Joyce **Morrow**, Doug **Shaw**.

**CALL TO ORDER, PRESS IDENTIFICATION, & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS**

**Petersen**: Alright, should we go ahead and get started? I'll call the meeting to order. I do not see any press, but let me ask for any press identification. Let me begin first by welcoming Kenneth **Hall**. He is a new Senator, member from CHAS from the Art Department. So welcome, and I know we also have some other guests joining us who will be sharing the good work they are doing. Would you be willing to introduce yourselves at this point?

**Shaw**: I'm Doug **Shaw**. I'm on the Gen Ed Committee.

**Kogl**: I'm Ana **Kogl**, also from the Gen Ed Committee and Department of Political Science.

**Bass**: I'm Brenda **Bass**. I'm Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Co-chair of the Gen Ed Committee.

**Fritch**: And I'm John **Fritch**. I'm the Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts and Sciences and also Co-chair of the Committee.

**Petersen**: Thank you. And just on a side-note, Steve **O'Kane** is also part of the General Education Committee. We'll move on to our Courtesy Announcements. We are missing a few. If President **Nook** and Provost **Wohlpart** do join us, we'll pause at an appropriate time and ask if they have any announcements.

## COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Petersen**: Chair **Cutter**, do you have any announcements?

**Cutter**: I don't have any announcements today.

**Petersen**: And I'm not sure about United Faculty Chair **Hawbaker**.

**Cutter**: She's in the hall

**Petersen**: Is she in the hall? Is she in the Elm Room?

**Petersen**: Maybe I'll let you get settled, and I'll shift to my announcements. As you know, I made a mistake. We are not in the Elm Room. The Elm Room was not large enough to accommodate us and so we shifted over to the Oak Room, and with that shift, it means that we must be a little bit more productive or timely in our meeting today, and I'm going to ask for a motion to adjourn at 4:45 today so

that we can make room today for UNI Dance Marathon, who needs this room. Thank you Senator **Strauss**. Is there as second? Thank you Senator **Smith**. All in favor say 'aye' and any in opposition or opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. Thank you. The motion passes so we will adjourn today at 4:45. United Faculty **Hawbaker**?

**Hawbaker**: Yeah, so big thing: One week from today folks, voting opens. So you should have already gotten an email from Michelle **Byers** with a link, but we'll send it out to you so many more times you'll be really sick of hearing from us about it. Please remember to vote. Not voting counts as a 'No,' and so we need full participation. And you'll be getting a little reminder in campus mail later this week. Also, just wanted to give a brief update about our benefits, because when I talk to people about recertification election and I say, "Yeah, you got the link from Michelle **Byers**." I can't tell you how many people have said, "I never read my emails from Michelle **Byers**," and that is so wrong because Michelle has been sending out lots of important information about open enrollment and about changes to insurance. This is the time that you can make changes to your insurance plan. And I also wanted to say that I'm really proud of the work that we have done—the collaborative work with the new University-wide Benefits Committee, because together we've found some ways to contain our costs so that for the first time in a long time we can say there is no increase in our premiums, and there is no loss to our benefits, and that's due in large part to changes that we are making as a community. That we're being smarter and savvier about how we're using our benefits plans. A lot of faculty are realizing that if they're smart about their plan, they can give themselves a raise like I did when I

realized I didn't need the PPO for my family's medical needs. I was fine with the HMO, and because I made that switch, I got a lot more money in my paycheck. Because I started using flexible spending accounts I was able to save even more money. I really encourage you, do not toss those emails from Michelle **Byers**, and please look at the one we got from Theresa **Callahan** today about the Benefits Fair on October 17th. That's another great way to save costs for all of us because it's the cheapest way to deliver flu shots. So, you go there. You get your free flu shot and if you wanted to talk to the benefits people about your plan and how you could save money, they're right there. You can talk to them. So I really encourage you to go to that Fair because faculty—of all employee groups are least attend that fair, and we really all should. So that is all.

**Petersen**: Thank you, Becky. (**Hawbaker**) Is there a question?

**Stollenwerk**: In regards to the voting, I thought I had voted already. Someone came around as our departmental representative. Is that something different?

**Hawbaker**: So we were collecting some commitment cards, and that was just internal for us to keep an internal tally of where we stood on the ballot. The actual voting is conducted by a third-party vendor. So it is online, or there is a phone option. But we strongly recommend that you do not use the phone option because it will take you a lot longer, and it's much more likely that your vote will get lost in the translation. And so there's a link to email. You click it. You have to enter your date of birth and your last four digits of your Social Security. You click 'yes' or 'no.' You click 'Submit.' You're done. Less than a minute.

**Stollenwerk**: I've been deleting emails because I thought I was done.

**Hawbaker**: Oh, I'm glad you asked. There have been other people have been confused. Fear not. We will send out that link many times, and if you're unsure whether you've actually voted, you can go back in and try to vote again and you'll be told you can't vote.

**Strauss**: When is that going to be?

**Hawbaker**: It's going to be one week from today at 8 a.m. You can join us. We're having a vote-in event in the Library 218 from 11:00 until 4:00. We've got some munchies and tablets, and all kinds of things so we can celebrate and vote together. And then we're also planning a celebration event for the Friday after.

**Petersen**: Thank you Becky. President **Nook**, announcements?

**Nook**: Just a couple of things to update you on. The Board of Regents meeting is almost always held on our campus in October. There's not going to be an October Board of Regents meeting. It has been moved to November. It will be on the 15th and 16th of November. Part of that is to get on the other side of the election, so we know who we're talking to and not about—just to. And at that time we will also acknowledge and celebrate our Faculty and Staff Regent Award winners. We have a luncheon at that meeting.

**Nook**:  We have some visitors on campus today and tomorrow from the Shanghai University of Engineering Science. The president of that institution was the president of Shanghai-Dianji University when we originally set that agreement up years ago now. And he's interested in setting up a similar agreement with us in Business as well as on the Engineering Technology. We've also talked about

several other things; interested in the sciences. I know he'll be meeting with the Physics Department tomorrow as well, so. It is one of the highly rated campuses in Shanghai, and it has been rated as the most beautiful campus in Shanghai. It is a gorgeous place. I was there this summer. This president of Shanghai University of Engineering and Science when he was the president at Dianji visited our campus several times and loved the layout of this campus, and went back and built a campanile at Dianji that looks remarkably like ours—different colored brick, and we think it probably has an electronic bell instead of real carillon. But, it was fun to be on Dianji and see what was there, too. He told me to make sure I looked for the bell tower when I got there. He's very proud of that. He isn't on campus right now. The equivalent of his provost is touring campus right at the moment.

**Nook**: The other thing just to mention: We've got a big Foundation Board meeting coming up a week from this Thursday and Friday—so almost two weeks away that always happens in connection with homecoming. Homecoming week starts next Monday: the game on Saturday and parade and a lot of festivities going on on campus next week with homecoming. The Foundation Board meeting will take up a whole lot of my time as we work through things. That's all I have.

**Petersen**: Thank you. Gretchen (**Gould**) I just want to acknowledge and thank you for manning the computer for me today. I appreciate it.

## MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Petersen**:  The minutes have been disseminated. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes from September 24? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Is there a second?

Excellent. Thank you Senator **O'Kane**. Is there any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And opposed? And any abstentions? Senator **Smith** abstained. Thank you.

## CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

**Petersen**: We have a three emeritus requests for Consideration for Docketing. They are 1413, Emeritus Request for Clare **Struck** in the Department of Teaching, 1414, Emeritus Request for James **Hanson** in Social Work, 1415 Emeritus Request for Donald **Briggs** in Health, Recreation & Community Services. I would like to suggest that we go ahead and bundle these requests, and I requesting a motion to do so, and to move them to the Calendar. Thank you Senator **Zeitz**, and second Senator **Skaar**. Any discussion? Would anyone like to pull any of these requests out? Excellent. All in favor then of moving the emeritus requests to the docket for October 22$^{nd}$, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And any opposed? And any abstentions?

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**Petersen**:  The next item on our agenda you'll see is Committee Reports. I just wanted to let you all know that it's been some time since we have had a committee report in the Senate, but it turns out that in the past, we have asked our Senate Committees to report to the Senate and I wanted to share with you that Jim (**Mattingly**) and I are working with the various committees so that we can begin to hear about some of the work that is occurring as it relates to some of these bigger initiatives. And so we'll be working to schedule some of the committee reports here in the near future.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

**Petersen**: That brings us to our Docketed Items but before I do so, we have the General Education Revision representatives here to share a bit about their work: To provide us with an update and to share a draft of Mission and Learning Goals with us today. I will turn it over to the Committee.

**Kogl**: Thank you for inviting us. We want to not take a lot of time presenting what we're doing to leave time for plenty of questions, so I'll try to go through this fairly quickly. So, this body approved our charge about a year ago. And our charge was to generate a new Mission Statement, Learning Outcomes or Goal Areas, for those of you who are sticklers about outcomes versus goals, and a Structure for the LAC or Gen Ed Program, and also to come up with a name for it: LAC, or Gen Ed, or Core Curriculum—we haven't figured that one out yet. The outcomes approach is really best practices now in Higher Education. It's also what the HLC is calling for, and so really because we were charged with coming up with a new set of outcomes, that meant coming up with a new LAC essentially: To do a backward-design process, and start with the outcomes and then build a structure around those outcomes. So this doesn't preclude existing courses fitting into a new structure. But it does mean that we begin with Outcomes and then come up with a Structure and then figure out what courses goes into that structure. The charge was also to shorten the program. And the reasons for these revisions were several-fold. One is our Academic Master Plan calls for a more coherent and consistent and clearly articulated program. The other reason is that the HLC has expressed very serious concern about the accessibility of our LAC. By very serious concern as I understand it—I was not on reaccreditation last time, but that our

reaccreditation was contingent upon our attending the Assessment Academy and doing a better job on assessment. So we kind of got a "Get Out of Jail Free" card last time, but we need to present something better. So early on, the committee came up with a process for coming up with this new LAC or Gen Ed Program and this body, the Senate also approved our process. And that process involves us taking our work to the faculty as a whole in listening sessions, which we already had in September, and then also doing an online survey, which we're getting ready to do right now. We also will take our work to College Senates and to the LACC, and then bring it back here for final approval. So where are we right now? Right now as I've said, we've had the listening sessions. We have worked on what we presented at those listening sessions, and come up with a document that we shared with you. We realize this is last minute. We realize people don't/haven't had time today to look at it, but we wanted to give you the most up to date— literally this is based on revisions we did this morning—the most up-to-date list of goals.

**Kogl**: I do want to say a couple of things about this list that's up there. The reason it's so specific is not because any of this work is done. It's not done at all. We wanted to be specific just to communicate more information about where our thinking is right now. As a result of the listening sessions, we realized that people didn't necessarily understand what we meant. So we wanted to just articulate that better with the bullet points. They are probably far more specific than is necessary at this point, but this gives you more information about where we're going. We still need and plan to narrow down the list considerably. It's not only too detailed, it's too long. We know that. The survey that will go out will ask

people to help us do that work of narrowing it down. So, our goal is to have a version of this that's much tighter and more accurately reflecting what the faculty are interested in by the end of this semester. And our request to you is that if you have serious concerns about it, that you turn in back to us so that we can do another round of revision, rather than simply voting it down. That would be our request. Our next stage will be determining, based on once we have the goal areas—our next stage of work will be thinking about a structure. The structure, I want to make very, very clear can look a number of different ways based on these goal areas. So the goal areas are by no means representative of individual classes. There is not at all a 1:1 ratio of say—we're <u>not</u> calling for a Diversity class or an Ethics class. Different goals could be combined. For example, I could easily see an Ethical Reasoning class combined with a Writing-intensive class, combined with a Critical Thinking-intensive class. On the other hand, there might be a few goals that make the final list that don't need an entire class, but are nevertheless very important. So, we have as a committee talked a little bit about structure, but only in very preliminary ways. A couple things that I will say about that, that I know some people have some questions about is the question of content: There are some approaches to learning outcomes that would argue for really minimal content, that outcomes actually cannot be content-oriented. That's something we're still talking about, and we'll certainly continue to take feedback from people in terms of what that looks like. We'll be working on the structure in the spring but only after we have this finalized after this body approves of it. Let me see if Steve (**O'Kane**) or Doug (**Shaw**) want to add anything.

**O'Kane**: Were you going to handle the background of how we got started? I didn't know what you were planning on doing. I suspect I'll jump in at some time.

**Shaw**: I think a logical question to ask that might be on your minds is, "Why do this at all?" And Ana (**Kogl**) I think covered a couple of those reasons. We kind of broke it down to three for the students: We want to transform the Core in ways that will stimulate learning and teaching. This is our opportunity to make the Gen Ed program better for the students. Then, for the University as a whole, we want to distinguish UNI as the premier institution for undergraduate education in the State of Iowa. I would give my take on how important that is, except Mark (**Nook**) and Jim (**Wohlpart**) are here, so I'll just say that that's a good thing to do, and then buy me a beer and I'll tell you why it's a crucial thing to do. And the final reason which was addressed is, 'Mom and Dad are making us.' As Ana (**Kogl**) said, this is it: The HLC—we had our "Get Out of Jail Free" card. We must do it.

**O'Kane**: Let me add just the background information: The Provost made it possible for four of the members of the Committee including myself and John (**Fritch**) and Doug (**Shaw**) to travel to Philadelphia last early last semester where we went to the American Association of Colleges and Universities meeting that were about doing exactly what we are here doing. The meetings were developed around how to change or make a new General Ed program. By the way, we heard lots of comments about not calling it "Liberal Arts." Friday evening I ran into our Congressional Liaison. I forgot her name.  [Mary **Braun**] I told her we're at least thinking about that and she didn't know me from Adam but gave me a hug. She said, "You just made my life 100% easier."

**Wohlpart**: Let me just say that she spends an enormous amount of time talking to our legislators about why we call it this. And that's not what we want Mary **Braun** to spend her time doing. That is not what we want her to spend her time doing, and she spends a lot of time doing that.

**O'Kane**: That is one of the things that we took away. Other things that we took away are that the procedure for doing this needs to be codified early—given out to the campus community so that everybody knows what's going on. We did do that. We got the Senate approval of how we're going to go about doing that. Another thing that we learned is it's highly important to talk. You've got to talk, talk, talk to your constituents. There's got to be meetings. People have to feel ownership in what we're doing. If they don't feel ownership, they'll probably feel threatened, and we don't want that to happen. So what we discovered by going to that meeting is that we're way ahead of the curve. We all talked to any number of university people, and they're talking--How long did it take some of those people? Three years? Five years? We're way ahead of the curve because we were able to take that information back from that conference. Anything else I should add?

**Shaw**: I would just want to emphasize that if we do this right, this is something we can really be proud of and show off and when we boast to people about how awesome our jobs are, this can be one of the things besides Rod Library we can point to and say, "Holy crap. Look at this. This is something UNI has."

**O'Kane**: There is something more I should have said: We did learn about failure. There were any number of schools there that flat out failed to get this done, so

being able to talk to those guys really helps inform our committee. "Don't do that."

**Kogl**: What questions do you have for us? The committee has only kind of begun to talk about the name question. We have been calling it the General Education Program. I have heard—I'm not speaking so much for the Committee as just I have personally heard concerns about General Education, but I teach Political Theory: I understand that you cannot spend your time defining that 'liberal' doesn't mean what people think it means, you've saved a lot of time. But the Committee is nowhere near making a …Send us your suggestions he says. "The Most Fabulous Core Curriculum Ever" would be a little too long. So no, we have not made a decision about that. In fact, we've kind of barely started talking about it. We've just been calling the Committee the Gen Ed Review/Reinvision. Something like that.

**Hesse**: I've been hearing mixed things about how many credits will be required for the new LAC. The Provost's website says it must be completed within 36 credits, but I've heard from other Committee members that that's flexible. Can you talk about that?

**Kogl**: We are under the impression that we need to cut it significantly, perhaps down to 36, or 36 is a kind of a goal post. But, until we talk about Structure, the committee has not come up with a final number. So the structure will determine the number of hours, but it has been made very, very clear to us that it needs to be shorter than 45 hours. And the Committee agrees that that is of benefit to students that want to do high impact practices, that want internships, that want

to study abroad, that want to double major, et cetera, and that want to graduate in four years. So, we can't give you a number right now.

**Hesse**:  I agree about the need to shorten it, but right now it says it must be completed within 36 on the Provost's website.

**Kogl**: Perhaps the Provost could speak to that.

**Wohlpart**: The Provost can say all sorts of things The curriculum is owned by the faculty. What I hear when I go across this campus is that we're stretched too thin; we don't have enough resources to do all the stuff that we do. At our last HLC visit, they said to us in our report (and I need to dig this out) "You have too big of a portfolio of programs. You have too long of a Gen Ed Program. Department of Education just did the visit for certifying our Educator Preparation Programs. You all cannot sustain a 45-hour Gen Ed program. So, if you all want to keep being spread too thin, don't complain to me about resources. I would encourage us, given the lack of resources we have, to think carefully about what it is we want to do, and do that really, really well. But I don't control the curriculum. The curriculum is approved here. So the Provost gets to say all sorts of things.

**Mattingly**: Senator **O'Kane** mentioned that we learned about some of the reasons that these kind of revisions fail. I wonder what some of the top reasons are that they fail.

**O'Kane**: The main reason I think if I had to summarize, would be lack of buy-in for lack of any other words. If we have lack of buy-in, I think that is a fault of our committee, because we are certainly trying to get the word out to people, visiting

as many people as we can, going to the various Senates around, keeping in touch with email; being responsive. I think if everyone could be a little fly on the wall at one of our meetings, you would all agree that the input that we get is extremely important and it changes things. So we're hoping that people feel that there's buy-in. That would be the main big one--lack of buy-in, and I guess another thing, lack of process—procedure. "We're just going to change our Gen Ed program, and let's get going," without sitting down and saying, "Wait a minute. We've got to do this and this and then get you guys' approval. Then we've got to go meet with folks and change things that we're working on. Bring it back here. That's today and get input from you guys." It's got to be input-driven constantly from every side, or there won't be buy-in and people will feel alienated and left out.

**Kogl**: Can I add to that? I was on the committee to review or revise the LAC last time—six years ago, seven years ago, whenever that was. And there was not a clear sense of why we needed to do that, so we're hoping it's a little clearer now why that needs to happen; That it's an opportunity to especially give young people, younger faculty a chance to kind of have some say over the LAC, but also they HLC is making us do it.

**Neibert**: In regards to this process question, first of all—great work done thus far, just looking at it today real quickly, but what do you envision that process being when we get to the point that we start to assign content and we start to look at classes? How do you guys envision that taking place?

**Kogl**: First we want to think about a Structure and propose a Structure and have a Structure approved, and then we've talked about a totally different committee

being the committee to figure out which courses actually populate the Structure. We just think that's good checks and balances, because checks and balances are a good thing. So, that's the extent to which we've really talked about it, but we are beginning with the presumption that no current LAC class will be in, but it could be. It depends on the Outcomes and that's partly why we need people to tell us what LAC or Gen Ed Outcomes are important to you, so that they're included. So that the effort is not to say, "We're just going to start from scratch and just make stuff up." So we're going to start with what we're already kind of trying to achieve with students, but just articulate that, and then fit the classes in at the end. Does that address your question?

**Neibert**: I'd say one thing: The reason why I asked this question is I've talked to some of the constituents on our end. There are people that would love—they have courses that they feel would fit within the new Gen Ed, and so they would like an opportunity to be able to present that to the Committee and say, "Hey, what about this course?"

**Kogl**: I think that would be awesome. I think that's why those of us who are on this Committee are on the Committee because we are like to teach in the LAC, and we like it when people are excited about teaching in the LAC, as nerdy as that makes us. So, if folks that are teaching courses that they thing would be great LAC classes, some of which might be interdisciplinary—that's one of the problems with the current program—is it doesn't really allow for those interdisciplinary courses. I think that would be fantastic. So, we want the outcomes to reflect what those folks are doing already in those classes.

**Wohlpart**: The best practice is that once you have a Structure and the clearly aligned Outcomes, when people apply their courses they have to agree that they will meet that Outcome and do assessment--participate in the assessment of that Outcome. So you can't just have your own outcomes for your course. You've agreed that this course will meet these Outcomes, and that you will participate— have an artifact that can be pulled from your class and participate in assessment. So it's kind of like an agreement. You have to agree to do that, and it should be open to all courses across campus at that point.

**Zeitz**: Other than the fact that the HLC is making us do it, are there curricular reasons to take us from 15 classes to 12?

**Kogl**: To enable more students to complete their program—to complete their college education in four years; to give them more flexibility regarding what they can do while they're here; to give them a chance to do more of those high-impact practices. I think those are the ones the Committee has talked about. Am I missing any?

**O'Kane**: The ability to have a double major more easily.

**Zeitz**: Because you're not spending as much time in the LAC.

**Kogl**: Right.

**Shaw**: Also, right now one of the main reasons it's at 15 is that's what our fathers did and their fathers before them. That we should be re-examining what is necessary, as opposed to what is traditional.

**Zeitz**: I think it's important that we have a reason we drop them. We're going to get more out of it if we have some philosophical background.

**Cutter**: I got the feeling from Ana (**Kogl**), from your presentation that you've been noticing that there's a sort of tension here between Outcomes and Learning Areas. And when I say 'tension' I'm not necessarily suggesting that's a bad thing, but just that it exists at present, and I think that's maybe where the comment about some people warn that content areas might not be Outcomes. I just wanted to suggest maybe another way of thinking about that question, which is if you think about something like critical thinking, there is a lot of literature that suggests it varies by discipline, so maybe there's a way to even take a category like critical thinking, or certain categories, and communication the same thing— totally varies by disciplines—some more than others, and that there might be a way that we're looking at different disciplines without having to say it's content that we're talking about. But that critical thinking in one discipline could be different than in another, and in fact I think you could make the argument that the mathematical reasoning category is sort of mathematical critical thinking. So it's been pulled out there, but have you thought about the possibility of pulling it out in other areas, maybe as a way of getting people exposed to a wide variety of disciplines without having to use the language of content area?

**Kogl**: We've certainly thought about that and talked about it, and in an earlier version, mathematical reasoning was actually in with critical thinking. We've certainly thought about the very vexing question of how these goal areas—some of them are just not like the others. Some of them clearly probably require

content for lack of a better word, to be taught well. Others maybe it seems like not so much. Yes—we've certainly thought about that and talked about it. We have thought of that as more of a Structure issue than a Goal Areas or Outcomes issue. So we've thought, "Let's first identify the Outcomes, and they are already the way they're written right now, there's a lot of overlap between the different goals ,and we're aware of that and we assume that that will have to get winnowed down somehow. But partly that's because—so like the human world has a lot of diversity language. In fact, some of the specific bullet points are identical. So we've certainly thought about both those areas of overlap, and the areas where there are many different possible approaches to something like critical thinking. Again, we're leaving that for a Structure conversation: For after we know what the faculty want the Goals to be. Does that address your question?

**Cutter**: I guess my only question about that is they could actually be embedded in the goals. It wouldn't have to be one type of critical thinking, right? You've already got a version where you have two types of critical thinking in there.

**Kogl**: So we could articulate in the actual critical thinking goal area—articulate the diversity within critical thinking. Is that what you're saying?

**Cutter**: It's just an idea.

**Bass**: The Committee is also in very infant stages. They have talked about how you take a goal like critical thinking and they are very much viewing it through a lens of they would anticipate courses that have content related to them. Though it hasn't been finalized in any way, because that is for a future discussion about the Structure. But definitely for the various Goal Areas as Jim (**Wohlpart**) said, if

you've got a course that meets those goals, it should be considered for in whatever structure is created that has that goal in it. It would be slotted in there if it meets that goal and can be assessed. It's not quite what you're saying. I think you're saying somewhat from the other direction, but I just wanted to take the opportunity to say that the Committee has definitely talked about how content could fit in, in terms of meeting some of these Outcomes.

**Kogl**: One of the challenges we've faced is that there is a school of thinking that you cannot write—and I'm sure most of you are familiar with this—that you cannot write a knowledge or content-oriented outcome. Some of us chafe at that. Some of us more than others. And so we have wrestled with 'How do we—I'll speak for myself—I'm not speaking for the Committee, but let me say that I remember six years ago there were folks advocating for a critical thinking class. Not any particular content. I personally wouldn't support that, but it is very difficult in a list like this, to figure out a way to write an outcome for content, because once you do, once you start trying, it starts looking very disciplinary. And we really don't want this to be a list of disciplines and approaches, but I would be happy to have a longer conversation with you about this, too. Thanks.

**Varzavand**: A question for the individual with the vision for this 36-semester hours of General Education or whatever it's eventually going to be called: So is this 36-semester-hours rigid or is it 36-semester-hours of flexible for a student to take? For example, when I looked at mathematical reasoning, everything under natural science can fall under mathematical reasoning. So is that class going to be open to the students to take?

**Wohlpart**: You're jumping to content areas. You're jumping to Structure, so you could have a structure that includes natural sciences as a category that students have to take, and limit how many hours. It's six hours of natural science, but they would have to meet the learning outcomes: critical thinking or whatever it is. That's a future conversation.

**Varzavand**: Okay, but this 36 semester hours is flexible, right? It may encompass any classes, any courses, or multiple courses, just like a present liberal arts course that we have.

**Wohlpart**: I don't know what you mean by flexible. You can't take 36 hours in the sciences and meet Gen Ed.

**Varzavand**: No. Of course not. But I'm talking about the categories.

**Wohlpart**: Yeah. But we don't know what those are. We don't know what the Structure is. That's a later conversation that we need to hold back on.

**Petersen**: Let's take one more question.

**Hesse**: I know that this is just a preliminary draft, and that you've got 13 learning areas and you're looking at combining some and reducing it, but one thing to think about is whether all these actually would require a three-credit course, or whether you could do it with two credits, or even a one-credit course, and that would give you a lot more flexibility.

**Kogl**: Absolutely, and I think a number of them can be addressed in one course. I also think a number of them need to be addressed over more than one course,

but critical thinking for example, communication for example, those are goals that I personally would argue for students—again this is a Structure conversation, but I personally would say, "Why not have multiple courses that students take that fulfill this critical thinking goal?" Whereas maybe some of them—I don't want to pick on any, but maybe some of them are kind of a small component of one course, or a one-credit course. Yes. So, that's why it's really important, even if this were reduced to eight (please don't multiply that by three to come up with a number of hours) and they really are. One thing that's challenging in thinking about thee is that they really are not all alike. Some of them are habits of mind. Some of them are skills. Some of them, the way they are written now, more content-oriented. So yes, that's a good suggestion, and there's multiple different ways to map this into a structure.

**Petersen**: Thank you. Thank you all. Thank you for the good hard work that I know that you are doing, and I expect we will probably see you again here soon to continue to update and continue to gather input.

**Kogl**: Thank you.

**Petersen**: Thank you. The next item for consideration on our agenda is the Request for New Membership in the Voting Faculty by Tom **Hesse**. So I would just remind you all as I did in my email communication that this is an issue that we are considering this year as a wider faculty for all of our non-voting faculty, and we started that conversation at our Fall Faculty Meeting. I'm going to give Tom (**Hesse**) an opportunity to share a bit about his proposal. As most of you are probably aware, the Constitution allows individual faculty to submit a request to

become a voting faculty member, and that's what Tom (**Hesse**) has done. I want to give him some time to make his case and we can have some additional conversation and discussion.

**Hesse**: I'll keep this brief because my petition pretty much summarizes everything. I've found that a lot of Senators don't realize that I don't have a vote on the Faculty Senate. I represent all term and adjunct faculty, approximately 200 faculty on campus and I do not have a vote to represent their interests. But, this isn't always the case. I serve in a similar capacity on the Executive Board of United Faculty, representing term and adjuncts, and there I always had full voting rights. I've served on other committees on campus, like the original Faculty Handbook Committee I was on. My voting status was never clear there, and other committees my voting status has fluctuated based on who was Chair. So, you know if one person was Chair, I'd have voting rights, and then a year later the Chair would change and I wouldn't have voting rights, and that's rather frustrating obviously. So I'm petitioning the Faculty Senate for a vote to join for full membership in the voting faculty. This was a project started by Scott **Peters** in 2015 and a committee looked into it and he chaired it as he was Chair of the Faculty and he proposed that one's academic freedom protections are in place of voting rights should be extended. So, last year we revised UNI's Academic Freedom and Shared Governance Policy, and I helped out with that, so that's all good to go, and so this is kind of Phase 2, extending voting rights to those who participate in shared governance. That was the second attachment.  And then the third attachment was just that AAUP supports this as well—the idea of participating in shared governance, you should have voting rights. One last thing I

put it in the action part there on the bottom, I did put in a little sunset clause. This is not a permanent membership in the voting faculty. This is just for as long as I serve on the Senate. So, as long as I'm here and am re-elected I'm a full member of the voting faculty. But if I were to step down from the Senate, then I would not be part of the voting faculty. So, there is a sunset clause in there. Questions?

**Stollenwerk**: I actually think it is a very good idea to give adjunct and term faculty members a vote. I think our only real power here if I understand this correctly is curriculum. Maybe I'm oversimplifying that, so adjuncts definitely contribute to that significantly. Does this extend just to Senate members, or is it overall ability to vote?

**Hesse**: No, this is full membership in the voting faculty. I would have the same voting rights as any tenured or tenure-track faculty member. And that would solve the problems I have on other committees.

**Stollenwerk**: Does this then, will this then change the number of Senators? Like right now we have eight Senators from CHAS, because we get one per—I don't know—30 faculty members?

**Hesse**: No, there are two spots on the Senate that are allocated to non-voting faculty. Myself and Bill **Koch**. So even though Bill (**Koch**) and I are both part of CHAS, we don't technically represent CHAS. We represent the term and adjunct folks.

**Stollenwerk**: One last thing: Is there some sort of clause in there, in terms of if you hire someone for just one semester, I don't think they should have voting

rights. But if you're here over a long period, I think that would be more appropriate.

**Hesse**: That is a separate issue. That's something we're looking at down the road whether we should extend voting rights to an entire class of faculty, but that's certainly not what I'm proposing here. This is just for me and no one else. It's just an individual petition and the Faculty Constitution allows individual faculty members to petition. It's very narrow in scope.

**Petersen**: Tom (**Hesse**) is making an individual request, which is allowed by our Constitution, but at the same time this year we are considering the issue for all non-voting faculty, which we shared at the Fall Faculty Meeting, and so the issues that you raise are really good issues that we will be tackling throughout the year as we continue to have this conversation as it relates to the entire non-voting faculty.  But today we are just considering Tom's (**Hesse**) request. So the larger issue is actually approved by a special vote of the faculty, and so it requires either at the Fall Faculty Meeting a vote, or at a Special Meeting a vote, and it requires the Fall Faculty Meeting a 15% quorum, and if we were to call a Special Election and have a vote, it would require 25% of faculty. So, more to come. Chair **Cutter** is putting together a committee on that larger issue so we can consider it throughout the year.

**Strauss**: Just a point of information. I was on the Senate a few years ago and I think this eluded me during my term, but are these seats that represent adjuncts and term faculty relatively new on Senate, or have they been around since the cows came home?

**Hesse**: I don't know what the origin of them is. It would be in the Senate's bylaws I guess. They've been here on the Senate for as long as I've been here, and I'm going on my seventh year. I'm guessing they've been around longer than that. Do you know, Bill (**Koch**)?

**Koch**: No.

**Strauss**: Thank you.

**Mattingly**: The latest revision of the by-laws, at least the by-laws say they latest revision was 2012, so they must have been around at least that long.

**Petersen**: Other questions? Did I miss a hand? Any other discussion? Okay, so is there a motion to approve? Thank you Senator **Burnight**. Thank you second, Senator **O'Kane**. All in favor of giving Tom **Hesse** voting rights, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? So the motion carries. It is approved.

**Hesse**: Thanks. [Applause]

**Petersen**: Any New Business? Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you Senator **Strauss**. Did I see a second Senator **Zeitz**? Thank you. We are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist
Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

**Next Meeting**: 3:30 p.m. Monday, Sept.24, 2018
                301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)
                University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa