

11-26-2018

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 26, 2018

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2018 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 26, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 1238.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1238

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

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
11/26/18 (3:30 – 5:00)
Mtg. #1815
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

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

Guests: Heather **Asmus**, Gregory **Bruess**, Maureen **Clayton**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Chris **Curran**, Robin **Dade**, Fabio **Fontana**, John **Fritch**, Tonya **Gerbracht**, Oksana Grybovych **Hafermann**, Michael **Hager**, Bill **Henninger**, Joyce **Morrow**, Alicia **Rosburg**, Joan **Smothers**, Elizabeth **Sutton**, Diane **Wallace**, Kristin **Woods**, and Betty **Zan**.

Courtesy Announcements

Provost **Wohlpert** extended thanks to the faculty for all of the hard work they will do in the next three weeks.

United Faculty Chair **Hawbaker** stated that preparations are underway to begin collective bargaining with the Board of Regents in early December. She reminds faculty that the only mandatory topic is the base wage, which does not include money for the merit system. UF is working to pull language from past contracts into the Faculty Handbook. A member survey will be come out soon.

Minutes for Approval: Nov. 12, 2018 (**Skaar/Stafford**) All aye.

Committee Reports

- The Budget Committee (**See pages 7-15**).
- Program Vitality Committee (**See pages 16-35**).

Consideration of Docket Items

- 1300 1421 [Emeritus Request for James Davis, Department of Language and Literatures](#) (**See pages 36-37**).
** (**Mattingly/Choi**) Motion to move to the top of the docket. Passed. All aye.
- 1296 1417 [Emeritus request for Mir Zaman, Department of Finance](#)
** (**Mattingly/Smith**) Passed. All aye. (**See pages 37-38**).

1297 1418 [Taskforce for Academic Suspension \(TAPS\)](#) (See pages 38-43)

1299 1420 [Proposal for Interdisciplinary Senate Committee](#) (See pages 43-46)

[1301 1422 COE Curriculum Proposals](#)

** (Zeitz/Skaar) Passed. All aye.

[1302 1423 CHAS Curriculum Proposals](#)

** (Mattingly/Stollenwerk) Passed. One abstention, Varzavand.

[1303 1424 CSBS Curriculum Proposals](#)

** (Stafford/Gould) Passed. All aye.

[1304 1425 CBA Curriculum Proposals](#)

** (Burnight/Gould) Motion to amend to include the Interdisciplinary proposals. Passed. All aye.

** (Smith/Skaar) Passed as amended. One abstention, Stollenwerk.

No New Business

Adjournment 5:00 p.m. (Skaar/Acclamation)

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, December 10, 2018
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library
University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 53 pages and 0 addendum follows

**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

November 26th, 2018

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Seong-in **Choi**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair James **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Peter **Neibert**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Shahram **Varzavand** and Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, and NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**.

Not Present: Senators Steve **O’Kane**, Mitchell **Strauss**; UNI President Mark **Nook**.

Guests: Heather **Asmus**, Gregory **Bruess**, Maureen **Clayton**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Chris **Curran**, Robin **Dade**, Fabio **Fontana**, John **Fritch**, Tonya **Gerbracht**, Oksana Grybovyh **Hafermann**, Michael **Hager**, Bill **Henninger**, Joyce **Morrow**, Alicia **Rosburg**, Joan **Smothers**, Elizabeth **Sutton**, Diane **Wallace**, Kristin **Woods** and Betty **Zan**.

CALL TO ORDER, PRESS IDENTIFICATION & INTRODUCTION of GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, let’s go ahead and call our meeting to order. Let me first begin by asking for any press identification. Not seeing any press, let me give our guests an opportunity to introduce themselves. If you would just let us know who you

are, and the agenda item, or why you are here today, that would be excellent.
Joyce (**Morrow**) do you want to get us started?

Morrow: Joyce **Morrow**, I'm here for the Dean and I'm also here to share anything for the TAPS Committee; the TAPS report.

Gerbracht: Tonya **Gerbracht**, the Comptroller/Treasurer, and I'm here for the budget summary.

Asmus: Heather **Asmus**, Office of Academic Advising, and I'm also here for the TAPS report.

Zan: Betty **Zan**: Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and I'm here for the College of Education Curriculum changes.

Dade: I'm Robin **Dade**, Department Head, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and I'm here for the same—curriculum changes.

Rosburg: Alicia **Rosburg**, Economics, and I'm here for the proposal for Interdisciplinary Senate Committee.

Smothers: Joan Smothers, also here for the Curriculum Committee.

Wallace: Diane **Wallace**, Registrar's Office. I'm also here for the Curriculum Committee.

Hager: Michael **Hager**, I'm here for the Finance and Budget Summary.

Henninger: Bill **Henninger**. I'm here for the PVC Committee.

Petersen: And then I think I see Kristin **Woods** as well. Welcome everyone. Kristin, did you want to introduce yourself?

Woods: Sure, Kristin **Woods**, Student Success and Retention. I'm here to talk about the TAPS Committee Report.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Petersen: Thank you. We will move into our Courtesy Announcements. President **Nook** is absent today. He is presenting the budget to the Governor this afternoon. Provost **Wohlpert**?

Wohlpert: I will make no comments except to say thank you for all the really hard work you're about to do over the next three weeks finishing out the semester. I hope you rested because I know that this last bit is a real challenge. So, thank you in advance for that. President **Nook** actually presented the budget about noon to the Governor's Office, and then has meetings with all of the lead legislators all afternoon long. I do believe he comes back tonight. He will be down in Des Moines through the afternoon.

Petersen: Thank you. Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

Cutter: I don't have any comments now.

Petersen: And United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker**?

Hawbaker: I know you have a very full agenda. I'll just say that we are preparing to begin our collective bargaining with the Board of Regents. And I just wanted to clarify and make sure that a couple of things are clear to everyone, because there are some changes in what we are able to bargain for, and what we are prohibited from bargaining for, and what we may bargain if both sides agree. So, one of the biggest changes is that we are only mandatory—the only mandatory topic is our base wages, and that is only our percentage increase and incremental increase. That does not include any money for the merit system, which is the faculty evaluation system. That used to be different in the past. Another major thing is that we are working to pull in a lot of the language in the Faculty Handbook that was bargained in past contracts in good faith. The Handbook is wonderful and we really value the collaborative process that we've had to create that, but it is not the same as a contract. It doesn't offer us the same protection, and there are school districts and counties and cities all over Iowa that have rolled all of the permissive topics right back into their contract, and we intend to do that, and we ask that our administration support us in that. We've already been told by the attorney for the Board of Regents that he has no intention of bargaining on any of those topics, and so we are asking for everyone for your support, for our allies support, in bringing those important protections back to the table and back into the contract.

Wohlpart: Thank you. Do we have a date yet? I've not seen it.

Hawbaker: I believe its December 17th. For both the initial and—I'll email this out once it's confirmed because the initial proposals are open to the public, and we encourage everyone to attend.

Zeitz: I guess I misunderstand. So, Des Moines came out and said, “You can’t do this anymore,” and they took away these capabilities. So how did we lose that?

Wohlpart: There are mandatory subjects. Those subjects must be bargained between the Board of Regents and the Union. There are permissive subjects, which if you agree to bargain them, then you can bargain them. And then there are subjects that you’re not allowed to bargain. Insurance has been taken off the table—that’s not allowed to be bargained. So, last year the Board of Regents said it’s going to be base wages only. Here’s your contract and that’s what they negotiated.

Zeitz: Okay thank you.

Wohlpart: So it’s completely a conversation in terms of the permissive subjects.

Zeitz: Great. Thanks.

Hawbaker: We’ll be sending out a survey to members as well to aid us in that process, so please take the time to complete that. We’d appreciate it.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: I’m going to move us into approving the minutes because we do have a full agenda. The minutes were distributed for our meeting on November 12th. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**. Second? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes from November 12th, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion to approve the minutes passes.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS:
(1) THE BUDGET COMMITTEE**

Petersen: We have two committee reports today, and I apologize that I forgot about one of those committee reports, and so I'm very appreciative that I was reminded this morning of the Budget Committee Report. Jim (**Mattingly**) and I had invited both the Budget Committee, as well as the Program Vitality Committee to come and share with us. So, we are going to start with the Budget. I'll let you take it over Michael (**Hager**) and Tonya (**Gerbracht**).

Hager: This is last year's. Do we have this year's? I think that's what I emailed you around noon. We can use this one if you want. It's the same concept. [Laughter]

Wohlpert: The one that you sent out to everybody is different than this one.

Petersen: My apologies. There we go. Thank you.

Hager: This is a presentation that actually the Provost, Jim (**Wohlpert**) and I gave two and three years ago to the Faculty Senate. I don't think we came last year. It's just a good general overview of the institutional budget. We presented this to the President's Budget Advisory Committee, and they thought it would be good to share with the Faculty Senate. And so I'm here today to give you just a brief overview of the current year's budget, and a little bit of historical perspective. And then I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have. You've met Tonya **Gerbracht**. Tonya was the Assistant Comptroller for about 15 years underneath Gary **Shontz**. When Gary retired, she moved on to be the Director of the Office of Business Operations, and now she is the Comptroller and Treasurer as

far as the budget operation for the University. The University's budget is really about \$350,000,000. I should say \$354,000,000, otherwise people think I round to the nearest \$4,000,000. But the total budget for the University includes more than just the General Fund. Most of the time when we're talking about the budget of the University, people refer to the General Fund Budget. But if you really look at all of the operations of the University, the entire budget is about \$354,000,000. Half of that is the General Fund, and we'll cover most of that—is what the rest of the presentation will be about—is the General Fund. But I wanted to be sure to point out, there are additional areas. And so some of those areas you can see: The Department of Residence, for example is \$40-some million. They're about 11% of the budget. Grants and Sponsored Programs, Athletics, Special Appropriations—and then that Auxiliaries or Other Auxiliaries, is 22%. That's really a large conglomeration of a lot of very small operations on campus that are not part of the General Fund. And so I think there's hundreds of different Auxiliaries across campus. Some of you may have those as part of your research areas. A lot of the economic development areas might operate as an Auxiliary. Parking—some of those sorts of things are Auxiliary enterprises. But for the most part, when we're talking about the University budget, most people are referring to the General Fund. And so if we look at the General Fund, it's comprised mostly of two different components: There's student tuition dollars, and then the money that comes from the State taxes, or the State appropriations that the legislature gives to us. So, those are the two big pieces for us. There's a small piece in there of "Other Sales and Services." Those would be like Admissions applications—those sorts of things; late fees on U bills, I think fall into there. For the most part, there's two primary pieces. Now, one of the main differentiators

between us and Iowa and Iowa State is the size of this pie. If you were to look at Iowa and Iowa State, their State appropriations make up about 25% or 30% of their General Fund Budget, where for us, it's just over half, or right about half. And so if the legislature—we saw this probably about eight years ago—if they cut evenly across the board, that sounds fair to everybody: We're going to cut everybody's budget 10% or whatever it is. That sounds fair on the surface, but when you look at the impact to us: If we were to be cut 10%, that would be over 5% of our budget would be taken away. For an institution that only has 25% of General Fund made up of appropriations, that's only 2.5%. So, there's a disproportionate impact to us compared to the other two institutions. And that's the situation we found ourselves in about eight or ten years ago during that reversion, when they made that cut across the board. It sounded like everybody's taking the same hit. Well, that's not really true when you look at it in terms of the source of funding. So we've done a good job the last few years; President **Nook** has done a good job, and Mary **Braun**, if you've met Mary, our State Relations Officer, has done a really good job of helping educators [legislators] understand the different funding mechanisms for each of the universities. And what we saw this last year, this last session for the legislature is Iowa and Iowa State actually had a cut, and University of Northern Iowa did not. They understood the impacts, and were trying to make up for some of that I think, from what they've seen historically. So there's different ways, and I'm going to show probably three different slides here that look at different ways of looking at it. It's the same pool of money—that General Fund, but it's looking at it from a different lens or a different perspective. It's the same amount of money, and so the first one we looked at was just the revenue. This is how we spend the money. So this is for the

most part, these are the IPEDS categories, which are U.S. Department of Ed categories that every university—every college and university in the country needs to report that to the Department of Ed, so that in theory we can do some kind of apple-to-apple comparison. Now, there's some fundamental problems, as with many federal programs. There's some fundamental problems with reporting these numbers, and so there's a little bit of skepticism when you're trying to compare one university to another. But on a broad-brush basis, you can kind of see generally where we tend to stack up. This particular view then breaks it up by division, and so you can see Academic Affairs makes up about two-thirds of the budget for the Institution. Finance and Operations—so that's HR, the Police Department, the Physical Plant, 11%; Scholarships make up about 9%. I don't want to read the whole thing to you. And so you can see what percentage of those. General Institution is a question that comes up frequently. General Institution is where we put the expenses for like property insurance goes there, if there's institutional memberships for like AASCU (American Association of State Colleges & Universities) would go there; those sorts of things will go under General Institutional expenses.

Hager: A question came up a few years ago about—there was a perception that there was a lot of money being moved from one Division to another Division. And so when we look back five years, we can see there's not a lot of difference between the different categories or different Divisions. Probably in [20]16 and [20]17, if you look at the green (It looks green to me. I have a little color deficiency), but the light green between '16 an '17 got smaller. That's the year that Admissions and Registrar moved from Student Affairs over to Academic

Affairs, and so the green went down a little bit, and Academic Affairs went up. But by and large, there's not a lot of movement year in and year out between the different Divisions and the money flowing throughout the Institution.

This is another way to look at that same money. And so of all of our General Fund this year, 78% of it is tied up in Personnel. So, budget lines that are for faculty members or for staff members. The other 22% is Non-personnel. This is one chart that's very helpful to understand why it's so difficult when the budget is shrinking to try to stay away from Personnel. It's difficult because I don't think anyone wants to do layoffs, and so most people assume that means we have 22% that's flexible. That's not really true either, because in that 22% we have Utilities, which is a large number—I believe it's about \$13,000,000 is Utilities. So there's about half of that Non-Personnel is Utilities. You have to pay property insurance. You have to pay health Insurance. There's a lot of things associated, that at the end of the day, there's not a lot of flexibility in a budget like this without impacting one or the other of those two areas.

Hager: This is that same graph, only it breaks down the Personnel in the dark purple, and so what part of the Personnel are Faculty, what part are P&S, what part are Merit. And you can see that. Academic Administrators or Department Heads, Faculty, P&S, and Merit and then Student Personnel. From a budget perspective, students account for about 1% of the Personnel spend. From a head-count, it's dramatically higher than that. So back to this: This is a chart we looked at a few minutes ago broken out by Division. There was a question a few years ago when we did this about the Academic Affairs budget. You can see the dollar figure there of \$118. So if you just take that figure of \$118 and just look at the

66% that's Academic Affairs, there's a question of what all that is. So this next graph breaks that down, that \$118,000,000 down, and this is the academic component of the General Fund. So you can see it broken out by College. The first time I did this, I labeled that Academic Affairs/Provost Office and Jim (**Wohlpart**) took exception that his entire office did not account for that 14%, and it does not. So you can see a little list of what that 14% is. It includes the Library, the Academic Learning Center—all of those sorts of things that fall under Academic Affairs is in that 14%. You can see by College where the rest of that is; IT and then Enrollment Management are the other two areas. You can kind of see a breakdown of the Academic Affairs budget.

Petersen: If I just might jump in: Jim (**Mattingly**) is chairing our Senate Budget Committee, and I'm serving on the larger UNI Budget Advisory Group to the President, and one of the things that we have been working on together in the Senate Budget Committee is to prepare a report for each College around the College expenditures, and to take that report to your College Senate, so that we can share that information widely across campus. And so this coming Spring, our plan is together with Michael (**Hager**) and Tonya (**Gerbracht**) is to visit each of your College Senates, and to share that information related specific to your College with those Senators, so that there can be greater awareness and information sharing around the budget as it relates to each of the Colleges.

Hager: The budget is available in detail online as well. It's behind a CAT ID. We have to have authentication, but anybody can see the budget. It's available online, so if you have more specific questions, you can always reference the budget. Any questions I can answer for you now?

Petersen: Can I ask one more questions? This was really important in my learning curve being a part of these budget committees is to have a better understanding of how your budget planning process has changed in the last eight years or so. Could you just speak to that a bit?

Hager: So I've been in this role for it's coming up on eight years now. One of the challenges that I perceived we had right as I came into the role, is we weren't very visionary with our budget, and so we've tweaked the process every year so that we try to have at least a one-year running start if we're going to have extra money, or if we're going to have to be short a little bit of money. And so we have what's called One-time Funding. So that at the end of the year, One-time Funding can come from sources if there's open lines, so there's a position that wasn't filled for part of the year—that creates a little bit of extra money, and so we can use that money differently than what we've been using it in the past. So it's a little bit of a cushion that goes in between that every year. So we hope not to find ourselves in the same type of crisis mode that maybe we were eight, ten years ago. But it still requires diligent planning, and depending on the scope. So we have a little bit more flexibility in the budget, and a little bit more buffering than what I think we used to have in that process. And I think having a Budget Advisory Committee will be a very important part of that process as well, so that we can start to outline some of those different buffers that are there, and do we create more buffers or less buffers? The other thing that I'm very cognizant of is while the Budget Office and the Accounting staff and some of us are very knowledgeable about the budget from a dollar perspective, we really shouldn't forget that this really translates into programs. So it's our responsibility—I think

it's our responsibility to give tools to everybody that puts the information in a format that's useable to you. So some people prefer to hear about—we don't have a budget issue, we have an enrollment issue, so let's work on enrollment. However we can phrase that, or whatever information we can provide to help with the decision making and the understanding—we're more than happy to provide that kind of information. Other questions?

Koch: As a point of knowledge, what is EM?

Hager: Enrollment Management. So that would be Financial Aid, Admissions, and Registrar's Office.

Wohlpart: Those were the offices that were in Student Affairs that bumped over to Academic Affairs—that orange that became green.

Mattingly: You mentioned that the budget was available behind a CAT ID on our website. If somebody wanted to dig deeper into that, where would they find it?

Hager: In terms of a faculty or staff member or an outside person?

Mattingly: A faculty.

Hager: I think there's quite a bit of detail listed in the Budget Book as it's published, but anything more than that, I believe it would be a department head. Or in Academic Affairs, maybe a dean's office would have more detail behind that. But department heads have access. Department heads get a monthly report of all the expenditures for all the details in their area, and those are available

online through them. So any individual department head would be able to give you backup for that specific department.

Mattingly: But the Budget Book is where we would look for the general outlines?

Hager: Yes. The Budget Book's about—I want to say it's 350 pages or so. It's pretty detailed as it is. But the department heads and the other staff and faculty members have access to an online budget system that's updated every night. Some of its live, but most of its updated every night. So there's a daily flow of information. That gets pretty granular. Not always exciting reading and sometimes it's good to have context with some of that too.

Petersen: Are there other questions or comments? Thank you so much.

Hager: Thank you. Thanks, Gretchen (**Gould**).

Petersen: If there are additional questions, please don't hesitate to email Jim (**Mattingly**) or myself, because we can take those questions back to either the Senate Budget Committee or the Budget Committee Advisory Group for the President.

Hager: Thank you.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: (2) THE PROGRAM VITALITY REPORT

Petersen: The next committee report, which I did have on the agenda is the Program Vitality Committee.

Pease: Alright. This is an update. You have heard about Program Vitality before, but we've been making some progress. There's a few people in the room that are on this committee as well, so if there's questions—Chris (**Curran**) just came in in the back, and Bill's (**Henninger**) here and Barb (**Cutter**) has been sitting on the committee since she took over in her current role. As you'll recall, this is a committee that was put together jointly between the Provost's Office and the Senate to try to fill in the gap between the seven-year APR program. So we have a robust process where we review programs every seven years, but the idea was that it would be helpful to do an annual check-in so that programs weren't surprised, or they had the—either they weren't surprised, or they had the information necessary to make whatever kinds of cases they need for resources going forward. Just a way to keep in constant or more frequent check on how things are going in programs. So in order to do that, we had to think about—the committee had to think about—what is it that a department might want to know each year to keep track of how they're doing? And we really approached this from the standpoint of what kind of information are deans and department heads already looking, at that would be useful to make sure that everybody in individual departments were also looking at every year, so that we had a continuity of information across all the different decision-making bodies and planning bodies, so everybody was looking at the same kind of data?

Pease: So we spent a lot of the past couple of semesters digging into different ways of looking at these things, and we've come up with this list. And this is included in the materials for the Senate, but I thought I'd bring this up and just show some of the metrics that we came up with. So, really divided them into

three areas: Student Indicators, Faculty Indicators, and then Research and Scholarship or just Scholarship kind of indicators. You can see some of the things that we wanted to get at to—and these are not unusual. It's things that are measured like Student Credit Hours, Times to Degree. We put a few other things in there that we thought would be interesting and that departments might want to know about. Things like the D/F/W/I Rates. We felt that was something that maybe departments aren't looking at, that they might want a piece of information. This is not meant to make any particular decision. This is to provide information so that programs can make decisions for themselves, and also provide the same information that probably deans and associate deans and department heads are already looking at anyway. There's very little on this that isn't already available someplace on campus, but it can be hard to get to, and in some cases faculty don't have ready access to it without having to go through some other route. Again, this is an idea of bring it together in one place and our goal is—we're not exactly sure what is the mechanism is going to be yet—but what we want to do is on an annual basis, push this out to everybody so that you don't have to go look for it. That it shows up either through an email link, or maybe it's an indication that you can go to a particular site and view it. But we want everybody to have access to it. We don't even necessarily want to send it through deans and department heads. We're actually considering sending it straight out to faculty within departments, so that everybody gets it at the same time. So you can see a range of things. We also did realize that lots of numbers may sometimes not really tell a story. So there's also going to be a text field that gives programs an opportunity to document for the sake of other people looking at this form, or just document history through time of anything interesting or

unusual about the data, that they think needs some kind of context. Whatever that may be. For example, things like a Division moving from one place to another, that has a fingerprint in the historical data. Without the context for why that is, sometimes it would be easy to forget what happened there. So these will have the opportunity for programs to add information in that they think are important for context.

Pease: We also have a mechanism for displaying this information and presenting it. Before I get to that, are there any questions for me or the rest of the folks that are in here about the metrics themselves?

Zeitz: On points like Research & Scholarship, and things like that, is that going to come from the FAR?

Pease: Yes. Yes, and that's the one place we're still not quite there. The reports on FAR aren't quite ready yet, but we believe almost all of that will come off the FAR. Everything that we're working so far is off Data Dashboard kind of information. So the FAR is still—we're developing that. We're pretty sure we can most of it off there, but we haven't really seen how the data come off yet. So that's a little bit of an unknown.

Burnight: Forgive my ignorance, but you mentioned D/F/W/I. What does that stand for?

Pease: D's, F's, Withdrawals, and Incompletes.

Burnight: Okay. Thank you.

Pease: So basically, these are courses that students are struggling with for some reason.

Wohlpart: They create bottlenecks.

Hawbaker: I just wanted to comment that I realize that these are things that are available in lots of other places, and that your charge says that we should be data-informed and not data-driven. I do worry that there are already sectors of our University where some of these metrics are taken at—I don't know—at face value. Looking at them like widgets that we need to make decisions without really looking into some of the real reasons why there may be differences in say average class size—is something that's come up in the College of Education, for example. And then, with the faculty indicators, when I looked at them, I question how well they will mesh with the Faculty Evaluation system and the Universal Standards that are established. I realize those are from existing categories of the FAR, but I just want to be careful that when we're looking at things like publication output, that that has to be balanced by well what percentage of faculty are on a research portfolio, versus a teaching-centric one. I just want to be cautious here, and I also want to make sure that those metrics are regularly re-examined as other things change.

Pease: One thing that I have said a number of times in things is that we have to think of things like this as not written in stone. We haven't carved anything. This is all electrons. We can update at any point. As the faculty categories get changed, obviously we need to change this. The other thing I'll point out though is that this Program Vitality Committee is not taking upon itself the task of making decisions

for programs. This is information for programs, and people within the chain of those programs to use how they see fit. So, it's really up to them to decide what value this information has. The department looks at D/F/W/I rates and says, "That's about right. That's what we want for that class." That's up to that department to decide it. If the department sees that and says, "Well this could explain the bottleneck we have with graduation rates," then that's a useful piece of information for the program to have. It's not going to come from PVC (Program Vitality Committee) with recommendations to do something. It's information that you have. And what we'd like to see over time is eventually some feedback coming back, so we know if these are useful pieces of information or not. Or that there's things that are missing so we can add in, and provide even more useful than what we did create. And other folks, feel free to weigh in if you have something else to say.

Skaar: I totally understand what you're saying there, but at the same time, the committee is called Program Vitality, and to me that word—vitality—says—indicates that the committee is doing something, and giving departments or programs indicators about their vitality. And so back to kind of playing off what Becky (**Hawbaker**) said, I just ask you to consider other ways that make programs vital, or being a vital program, or having vitality or whatever we're saying with that word, so that we're confusing these numbers with vitality. They may indicate something—and I totally get that you guys aren't making decisions, and departments will make those decisions, and that kind of thing. But, is this—are these metrics indicators of vitality? I'm thinking about Graduate Programs and I'm wondering if those student indicators are the indicators of vitality for Grad

programs that are small and expensive (meaning mine) [Laughter] I'm biased because I know mine best. All of this looks to me like undergrad, and we have Grad programs too, and how does that work? Just thinking about that wider perspective with that word 'vitality.'

Pease: These kind of things have been discussed at length in the committee and we fully recognize that this does not capture everything that a program does. This is information that we can track over time. A lot of what we want to track is really giving an opportunity for programs to see change over time. That change may—and that's not to say that change is good or bad—but we think that programs should know what kinds of changes are occurring. So, it's not going to capture everything. That's part of the reason for having the text area as well, so programs can, if they feel the information is not representing something, they can create that kind of context and provide it so it's documented with these reports over time.

Hesse: In the student indicators, I don't see anything about job placement data. That seems to be a big one regarding the vitality of a program.

Pease: That's a great point. If we can track that, we can add it. I don't think we're at a place to track it very well right now though. One of the things we're very conscious of—we didn't want to put information, even if it's useful information, if it's so incomplete as to potentially be misleading—again we sort of glossed over it and skipped over that.

Hesse: You could maybe keep track of the number of students in a department that go on to graduate school. That might be easier to keep track of.

Wohlpert: So the key is—is it automated? All of this is going to be automated.

Hesse: That wouldn't work then.

Wohlpert: A department may track that, and they could add it in the information at the end.

Pease: But it also ends up in the APR every seven years.

Stollenwerk: I was actually going to say the same thing about the job placement. Just putting out numbers doesn't account for the fact that—I don't know, maybe you have a small program, but if you look at all the programs out there, then maybe you're bigger than 99% of the programs that are out there. Again, we have a small program also. But also looking at the market need. So, you might have a small program, but everybody's being placed into a job, as opposed to a larger program, where maybe only 75% are finding job placement. I would suggest adding additional things into it, so they're not just numbers. Again, 'vitality' kind of strikes fear in my heart from 2012. Numbers like this were used to justify things that were just without thought.

Pease: I actually had the change from 'sustainability' to 'vitality' because I thought vitality sounded more positive. [Laughter]

Wohlpert: So Andrew (**Stollenwerk**), I was not here in 2012, but from what I understand, in 2012 first of all, we didn't have any good data, and we didn't have

this much data, nor did we share or look at this data on a regular basis, or ask programs to do that on a regular basis.

Stollenwerk: There was something passed around in terms of number of majors. Some of it was passed around. This is more comprehensive. Like no thought was put into the amount of research money that was brought in, or one thing that I don't see in there or maybe it's hidden in there: average class size perhaps. We're a service department. Why do we have so many faculty members? Well, we're not just teaching our majors, we're serving other departments, and that wasn't accounted for either. Maybe average class size might go into that. But something like that might make me feel better.

Pease: This is about transparency. It's about getting information out. It's also about creating a standardized information footprint that everybody's looking at the same kinds of things. It may not be perfect. And in some cases, some categories would be more meaningful to some programs, and other categories would be more meaningful to other programs. So, a lot of what we looked at here by having in a very larger group was trying to get at all of the things that (a) we could get at, but then all the things that different programs might be interested in. For example, grants are in there. That's going to be more important to some departments, and less important to others. But, it's in there. If it's not important to your department, then it's not important to your department and you don't need to spend much time looking at it. If it's a metric that you track regularly and care a lot about, and put a lot of stock in, then you probably want that information coming from Sponsored Programs so that you have that kind of annual look and you can see how things are moving along.

Wohlpart: What I would add—real quickly is that hopefully what will happen is we will have increased funds as our enrollment increases, and then we have to make decisions about where we will want to put that, and this will hopefully help. Heaven forbid that we have serious decrease in funds and have to make hard decisions. The point is to be using information on a regular basis so that we're comfortable with that information, and it is transparent and shared very collaboratively. You don't want to come up to that hard place, which is what I understand happened in 2012. You develop the data, and then you use the data when nobody has even seen the data before or had an opportunity to contextualize it. We need to get into the habit on this campus of sharing data and using data. That is a habit that we need to be into, so that we can contextualize it and have it make sense. That's really, really important.

Stollenwerk: In terms of directing money, it seems like it would be a really good idea to see what the job market is actually like. That way if where to do we redirect money if it happens to be increased one year? Where can we redirect it? Well let's look at the job market: this particular major is in high demand, maybe even if they're large or small, we should redirect money into that. Maybe an exit survey might be...

Wohlpart: But again, we have to remember all of the facets. There are so many facets. Some departments are service departments. Right? They're offering a lot of classes that serve all of the other majors, and so they don't necessarily have a lot of graduates that get jobs, but without that large department, we wouldn't be able to do what we do. So, there's a whole host of reasons that we have faculty in

all different areas. We need to always be conscious of that and sharing that very transparently so we can understand that, and do it over time so that we get comfortable with it, so that hopefully when we get to a point where we're adding resources, we can do that very transparently.

Pease: A really important guiding principle or idea that we've had in the Committee is if data are going to be used to help make decisions, everybody should know what those data are. Everyone should have access to those data, and that's what we're doing. If I can switch gears a little bit, the way in which we...

Petersen: Do you mind if you take one more question?

Pease: Sure.

Cutter: So, as Patrick (**Pease**) indicated before, I kind of got into this committee midstream after the indicators were decided on. So I asked some of these questions in the Fall. Like he said, it wasn't written in stone. And another thing, I think you were telling me is that these—which I want to talk about because I'm a little bit confused by this, is that we weren't going to be comparing different department's data. The data would go to departments themselves, and it wouldn't be that your department was compared to others across the University. And some of the reasons for this are things like class size, and for example, publications, number and type. You can't compare articles in different disciplines where in some disciplines it's considered normal to get three articles out a year, and in in another it takes three years for an article. Right? If we're going to then use this data to make tough decisions, how are we avoiding doing these comparisons? What's to protect us from...

Hawbaker: People will compare.

Cutter:...from having quantitative data that appears to be comparing like things that really isn't.

Wohlpart: So Barb (**Cutter**) at the end, there are those questions that need to be answered that provide context for all that data. That information is really, really important not to overlook.

Cutter: I know, but it sort of seems that you're going to be in a kind of...

Wohlpart: So, this department has a low average class size, let's say Languages & Literature because they teach a whole bunch of writing classes. Their average class size is low. Well we're not going to cut them because they have a low class size. There's a context for that. We have to share that, and understand that and understand the context around that stuff. What are the other options? We need to get this information out so that we can start using it and understand how we can use it in collaborative and inclusive ways.

Cutter: I think more qualitative, in addition would be helpful.

Wohlpart: So let me suggest that this is going to be really important for faculty to engage this. And this is what Patrick (**Pease**) said. It needs to go out to the faculty in the department. Everybody needs to be looking at this data, and using this data so that all of that information can be talked about and discussed in that qualitative way. And other metrics that we come up with over time need to be

added. We can't wait until we get to a crisis to do that. Right? It's got to start happening, and we've got to trust that process as we go through it.

Pease: These are things that your department head and dean already know. So part of this is making sure the faculty know this as well. There are reports that come in that have numbers like these in them every year, and so this is a lot about creating a single way of viewing the data that everyone can see, so there aren't surprises, and there isn't hidden information and people in the dark about things. So the way in which we have decided to try to present this data is in something called Tableau. This is what I'm showing right now, and the reason it's small there is that I'm kind of new to this, and haven't quite figured out how to make it zoom out, so forgive me. This is something that institutional research is using to build visualizations to link up with our data base, and pull the information and create the visualizations. I want to show you a few examples. These are just drafts, but I'm going to show you a few drafts. These are individual. We're ultimately going to piece these together in one large document so that all the information is in one place, so that when it goes out actually we can package it as a file. The file will go out. We're going to have IT push out to everybody's software center the Tableau Reader. So everyone on campus can install Tableau Reader on their laptops or desktops without having to go through IT requests. That's already in the works, so that I would guess within a week or two you'll be able to download the Reader to see these kind of files. And this is how we're going to deliver them out. So we're going to be able to see things like this. I'll get to a question I have for you in just a minute, but in this particular case there's a drop down and you pick one department. But this is for example, is how we can

represent—a couple of ways we can represent—things like average class size. Now, while this is not really a lot about comparison, this is one of the cases where I think departments might actually want to know where they sit, because we talk a lot about average class size. So what we did here is we broke this out between lower level, upper level, undergraduate total, graduate total, and total for the department. But this looks at both the numbers, so for example if you look at total for 2012, this department was averaging 24.8 and the University average was 26.8. So you can look at what the averages are on campus and kind of make that comparison for yourself. It won't work for every program. Obviously, a lower division LAC class is different from a maybe a lower division course in a lab. So, it's not a perfect comparison, but it does give you some kind of idea. One of the reasons we broke it out to total, as well as breaking it out by lower level, upper level, graduate was we wanted to give departments a little bit of flexibility in looking at how they're sitting there. Then at the bottom you can see some changes through time. Look at lower division classes for example through time. There are waves up and down, but you can see kind of a trend over time. So, these are just examples of how to represent the data. And that's really what the Committee is doing at this point. We're getting tasking IR with developing visualizations to represent what we have on the metric list, and then we're reviewing them one by one, and deciding: Is that actually what we meant to show? Is that the story we meant to tell? And we're sending these back and forth for edits and revisions. I'll give you another example. Here's one for the faculty in departments...the department of music and again...

Zeitz: If you want to make it bigger, try holding down the control button and hit the plus sign.

Pease: I'm not sure that works here, but I am going to try that. No. It's in this Tableau environment, and somehow we have to actually resize the page.

Zeitz: No problem.

Pease: It's one of the quirks. The way this works out is administrators, tenure, tenure-track, and instructors. We can look through time. One of the things that the committee thought programs might like to see at a quick glance is how the balance for faculty and instructors within departments might have changed through time. This pie chart is just a different representation of the same thing, so there's counts here, percentages in the pie chart, and then this bottom one actually adds some other information in. The very first draft we saw of this for example was very confusing, and we realized it's because the way the data came from IR, it actually rolled graduate students in with faculty, and everything looked really odd. Then we discussed it and thought, "That might be interesting to know." This breaks out adding administration, grad assistants, and support staff. Again, you can see how that might have changed through time. In this particular case, it looks like there's an increase in support staff. You can contextualize that in your text box. And then I brought just one more example. We actually have quite a few. This one for example is looking at different ways of looking at enrollments: Looking at enrollments by major, minor and certificate. Here there's a box here, so you can see the counts. You see the bar charts. And then again, just looking at it as a total percentage at the bottom, to see if there's any kind of significant

changes. We're not really sure about any of these particular visualizations. We're just exploring them. We're taking a look at them to see if they're intuitive; if they're representing what we want them to represent. But this is going to give an opportunity as well, since we're dealing electronically, we'll have the ability to do a little bit of drill-down in here, so it's not just a static report. We'll default everything to what we think people want to see, but there'll be an opportunity for data on here. Now here's the question I have for you. You can also see for example, you can look at all students, grad students, undergraduates: So there's some choice you can make in here in terms of what you're looking at. We do have a question, and we've debated back and forth about this, and that is: When these things come out, should you be able to drop down the department, and actually look at everybody else's, or should you only see your department?

Wohlpart: What a great question. [Laughter]

Pease: What does Senate think about that?

Mattingly: It seems to me that when you're making decisions, it's hard to make decisions out of context. You need to be able to compare yourself against some other departments, especially ones that may be relatively similar to yours. I don't know what you would use the information for, if it was only your own department.

Pease: We've gone back and forth about whether it's a good idea to reach maximum transparency, or whether that creates additional issues.

Henninger: The Committee is fairly split on this.

Wohlpart: Can you talk about pros and cons—what you all have discussed?

Henninger: I, being somebody who has a background in statistics, would like as much data as possible, and I would like the ability to make my decisions from that. I think the issue is people making comparisons of themselves to other programs. Some programs feel like conclusions could be drawn from that, that are not made in context. Like, “These many people have these many faculty. Why don’t we have this?” But there’s not that ability to have that kind of conversation back and forth.

Wohlpart: So the reason, I think, for having it just for your department is still useful is you’re going to be able to see history. I think that’s going to be the most useful piece, is you’re going to be able to see trends for your own department; your own program.

Petersen: I think I would appreciate the transparency if such transparency was facilitated in a way that brought about conversation across the various divides, departments, colleges, in ways that would be productive. For me, I share the same hesitation as I’m hearing many of you speak about, because I too in 2012 coordinated a very, very small program that was on chopping block. But I vividly remember numbers being handed to me, and they were numbers that were not familiar, and I did not believe them to be accurate. Things like Continuing Education numbers were not a part of the numbers given to me, and so I felt very powerless to be even engage in the conversation. When I see this type of data, and the notion of having it ahead of time on a regular basis, and engaging in conversation with my department and with others about this type of data, I

would feel much more prepared if hard decisions eventually come about. And I would feel much more empowered to represent my department, my program, in a way that I didn't feel in 2012.

Wohlpart: Let me add to that, that Kristin **Moser's** shop has done a remarkable job of cleaning up the data—our data. It's still not perfect, but it's much better than it was in 2015 when I got here. It still needs to be improved, and truly the only way to improve data is to share it and use it. If you're not sharing it, and you're not using it, you're not cleaning it up. So, once we start sharing and using it, it will get better and better; more and more usable and more understandable.

Pease: It creates an opportunity for programs to check and see if they actually believe the data to be right.

Henninger: I would add that that's already happened quite a bit in our meetings. We have representation from all across, so immediately when Patrick (**Pease**) pulls up Family Services, I'm like, "that's not right." I think one of the issues that we had was the single faculty, like the independent study—so it's dropping your class size because you've got one faculty, one student in there and they had to pull that out. So that's been corrected now. But that's just one of the things that you get enough eyes on it. People who have the correct eyes—we've corrected or Kristin's (**Woods**) has corrected a lot of that.

Pease: We complain to Kristin (**Woods**) and Kristin goes and fixes it.

Henninger: It's kind of amazing. Like "fix this."

Pease: The reason that this starts in 2008 is that's how far back Kristin (**Woods**) is comfortable with the data. So, we talked originally about seven years, just so it would slide nicely with the APR, but Kristin (**Woods**) was confident back to '08, so we went with '08.

Mattingly: I just wanted to mention to the rest of the group, that as we have the Program Vitality Committee back, year over year, it would be incumbent on us then, the people in this room, to talk with our faculties and our colleges and our departments, to find out what are the problems with the data items that we are reporting and the way that we're showing them, so that we can continue to develop this into something that will be useful for us as a faculty to guide our own decisions about our programs. If we do a good job of that, we prevent any top down kind of things from eventually occurring.

Pease: One of the things we've talked about doing is running a test. We're still thinking about when the snapshot is going to be. We've talked about going one year back, so that we don't have to worry about the current year or snapshot, and running the report and pushing that out to everybody as a test. That's a good point to not only see if the whole system works, but to give each program an opportunity to say, "That's not representing what we would like it to represent," or "We have no idea what this chart means." Something that we thought was obvious because we look at it a lot. And so it would give us an opportunity to get that kind of feedback. In the intervening time, what I would ask you to do is you could add comments on metrics or representations: now's a good time to begin to send them in, especially with what you've seen. Now's a good time to send them in. As we get more of the visualizations ready and we start building it in to

an actual report, I'll come back, and we'll begin to see how some of these things work. In fact, by the time we have that, you'll be able to get the Tableau Reader, and we could actually provide it in such a way that you can spend some time with it, and really dig into it, and then provided feedback as well.

Petersen: In the interest of time, we'll take our last two questions from Senator **McCandless** and Senator **Varzavand**, and then we'll move on.

McCandless: We're looking at the previous materials, and there's going to be context and opportunity for different programs to give information that goes along with their numbers. That context can be provided in these snapshots because it might be interesting because there's different types of teaching going on. It's really difficult to compare one type of teaching with another type of teaching. Is that going to be available? Let's say everybody can see everything, then there's an explanation for why it looks like this in this department, because they teach like this, and they teach differently in another department.

Pease: I think that's a choice we can make. If we want to make all program available to everybody, then I think we also have the choice of making that text area either available or not available for programs. So I think that's a choice we can make. No decision on that one, but it's a choice we can make.

McCandless: I think we can make it more clear because I don't understand necessarily how things are done in other departments, and I know other people don't understand how things are done in ours. So, again if we're going to have

this information, as much context as possible, so that nobody gets the wrong idea.

Pease: We did actually have a conversation though, that we had this relatively automated and data that people can use how they find it valuable. We were very cautious about adding a lot of text boxes though, and a lot of opportunity in a way that it would draw departments in with the sense that they have to do a lot of extra work. We don't really want this to be a lot of extra work. We thought about do we have one box at the end, or a box after every single representation of data? We thought having a lot of boxes just invited a lot of work that didn't have to be done. The reality is, departments probably know why, and they've probably done a good job of making sure their dean knows why something is the way it is. So, it may not actually be a lot of need for departments to do a lot of work on this thing. It's really just there if something unusual is going on and the department really feels compelled. But, we're not trying to create work for people.

Varzavand: I think making the data available to the entire faculty and department would be valuable, and if there is concern in regard to data lacking perhaps a context for the cost of facilities and energies which is missing, then a university lawyer can be there writing a description at the bottom of the screen as a disclaimer.

Pease: I hope we don't need that. [Laughter]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: Thank you. Thank you for an excellent discussion. We have a number of items for consideration today. What I would like to suggest is that we take the emeritus request for James **Davis**, 1300, and move it to the top of the order so that we can consider the two emeritus requests together. Is there a motion to do so? Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Choi**. Any discussion? All in favor of moving the emeritus request to the top of the docket for James **Davis**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions. So we will begin by considering the emeritus request, and I see that Jennifer **Cooley** is in our audience, and she wrote a beautiful letter in support of his application for emeritus status. Instead of me reading it to you all, would you be willing to make any comments?

Cooley: I'd be happy to. In the interest of time, I'm going to summarize, and I hope you will enjoy reading the letter. Thank you for the direction. Dr. **Davis** has been very instrumental in training all kinds of teachers; large numbers of language arts teachers in the state of Iowa and across the country. He's also been a very good steward of the National Writing Project and its local chapter, which is called the Iowa Writing Project for all the years that he's been at UNI. He was one of those unusual people who actually brought in a lot of money for the Humanities and for English, so he will be missed.

Petersen: Thank you so much. Are there any other comments?

Koch: Jim (**Davis**) was a colleague of mine too. He was always very collegial and friendly, and willing to share his expertise on committees and things like that.

He's another star of the faculty that will be setting. That's regrettable, but I'm sure he deserves the retirement now.

Ahart: As a student in the Department of Languages and Literature, I had the pleasure of having Dr. **Davis** for two courses throughout my career here, and I'd say that something that made him stand apart from some of my other faculty members was the emphasis he put on community engagement for the students in his courses, and the heightened importance that had on my career here in pursuing my future career, and I really appreciate his intentionality and just love for his profession.

Petersen: All in favor of approving the emeritus request for James **Davis**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstention? The motion passes. The second emeritus request that we have is for Mir **Zaman**. Is there anyone who would like to speak on his behalf?

Mattingly: Should I read this?

Petersen: Sure.

Mattingly: Well Mir (**Zaman**) was a colleague of mine and of Imam's (**Alam**). We've known him for some time. "Mir **Zaman** has provided 25 years of meritorious service at the University of Northern Iowa. During his tenure, he's developed and taught advanced level courses in Finance and administered the Chartered Financial Analysts Program for over 16 years. Over and above his teaching, Mir Zaman has an extensive record of publications in Investments and Corporate Finance. His research was published in top-tiered journals such as

the *Journal of Finance*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, (which are very, very high level journals) *Journal of Business*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, and *Financial Management Journal*. In addition, his service record includes several terms on the University Faculty Senate and the CBA Faculty Senate. He also served as an Interim Head of the Department of Finance in the CBA (that's the College of Business Administration) and was in charge of the Financial Analysis Program at the Department of Finance for more than 16 years." He will be missed.

Petersen: Any other comments then? Is there a motion to approve the emeritus request for Mir **Zaman**?

Mattingly: So moved.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Thank you, Senator **Smith**. Any further discussion? All in favor of approving his emeritus request, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Alright, the motion passes.

Petersen: The next item to be considered is the Taskforce for Academic Suspension, and Patrick (**Pease**) is sharing revisions to this policy with us, looking for some review and feedback. In the interest of time, I certainly don't mean to rush you Patrick, but if we could try to keep our conversation here to about five to seven minutes, and then we can decide if we need to table it, or if we can provide feedback via email, then we can ensure that we'll get to the curriculum requests.

Pease: This was actually put in by Peter (**Neibert**). Peter is the Senate's representative on that group.

Petersen: Yes, I'm sorry.

Neibert: So, as you can see the purpose in the background on here was to look at the suspension policies and practices. One of the things that we as a committee felt like we wanted to make this new policy. It seemed like it was more of a punishment and a kind of a deterrent, to make students return to the Institution. So, we wanted it to be more student-friendly but also at the same time having a vehicle for when they did return that they could be more successful. That's the general overview regarding that. There are others in the committee that may be able to share additional insight if they would like or answer questions.

Pease: At the bottom, you see the two main changes that we're looking at is a reduction of first-time suspensions from one year to one semester. We were out of balance with most other institutions on the length. And the other was when students are suspended, they immediately want to not be suspended, and we do have a process by which students can try to avoid having to sit out. Right now it's basically based on a feeling, and an opportunity of support. The change would be that in order to come back into the program without sitting out, students would have to go through a mandatory program geared at making them successful. That program is geared around a two-credit hour course that combines both peer mentorship with some group work to try to develop the skills that they need to be successful. Kristin **Woods** is here, if there are any questions about that particular portion of it, as well and Joyce (**Morrow**) and Heather (**Asmus**) is representing the CAR group that actually is the body that re-admits students once they've been suspended. So we have a lot of people here if there are questions about this.

Neibert: On of the comments, as I came in a little bit later on this committee— one of the questions I had which may be helpful for faculty is I wanted to know

what percentage of these students were basically just students who measuring up; who weren't ready for college. That really wasn't the case. More of it was related to a lot of health-related issues: Mental health related, other health related issues, was why these students were having difficulties. That gives a little bit more context to why I think as a committee we looked at reducing the suspension time, and having a recovery program to be able to facilitate and help those students that were really struggling in so many other ways that just academics. Their academics were reflected in their struggles, but the main struggles were some of their health-related issues.

Zeitz: Does the course include time management and that sort of thing and organizing the way in which you approach things?

Woods: I can speak to that. Right now, there's a course called Strategies for Academic Success that many students take, especially students that enter as conditional admits. So we didn't want to replicate that course. That course does include time management. We wanted to deepen our approach to some of those issues, so time management will be included, but kind of under the umbrella of motivational interviewing and kind of helping students focus on eliciting behavior change by looking at their current behavior, and how that may be out of line with the goals that they have looking ahead. Often, time management will be one of those barriers that's blocking what they see as their future goals. So, the answer to that is 'yes' but to some degree it's a bit individualized. There would be classroom component and also a weekly mentoring appointment with a social work graduate student who could help them through some of that more individualized pieces.

Zeit: Thank you for doing that.

Hesse: If you could scroll forward to Page 5 for the proposed wording. It's at the top. The second sentence, "Academic suspension is for a period of one semester and is permanently noted on the student's official transcript." I don't know why it has to be permanently noted if the purpose of this is to give people a second chance. That seems to discourage people if you permanently note that they were academically suspended.

Pease: That came up. Maybe Joyce (**Morrow**) could speak to that a little.

Morrow: It's part of the past history that's been here. It's part of their academic record, and so if we take it off of there, it doesn't show a clear reflection of really what happened along the way. That's been the rationale from the past. Going forward, we'd have to have a different rationale if we took it off there, how we would document what their actual performance was.

Pease: The students are still suspended but if they agree to, and CAR admits them into this alternative program, it allows them to avoid sitting out. It allows them to continue back into their studies immediately, but they were still suspended. This is a notation; a record that that did happen.

Wohlpert: Which is current practice.

Pease: Yes. That is current practice.

Hesse: Okay.

Wohlpert: Something to take up later because it surprised me also.

Hesse: I just don't see why it's necessary. It seems at some level to discourage people from re-applying if there's always going to be a red flag on their transcript.

Wohlpart: It wouldn't do that, Tom (**Hesse**). When they get to a certain point with a certain G.P.A. et cetera, et cetera, they are suspended.

Hesse: But the notation isn't going to go away no matter what their future G.P.A. is?

Wohlpart: That's correct. It's always going to be there.

Hesse: That's always going to be there.

Wohlpart: So there's nothing they can do to have that or not have that. They got suspended. It is going to be on their transcript.

Pease: Whether they sit out a time, or whether CAR allows them to be re-admitted immediately, the suspension actually gets triggered at the point when their grades are...

Hesse: I'm fine with the suspension. I'm just not fine with the permanent notation that can't be taken off.

Wohlpart: So that's something we can take up later. I think that's a great discussion point.

Pease: That's written in there to maintain the current policy. That piece of it.

Petersen: And I'm correct in that you were not looking for us to vote on these changes?

Pease: It's a consultation. Feedback. If you see anything that you'd like us to address at the last minute before we go forward...

Wohlpart: You want to give a deadline for feedback?

Pease: We're actually hoping to pilot this going into the Fall, so it would be right after—the first time we would need to make the decisions would be right after finals in December. So, a couple of weeks.

Petersen: So, if anyone has additional feedback, is it appropriate/okay for anyone to email either Patrick (**Pease**), Peter (**Neibert**), Joyce (**Morrow**)? Those on the committee? Okay. Excellent.

Petersen: The next item for consideration is a proposal that comes to us to create an Interdisciplinary Faculty Senate Committee. I believe Alicia (**Rosburg**) is here to speak to this proposal, and I believe I saw Elizabeth **Sutton** walk in as well. Do you ladies want to share a little bit about this need for an Interdisciplinary Committee?

Sutton: Sure. I'm Elizabeth and I walked in late. I would direct your attention to the proposal in the background that states that we have a long history already of interdisciplinary work. And in light of some of the discussion already here about wanting to become more of a data-informed culture, this is a committee that would try to collect some information about what is already being done; what

kinds of infrastructure is already in place, and then look to other institutions as well, and research best practices of interdisciplinary work. That would align then with some of our Academic Master Plan goals. We have also talked with the Provost's Office and have a potential person who might be willing to help out next year with that committee. We've listed potential partners who could be part of the committee. So if anyone has questions, I think Alicia (**Rosburg**) or I can speak to them.

Rosburg: I'd just like to add that given my experiences in a sustainability role, have shown that there's a lot of informal lack of structure to have an interdisciplinary studies set up right now. So, people who are trying to do the work go through a system that hits roadblocks, along with a lot of people who are going through the same thing. So we looked at this and said, "It needs to be more efficient." There can be a better way. This committee is not designed to say what way that should be done. This committee is set up to be exploratory and can figure out what are the challenges that are being faced; what's working and not working on campus, and what's working elsewhere, and to bring back information from which then more decisions can be made. We really just want that to be exploratory to be more efficient, because right now, for those of you who have been participating in interdisciplinary studies, you can probably attest to that. It's a fairly inefficient process at times to make curriculum changes.

Petersen: As I understand it, the committee would be looking to ascertain the current state of affairs on our campus related to the current interdisciplinary structures, and then to also explore and research and understand best practice around interdisciplinary work on campuses by looking at other peer institutions.

Wohlpart: I'll only add that there are very few things on the Academic Master Plan that we haven't engaged. This is one of them. And this is one that the faculty felt very strongly about in that first year that I was here that we developed that Academic Master Plan, and it hasn't been touched. So I think it's a perfect time to engage it and look at it and think about it.

Cutter: I just wanted to say, as somebody's whose been very involved in interdisciplinary programs, I think this is a great idea.

Petersen: Is there a motion then to approve the creation of this ad hoc Interdisciplinary Committee? Thank you, Senator **Alam**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Stafford**. Is there any other discussion needed? Questions or comments?

Hesse: I have one quick question. Can you scroll down to the Voting Faculty Representatives? I see there's a Women & Gender Studies person on the board and I support that. But who represents current undergraduate interdisciplinary majors? I mean like we have a Global Studies major that has 30 or 40 students in it. We have a Humanities major. Who specifically represents current undergraduate interdisciplinary majors?

Wohlpart: One would be the Sustainability advisor group, because that is Interdisciplinary certificate right now.

Sutton: Just to speak to that, we were trying to not make the committee overly large. I'm trying to find a workable number, and we were going off of the

initiatives and the fellows that exist already in Academic Affairs and the Ad boards that are on the list. I think that's a good question though, and we put in that little footnote about the consultation with other constituencies and we are trying to brainstorm who those other constituencies might be. Because like you bring up Humanities. There's also in the former HPELS—there's lots of...I think we didn't want to exclude anyone, but we didn't want to make the committee become unwieldy.

Petersen: Do you have a particular position in mind?

Hesse: Just some individual to represent current undergraduate interdisciplinary majors.

Wohlpart: So "F" could be that? One of the questions would be if you want two from CHAS, because I can think of a lot of interdisciplinary initiatives in CHAS: IDS, Humanities, and some other areas.

Petersen: Tom, (**Hesse**) would you like to suggest that we amend the proposal to include two from CHAS and/or a different area position?

Hesse: I don't know if we need two, as long as we have one strong voice, that would be sufficient.

Petersen: Alright, all in favor of approving the request to create this Interdisciplinary Senate Committee, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Opposed? Abstentions? Excellent. The next items for consideration are the Curriculum Proposals. The first curriculum proposal is the College of Ed Curriculum package.

Patrick (**Pease**) are you comfortable summarizing each package, and then we can have discussion as needed?

Pease: You bet. I'm comfortable summarizing everything all together.

Petersen: Alright. We could do that. Can we bundle? How does that work?

Mattingly: We could unless somebody wants us to...

Pease: That's up to you. I can talk about each one, or give you a quick overview and you can vote on them individually if you want. How about I give you a big overview?

Petersen: We can vote individually. If there are any hiccups along the way, we'll...

Pease: The materials in there actually lay out the details college by college. Programs, new courses—things like that. I'll give you an overview of what UCC and GCCC did this year. There were three new programs, 82 edited programs, 333 edited courses, and in a beautiful stroke of symmetry, 46 new courses and 46 dropped courses. So that's the big overview. The reason that they're coming together—very often they come sequentially, but UCC and GCCC do a lot of hard work and in this particular cycle, in every college there were some programs that issues could not be resolved in the first meeting, so the committees have something they call "Cleanup" where they push some overflow work to a later meeting. Every college had something that went into the Cleanup, and so everything ended up just waiting until we could resolve all of the issues, and

that's why all the packages are coming at one time now. If you really want to see the details, you can look for example, this is the College of Education. You can see how each individual college broke out in terms of the individual new courses and edited courses and things like that that they had over the summary. You get a bigger picture view. While I have the floor, I will take a moment to say a public thank you to both of those committees that do a lot of hard work. There are committees that meet, and then there are committees that really meet and work, and UCCC particularly is one that does a lot of work. If you think about the numbers there, they do a ton of work. And there's some representatives in the back from the Registrar's Office that are owed a huge amount of thanks. Joan (**Smothers**) and Diane (**Wallace**) back there, that do a tremendous amount of work with those committees as well, and help to compile all this work and the work could not get done without those two. So I want to give a public thank you as well. I will take questions.

Petersen: Do you want to take questions college by college?

Pease: Whatever you like.

Petersen: Start with the College of Education then. Are there any questions or comments related to the curriculum proposals in the College of Education? Is there a motion to pass the curriculum? Thank you Senator **Zeitz** and seconded by Senator **Skaar**. Any additional discussion needed for the College of Education curriculum package? Alright, all in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' And opposed? And abstain? Alright, the motion passes for the College of Education Curriculum proposal. Thank you for all of our visitors who attended. Next, is the CHAS Curriculum proposals. Are there any questions or comments related to

these specific proposals? No new programs, four new courses, three deleted, 14 edited programs and 29 edited courses.

Pease: That's the Humanities Arts and Sciences portion. CHAS is so big we break it up into two groups. The science section is a separate page.

Petersen: And in the Sciences, no new programs, five new courses, three deleted, 13 edited programs and 36 edited courses.

Pease: Just to be clear, the graduate stuff is below that. So that's broken out as well. The totals I gave you were undergraduate and graduate together. In many cases, courses for example are 4,000-5,000 so there's a little bit of overlap.

Petersen: Is there a motion to pass the CHAS curriculum proposals? Thank you, Senator **Mattingly**. Second by Senator **Stollenwerk**. Any additional discussion or comments? Alright, all in favor of passing the CHAS curriculum proposals, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? One abstention from Senator **Varzavand**. The motion passes. The next package is the CSBS curriculum proposals and here Gretchen (**Gould**) you will not find the summary page. It was loaded late, and it hasn't updated yet but I know Patrick (**Pease**) was just going to provide us with an overview of that summary page.

Pease: There was one new certificate, there were seven new courses or deleted courses—this is undergraduate. Nineteen programs went through for edits. Most of them B.A. or B.S. programs along with a few minors, and a total of 59 edited courses. And then numbers at the graduate are no new programs, nine new

courses, three dropped courses, four programs were edited and 30 individual courses were edited at the graduate level.

Petersen: is there a motion to pass the CSBS Curriculum package? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Gould**. Any additional discussion?

Smith: I was wondering what the new certificate is.

Pease: Unmanned Aerial Systems in Geography.

Petersen: Alright, all in favor of passing the CSBS Curriculum package, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstentions? Alright, the motion passes. And the last Curriculum package is the Business package, CBA.

Gould: Are the Interdisciplinary proposals—curriculum proposals there?

Pease: Are those in a separate file? Yeah, those are probably a separate file.

Petersen: I think it was named wrong.

Cutter: It's CBA and Interdisciplinary. There's no Interdisciplinary?

Pease: That might be an oversight. When the programs were viewed, Interdisciplinary was reviewed with CBA because it was the smallest of the curriculum packages. But I think it didn't end up on the summary sheet. That was the—Interdisciplinary ones were a course in Collections Care and Management, and a certificate in Museum Studies. Those were the two Interdisciplinary pieces that are missing from here.

Mattingly: It seemed when reading over the transcripts that this was rather non-controversial.

Pease: CBA? Yes.

Mattingly: It was the most controversial of all of them. They had to remove a class, right? Management 3154—or something like that?

Pease: Right. There was an issue. A new course, Management 3123 was the course. The title of that course was Network Fundamentals and Security. The Department of Computer Science—UCC initially questioned the lack of consultation. That was pushed over to a consultation with Computer Science. Computer Science wasn't terribly happy with it, because they felt they had the exact same class, and so the course was pulled with the discussion that Management and Computer Science would have a conversation this year, and either come to an agreement on an alternate curriculum or maybe a collaboration. Something would come back to UCC next year. So yes, there was a course that was removed from the packet after that consultation happened.

Petersen: We haven't had a motion yet.

Wohlpart: You might want a motion for an amendment first.

Petersen: Because it went through inaccurately?

Pease: Any other questions about CBA or Interdisciplinary?

Petersen: Let me begin by asking if there is a motion to amend the CBA Curriculum package to include the Interdisciplinary courses that were noted.

Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Gould**. All in favor of amending the CBA Curriculum package to include the Interdisciplinary proposals, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes. Is there a motion then to approve the CBA and Interdisciplinary Curriculum package? Thank you, Senator **Smith**. Is there a second? Thank you, senator **Skaar**. Any additional discussion? All if favor of passing the CBA and the Interdisciplinary curriculum package, would you please indicate by saying 'aye?' Any opposed? And any abstentions? One abstention, Senator **Stollenwerk**. The motion then passes. Is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**.

Wohlpert: Look at that time.

Petersen: You didn't think I could do it. But is there a motion to adjourn? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist & Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. December 10, 2018
301 Rod Library (Scholar Space)
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa