

2-11-2019

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2019

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2019 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 11, 2019" (2019). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1246.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1246

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 Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
2/11/19 (3:30 – 4:54)
Mtg. #1819
SUMMARY MINUTES
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

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

Guests: Brenda Bass, John Fritch, Bill Henninger, Ana Kogl, Nicole Lehman, Emily Loomis, Joyce Morrow, Lily Schwarz, Doug Shaw

Courtesy Announcements

Regarding today's announcement of the University closing at 5:00, Provost **Wohlpert** clarified new closing language which states, "classes will not meet" allowing faculty the purview to continue other avenues of instruction.

United Faculty Chair **Hawbaker** reported the tentative agreement with the Board of Regents regarding faculty wages. "We're happy about some aspects of it, and disappointed in others." (See pages 6-10) **Hawbaker** noted that a bill before the legislature suggests elimination of tenure. However, UNI lobbyist Mary **Braun** reassured **Hawbaker** that the Board of Regents would be opposed to this. United Faculty hosts a Faculty Appreciation Dinner on Saturday, April 13th at 6 p.m. in the Commons Ballroom. Nominations for UF leadership positions are open now.

NISG Representative **Ahart** said two more members of the Board of Regents will be on campus visiting UNI classes this spring. Ahart announced student lobby days, the ongoing NISG leadership campaigns, and the importance of faculty nominations for Student and Organizational Leadership Awards.

(See pages 10-11)

Minutes for Approval: January 28, 2019

**** (Skaar/Varzavand)** Passed. One abstention.

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

**** (Zeitz/Stafford)** Bundled for docketing in regular order.

1317 [Emeritus request for Deborah Giarrusso](#)

1318 [Emeritus request for Cynthia Dunn](#)

1319 [Emeritus request for Anne Myles](#)

Consideration of Docket Items

1286 1407 [General Education Revision Committee](#) Consultation (See pages 12-33)

1314 1435 [Purple and Old Gold Award Consultation](#)

**** (Burnight/O’Kane)** to move to head of order. Motion passed.
(See pages 33-35)

1313 1434 [Proposal to Revise Emeritus/a Policy 4.21](#)

**** (Hesse/Burnight)** Motion passed. (See pages 35-44)

1315 1436 [Revocation of Emeritus Status for John Longnecker](#)

**** (Strauss/Zeitz)** Motion passed. All aye. (See pages 44-45)

1316 1437 [Revision to Senate Bylaws](#)

**** (O’Kane/Burnight)** Passed with friendly amendment.
(See pages 45-49)

No New Business

Adjournment: (Strauss/Acclamation) 4:54 p.m.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, February 25, 2019

Scholar Space (301) Rod Library

University of Northern Iowa

A complete transcript of 50 pages and 0 addendum follows.

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

February 11th, 2019

Present: Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Senator Seong-in **Choi**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Senators Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Justin **Mertz**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gloria **Stafford**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Shahram **Varzavand**, and Leigh **Zeitz**.

Also Present: NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**, Associate Provost John **Valentine**, and Provost Jim **Wohlpert**.

Not Present: Peter **Neibert**, UNI President Mark **Nook**.

Guests: Brenda **Bass**, John **Fritch**, Bill **Henninger**, Ana **Kogl**, Nicole **Lehman**, Emily **Loomis**, Joyce **Morrow**, Lily **Schwarz**, Doug **Shaw**.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Petersen: Alright, shall we get started? I call our meeting to order. We have a number of guests this afternoon, so let us begin by introducing those of you who are with us, and you might just share the committee or the group that you are with, or your purpose for attending today. That would be wonderful. Should I start way in the back?

Morrow: Joyce **Morrow**. I'm here to talk about Purple and Old Gold Award

Lehman: I'm Nicole **Lehman**, also of the Registrar's Office to talk about Purple and Old Gold.

Kogl: Ana **Kogl**. You've seen me before, most of you before; Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Shaw: Doug **Shaw**, Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Fritch: John **Fritch**, Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Bass: Brenda **Bass**, Gen Ed Revision Committee.

Loomis: Emily **Loomis**. I'm a student here with my roommate.

Schwarz: My name is Lily **Schwarz**. I'm an Anthro and Religions major and I'm actually here to study the way that you all use language in your meetings.

[Laughter] I'm actually doing this for a research paper with Dr. Cynthia **Dunn** in the Anthropology Department for Language & Culture. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer after the meeting.

O'Kane: Will you be analyzing our transcripts? The past ones

Schwarz: I actually already have. I'm all caught up.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Petersen: Let us move in to our announcements. I do not believe that President **Nook** is joining us today, so let me give the floor to Provost **Wohlpart**.

Wohlpart: You all got the announcement about today. One of the things I'm working towards is more timely announcements of when we will close and how long we'll be closed. Obviously, one of the challenges of that is that the weather forecast changes, in fact it changed about a half an hour ago and it looked like the storm was pushing later, and so I had a flurry of texts with Michael **Hager:** Should we close at 5? Should we not close? And I said, "You know if we're open at 5:00 for classes, those people are going home at 7:00 or 7:30. It's not going to be good at 7:00 or 7:30, so we decided to go ahead and close. So, thank you for your patience. You'll notice a change in the language. In the past, it has said that classes are cancelled, and what was awesome was that lots of faculty on our campus provided information for students so that they could continue their learning, and I heard from a lot of those students that classes were cancelled, and from some of their parents. So, it no longer says 'classes are cancelled.' It says 'classes will not meet on campus.' If faculty want to do something, faculty have the purview to do that.

Zeit: Unfortunately, I have a Zoom meeting with other faculty members tomorrow morning, so I can't cancel that one either.

Wohlpart: You can't cancel that. Thank you for your patience. If you have feedback, I will gladly take your feedback. Thanks.

Petersen: Faculty Chair **Cutter**, do you have comments?

Cutter: I don't have any comments today.

Petersen: UF President **Hawbaker?**

Hawbaker: I wanted to announce that United Faculty has reached a tentative agreement with the Board of Regents on negotiating our contract. It's a mixed bag. We're happy about some aspects of it, and disappointed in others. So, we've agreed to a 2.1% salary increase overall. 2.1% is the Midwest C.P.U for February, 2019, so that increase at least keeps pace with inflation for right now, but it doesn't make up for any of the past that has pulled us behind there. That 2.1% will be divided: 40% across the board; so that percentage applied to your salary. 20% incremental increase, which is everyone gets the same amount and that's based on the average salary for the entire University, and then 40% of that will be individual adjustment or merit and promotion money. So, what I want to say about that is on the plus side, we appreciate that the Board of Regents included permissive wage topics. The way the new law is written, they really only had to negotiate on base wages, which is the very lowest salary for the opening—what you get when you're an Assistant Professor, the lowest percentage. And that 2.1% could have only been applied to that lowest amount, which would mean that no one would get a raise at all. So that was my email around Christmas time, which was their first offer. So we appreciate that it was expanded across to actual increases for everyone and we appreciate that the total increase does match the cost of inflation, at least for now. Some things to think about though: So 40% is a bigger chunk to be designated for merit or individual adjustments than we've had in the past, and so that means a couple of things: For those of you who are in the midst of doing your department standards and criteria, this is another reminder for why it's important to invest time in those, and to make sure that they are clear, objective, fair, and that everyone in your department agrees that these are the standards. Because what that will also mean is that even though that 2.1% is

the C.P.U. for the Midwest for now, not everyone is going to get that merit increase, right? So that's a percentage that goes to a merit pot, but how that pot gets divided is up to the criteria that are being established now. So that means that for some people, they will not have an increase that matches inflation, and so in terms of buying power, that will be a cut. So that's another reason why we have continued discussing with administration about there is nothing that would prevent UNI from putting more money into merit than what is contractually obligated, and so we've asked them to consider that as we move into post-tenure review and we're moving into new territory, we've all been saying that has been a comprehensive system that will reward excellence. And that we want to make sure that that is a significant and notable recognition, and not you know, "Here's an extra \$20 for you. Good job, John." So other things that we're a little disappointed about: We had hoped that we would be able to convince the Board of Regents to negotiate on other permissive topics that don't involve money, so we were trying to get language back into the contract for our grievance procedure because having that in the contract is better protection than just having it in the Handbook. And because of the feedback we got from faculty, we were really pushing for some strong language in support of tenure. As we move into post-tenure review, I've heard a lot of conversation across campus that worries me; that people believe that, "tenure is dead." Those are literal quotes that people have told me, and I don't agree with that, but I know how it can feel that way to some people, especially when bills are being introduced in the legislature to get rid of tenure overall. So, we were not able to successfully get any of that into the contract and we'll keep at it. Keep supporting us. We'll keep fighting and we'll hope for a change in our governance in Iowa and a change in the law in the long term.

I'll also just note that regarding that bill before the legislature about getting rid of tenure, I do want to thank our lobbyist, Mary **Braun**. Mary **Braun** called me almost immediately after it made it through subcommittee to reassure us that the Board of Regents would be opposed to this, and will push very hard against this and we appreciate that support, but I also said it sounds a little bit hypocritical to me that they're willing to fight that fight in public, but not put it into our contract to make it real to us. So there is that. So we will have a ratification vote on Thursday, February 21st. I'll send out more information about that for those of you who are members. And then I also wanted to announce the date for the Faculty Appreciation Dinner. United Faculty will host a dinner on Saturday, April 13th starting at 6 p.m. in the Commons Ballroom. Finally, if you are a member of UF, you'll soon be getting a call for nominations for UF leadership: President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and our College Representatives and other groups. Thank you.

Zeit: Is everybody eligible to be considered for merit pay based upon our plans?

Hawbaker: Yes. Right? Will the new system apply to the temporary faculty and term faculty as well by next year?

Wohlpart: Not adjuncts.

Zeit: At one point it was said that only the full professors would have—that was way back when, but I'm just saying that at this point, anyone who's on the tenure track could receive merit pay?

Wohlpart: Tenure and tenure-track, and then the real question is term and renewable term. I believe both of those are included in merit as well. We can double check on that. Any full-time faculty member, not adjunct faculty member.

Zeitz: Are they going to be using the –I don't remember what they're called—but the review charts that we're creating, are those the ones that are going to be used for merit pay, or for post-tenure review, as to whether you're going to continue with your job?

Hawbaker: All of it. That's the whole idea behind making this a collaborative process, is that the same standards will be used for PAC, for promotion, for annual review by your department head, and for post-tenure review. That we're all on the same page.

Mattingly: And merit pay.

Petersen: Senator **Zeitz**, I had a meeting with your department head on Friday...

Zeitz: ...I know you did.

Petersen: And we talked about these issues.

Zeitz: Right. Okay. I read that. I just wanted to verify.

Petersen: I just wanted...

Wohlpart: And if I could--I want to be cautious about the language that we're using. Post-tenure review is not about whether you're going to continue to keep your job. Post-tenure review is an opportunity to check in, and for people who are getting "Meets Expectations," which almost all of our faculty do all of the time,

it's a cursory 'check the box' post-tenure review. If there's problems, which would have been identified along the way, faculty will then get to weigh in and say, "Here's an improvement plan. Here are things you need to do differently." It's not, you lose your job—that's not what post-tenure review is. We should not think about it that way, or talk about it that way.

Zeitz: I appreciate that.

Stollenwerk: So with merit pay, is that being put into one pot in the middle, where we then compare individually, or is that being doled out per department?

Hawbaker: What we have negotiated for is the pot. Right, and so the rest of those processes are...

Petersen: The Faculty Evaluation Committee is still working on a formula, playing with the numbers if you will, in the various scenarios. So, that piece has not been formalized or finalized. We're taking those ideas to the Dean's Council, to other faculty groups for feedback.

Stollenwerk: Thank you.

Smith: Who makes the decision on merit pay?

Hawbaker: So, you're evaluated annually by your department head, but they will be using the criteria that we are creating, and that will follow a formula that is being worked out by the committee, and there should be some rough equivalence, across departments and colleges, so we're on the same playing field.

Petersen: So when Becky (**Hawbaker**) stated how important it was to have a voice, make a contribution related to those standards that you're developing within your departments, it is important because those are the standards that you'll be evaluated upon that will determine merit, in addition to your annual review, and also for the purposes of post-tenure. Any other questions? I don't have any announcements, but I do want to invite Kristin (**Ahart**). Do you have any student announcements?

Ahart: Yes, real briefly, we've secured a date for two more regents to come to campus this spring, which we're really excited about. So, I look forward to organizing some classes for us to visit, and hopefully we can come to some of yours. NISG campaigns kicked off today, so cheer on some of your students that are running for office in NISG. It's a big deal. It's a hard campaign trail out there. It's a lot of work, so give them a pat on the back for all the effort that they put in to putting themselves out there to the entire student body to run for these elections. Continue to encourage them to run for office, because it's not too late to declare their campaign. Student Leadership Awards are due on Friday, the 15th, so if you have any nominations for students or organizations that you supervise, don't forget to get those in. It makes a student's day to have those come across their email. Even if they don't end up being a winner for that award, it still means a lot to hear your words of support for them. Then, UNI Day at the Capitol is next Monday the 18th, so we have about 35 students I believe is the last count that I had. We're taking a large charter bus down to the Capitol. We'll be out in the rotunda just hanging out, talking to legislators as they come in and out, and we're really excited about that. It's a big day for UNI to be represented at the Capitol

and to have a larger student voice in that, outside of our traditional legislative liaison team. So, we'll have a good spread of campus represented down there next week. That concludes my report.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Petersen: The Minutes for January 28th have been distributed. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Thank you, Senator **Skaar**, and a second? Thank you, Senator **Varzavand**. Is there any discussion? Any corrections? All in favor of approving the minutes for January 28th, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstentions? Senator **Smith** abstained.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Petersen: We do not have any committee reports today. We do have three items for docketing. Is there a motion to docket these three emeritus requests in a bundle? Thank you, Senator **Zeitz**. And a second? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Any discussion needed regarding these three emeritus requests? They include an emeritus request for Deborah **Giarrusso**, Cynthia **Dunn**, and Anne **Myles**. All in favor of docketing these emeritus requests as a bundle for our next meeting, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKET ITEMS

Petersen: The first item on our docket today is the Consultation by the General Education Revision Committee, to update us on their continued work around the Mission and the Learning Goals. I sent a late email on Saturday morning with

these materials, so I'm hoping you might have had an opportunity to take a look at them. But, let me invite our committee to share.

Kogl: Would you like me to come up there?

Petersen: Yes. That would be great.

Kogl: So, thank you again for having us here to report on where we are in this process. We only met as a committee Friday afternoon, and so we have not had a chance yet to really analyze all of the comments. We've of course looked at the general numbers in response to the survey. We were pretty pleased with those numbers, especially those of us that were on the Mission Statement Subcommittee. We were pleasantly surprised that there was the support for that, but we have not really had a chance to analyze the specific comments for every single one of those outcomes, and we're dividing the labor, and we're going to do that in this coming week to really think through whatever—especially comments that people have around clarity, or around language that we use, because sometimes the Committee knew what it meant by a particular outcome, and comments may have revealed that that was not at all clear. So, we're going to meet again on Friday and we hope the aim is to polish that language; clarify that language as much as we can. Maybe, work a little bit more on the Mission Statement, although we were pretty pleased with the response. Not everybody loved it, but a lot of people liked it as you saw if you looked at the survey. We hope to have something to you to docket very, very soon—did we say a week to our next meeting on Friday? I think we were going to try to have that done. So, we meet Friday early in the morning, and we're going to hope to have that done and have that to you. So, as I said, there are some questions of language;

questions of clarity that we want to work on. There probably aren't any substantive changes that we're looking to make at this point. So, today is the day to let us know if you feel like there are substantive changes that we need to make. There may be one or two outcomes that we may be able to combine, and I say this based on looking very closely at the comments in a couple of the areas. Some of the outcomes I think, particularly the ones around ethical reasoning, maybe could be combined. Certainly maybe could be articulated a little bit more clearly, but that's for the committee to think a little bit more about and decide. One way in which you could perhaps help us is that one of the comments that we've seen a lot is, "this language is too vague." We prefer to think of them as broadly worded, not vaguely worded. That's deliberate because we want faculty members to be able to see their course in an outcome, and if it has to be a measurable outcome, we're sort of walking this line between measurable but also inclusive. That's maybe something that you could help us get that message out, that we're definitely not trying to be unclear. So if it's vague in the sense that people don't know what it means, we'll work on that. But if it's general or broad, then that's kind of the intent. So, once again these are not rubrics. These are just the outcomes. There will be a separate process for figuring out the rubrics. We hope, and I believe we might have discussed this briefly the last time we were here in December, we hope to make the rubrics, and maybe even the outcomes flexible or revisable in the future, so that we don't have to go through this whole process every single time we realize that there's a problem. As I've said, we hope to have a polished version of this in a week to ten days, to this body, so that then you can figure out the process for getting it out one last time for the faculty as a whole, soliciting feedback yourselves if you wish. In other words, we'll put it on

your plate from there. So, what questions do you have for us? I realize you maybe have not had time yet to...

Hesse: Can you pull up the Mission Statement? Is there a reason why General Education doesn't appear in the Mission Statement—that term?

Kogl: Thank you for asking that question. The first survey raised—the results raised a lot of questions about 'What's this going to be called? Is it going to be called the Liberal Arts Core? Is it going to be called General Education? Is it going to be called Core Curriculum?' That right now is kind of a place-holder, so thank you for asking.

Hesse: I bring it up because one of the criticisms of the current LAC has been that members of the general public don't know what it is. Whereas, people tend to have a better understanding of what General Education means. And so I would just say 'UNI's General Education Curriculum.'

Kogl: Perhaps we need to have a separate conversation about okay, "What do we call this?" And I for one am fine with giving people plenty of time to think about that. I know that Jim (**Wohlpart**) and others have talked about how when you have to explain to legislators that we're not trying to turn students all into 'liberals'--It might be useful to move away from that language, but then I've certainly heard from faculty who say "No, no, no—It's always been the Liberal Arts. We need to stand by that." That's a conversation the Committee has not yet really finished having, and I don't think the faculty as a whole. So, thank you for asking that.

Shaw: when we have something to call it, ideally we would like to put it in the second word. So, “UNI’s ---“

Kogl: Whatever it is. And we probably should have or could have flagged that somehow, that this is not necessarily the final language.

Hesse: I don’t want to monopolize the conversation: Outcome #4? What do you mean by “an inclusive setting” at the very top there? And, is that necessary? Could you just say, “demonstrate an ability to work with others period”?

Kogl: Right. So. “Demonstrate an ability to work with others in inclusive settings.” The idea is these are settings in which heterogeneous groups of people have to work together, and they may not all come from the same cultural or religious or economic et cetera background, and one has to be able to speak respectfully across differences. One has to recognize the particularity of one’s own position and background. The word ‘diverse’ settings doesn’t actually work grammatically in that context. Also, ‘diversity’ has become so buzz-wordy. Of course there were a couple of people that commented, “Well inclusive is now a buzz word, too.”

Hesse: That’s a concern I have. I think what you’re trying to accomplish could be done just by leaving off those three words: Just “demonstrate an ability to work with others.”

Shaw: The problem with leaving that out is people will say, “Oh yeah, I work great with others as long as those others agree with me, and have my exact background.”

Kogl: I personally am trying to work on the wording for that. So, whatever suggestions you have, please send them. Please email me. I personally like the language of “working with others across differences to accomplish shared goals.” Something like that, so that there’s a...

Hesse: I like that a lot.

Kogl: I just heard a lot of yesses.

Cutter: I have a questions, but to follow up on that particular thing, I guess what’s confusing to me is it seems when you’re talking, it’s more about understanding different perspectives. ‘Work with others’ sounds to me like it’s about group work in the classroom.

Kogl: So, what the Committee really meant by that was that whether in a political setting or whether in a workplace, one has to do what we’re doing now. One has to actually work with other human beings. And so it’s not necessarily a pedagogical imperative that everybody should assign group work, so much as a recognition that human beings accomplish things together, and there are certain social skills—for lack of a better phrase, that one needs to develop, and that our students don’t necessarily come to us with. So, in other words, we’re trying to capture all of that in a very short phrase. There were comments in which people said it sounds like you’re saying everybody needs to do group work. Or maybe that wasn’t exactly the comment—but something like that. Again, if there were a way to get away from that reading or interpretation of the phrase, I would be happy to suggest it to the Committee as a whole. The challenge is that I think

what we're trying to get at is work in its broadest sense; that when we accomplish things as humans, we do it with others. So that's what we mean.

Cutter: So, "understanding perspectives' wouldn't...

Kogl: That's I think a piece of it. I think it's broader than that.

Shaw: Also, an important thing is the word 'outcomes.' None of these have anything to do with a particular pedagogy or a particular course. We're not saying we should have a course in including. It's an outcome like when they go through the hopper, what would we like to see?

Cutter: But I do think that has led a lot of people to think it's about actually having students work with others in the classroom, right? Because it's set up as an outcome: You will demonstrate an ability to work with others. So I think that doesn't seem to be exactly what you're getting at.

Kogl: Yeah.

Mattingly: Your statement does more of what you're trying to accomplish.

Wohlpart: I would encourage you also to remember that these are the outcomes for the program, which means it's not going to happen in every single course. What do we want students to be able to do when they get done with two years-worth of classes in the General Education?

Koch: Looking at the same one there, when you look 'recognize significance' that suggests the student talks in a way that shows he or she recognizes differences. And then the third one, 'Analyze Identities,' there's an implication of the student

is verbalizing their analysis and demonstration of an ability. It's more like a judgement from the teacher or others on that student, and so I had an issue with that one too. I was thinking in terms of saying stuff like, "The student understands or demonstrates," understanding the source of conflict in settings where cooperation is essential, and so that... It just sounds like parents say, "Use your words well," and that's the kind of thing I was getting at in that particular one. If students could articulate their perception of sources of conflict, which essentially we'd hope would lead to working with others. That was what I've suggested in my comments.

Kogl: Yeah, and I have read the comments for the Human World, because that's my College and that's what I teach in the LAC, and I remember that comment, and I do remember thinking that if there were a way to explicitly talk about conflict as something that's part of the human experience—I couldn't figure out good language for it, but yeah.

Koch: There's a goal of coming out with some kind of result that would require cooperation among diverse opinions and viewpoints, and it might be just the better result is the fact that there's still lack of cooperation, but there's been an expression—a viewpoint and a respectful listening of them.

Kogl: Yeah.

Shaw: And also understanding historical and cultural contexts—are part of it, and I think a lot of people coming in here are not understanding that.

Koch: It's probably been that way all the time. And another thing in terms of the whole vision, it just seems like we're trying to make—students come in not expecting to be confronted with some observations about their understanding of—that they don't have—I'm not expressing myself very well here—but the whole idea that a liberal arts course, like adult education and they think that we're going to get them to talk like professors, and I think LAC should just be about getting an adult understanding of adult ideas that they were taught in childhood, like respect your elders, or—have this or that belief, and make sure you use it during your adult years. But, those can't be explained with language that the child can understand with adult language. And so it's like a matter of engaging with language, and then saying this is all about getting an adult understanding whether you're going to stay in the academy or not, and most aren't going to stay in the academy, but now for four years they're in the academy, and they kind of assume they're supposed to then use a lot of passive voice verbs and sounding like a professor, and that's not. That's something that I try to get rid of in my students, to say, “No, we're trying to get you to think as an adult, not as a professor.” We do want you to be exact in your language and analyze things, and so that's another part that I would like to see in terms of how we present Liberal Arts Core.

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

Cutter: I did get a chance to look at the feedback, and the first thing I want to say is I think this version—it really holds together much better, and there's only one area where it seems like something's a little, still a little—I don't know, incongruous maybe. It's all very skills based, except The Human World. And the

other thing I noticed in a bunch of comments was the Critical Thinking seemed kind of duplicative because you've got different versions of Critical Thinking in other categories. So would it be possible to think about getting rid of Critical Thinking as a separate category, and then maybe taking the Human World and thinking of it in a couple of different categories like Humanistic Thinking, Qualitative Analysis—to get at the various disciplines: your historical and cultural analysis basically there.

Smith: I would add to that that Technological Literacy seems to be missing, but it could be incorporated into the Human World, especially in terms of society and technology and how they impact each other.

Petersen: Thank you, Senator **Smith**.

Choi: I'd like to add some comments about the Human World. I'd like to add some words such as 'respect' and 'appreciation.' For example, we can easily recognize the significance of human differences, "Oh, she's so different from me. He's so different from me." You can recognize it, but not everybody appreciates and respects the differences, so I think the goal of the General Education is to train our students to be good citizens; to contribute to the diverse society. So I would like to emphasize that kind of respect and appreciation.

Burnight: Still on the Human World category, I very much like the short description, "Students will explore a range of views, identities, and cultures," the theme of trying to connect one of the outcomes more to elements in the culture. In terms of Outcome 5, "Analyze these institutions and structures,"—One of my colleagues proposed something that gets at the history of ideas there, like

conceptions of the human condition, was one of the things he proposed, and so maybe a way to sort of expand our notion of culture beyond, “identity, structures, and institutions” to something that includes conceptions of what it means to be human.

Kogl: Yeah, I noted that comment, and one of my fellow committee members suggested ‘beliefs,’ which I realize is not the same as conceptions of the human condition, but it’s shorter and might be easier for—it might be again that kind of more general kind of language. So I’m wondering if that would...because I value that too, and I think it would be nice for that to be in there. Outcome 5 was trying—we were trying to not be so specific that everybody feels like, “What about geography? What about ...” But I think if we’re going to be as specific as we are, then we maybe do want to specify ‘beliefs.’ I also think the other way to go is to say something like, “analyze identities, structures, beliefs, and institutions in a range of contexts.” That’s for the committee to figure out.

Hesse: One more quick one: Outcome #3 “Recognizes significance of human differences.” I would add, “and similarities.” All of the social sciences rest on the premise that we’re more similar than we are different, and we can understand and predict behavior through research.

Kogl: Yeah. I think that’s a very easy one to add, and I think so Senator **Choi’s** comment about respect, I think also. One comment about Outcome 3 was, “That could be read as probably the opposite of what you intend it to be,” meaning, “Notice how different these groups are and they inherently and essentially

different from each other and ne'er the twain shall meet." So I think #3 needs some attention from the Committee.

Zeitz: Maybe, "similarities and differences," rather than, "differences and similarities."

Kogl: Yeah, and I like the language of both conflict and respect, because that's much meatier than just recognizing the significance.

Burnight: I had just one more on the Quantitative Reasoning area. I'm just wondering about why quantitative reasoning, rather than formal reasoning? Was there a reason for that distinction?

Shaw: Formal reasoning means an upside down A, to mean for all, and a backwards E means there exists.

Burnight: I'm sorry. I'm not following.

Hesse: Formal logic.

Shaw: Formal reasoning is—will connote to a lot of people formal logic.

Kogl: So it's more specific than...

Shaw: Which is a very specific topic.

Burnight: See, I was actually under the impression—and maybe I've been talking to too many philosophers, but it actually goes the other way: That formal reasoning would include quantitative reasoning. But quantitative reasoning would not include things like logic and computer science.

Shaw: Right. I was under the opposite impression.

Burnight: Okay. It's something to look into.

Shaw: When you say formal reasoning, that starts to be the 'there exists' and 'what's the contrapositive of the following'?

Burnight: I was doing a little online searching of how other programs define this and so, like Northeastern University, for example has formal and quantitative reasoning. They have them both, and so they frame it like this: "Students study and practice systematic formal reasoning using either the symbolic languages of mathematics and logic, or the combinations of text and symbols, characteristic of computer software."

Shaw: Right.

Burnight: So that seems to get at basically understanding that formal reasoning includes all of these things. Like I said, it's not my area at all, so you would know better on that than I would, for sure.

Kog: It seems like outside of mathematics it's used in a much broader sense, and inside mathematics it's more specific.

Shaw: In computer science, too. Formal reasoning has a very similar...How is it in your field?

Kog: It's more what John (**Burnight**) ...It's broader. It doesn't refer to a specific.

Burnight: Maybe both work. Maybe both terms are possible.

Kogl: Yeah, again we want the language to be inclusionary so that people can...we're not boundary-keepers.

Burnight: Thanks.

Zeitz: Is there a reason that they're in this order? Is there a significance to the order in which they appear?

Kogl: No.

Zeitz: Just a thought, and that would be that, would it make any sense since we take a look at the main goals of UNI, we talk about communication and creative thinking, and that sort of thing. Would it make any sense to put them in—not necessarily the order, but at least put them together, so that it is actually reflecting the goals that we have at UNI? Not that they need to be combined, simply that they're in proximity.

Kogl: Yeah, I will...I think that's a really good idea and we'll certainly discuss it. I think that we're trying to put off discussions that imply a structure at all even, so I think at some point though, once we have a structure, they may sort themselves into something; into an order. It also goes to Barbara's (**Cutter's**) point about one of these things is not the others. Some of them are a little bit more contenty and some of them are not, so that would seem to imply just a cognitive structure to the list.

Zeitz: Sure.

Petersen: Ana (**Kogl**) could I just ask a logistics question? So if you're group is meeting Friday, your plan is to finalize these, send them back to us to share widely with our colleges and departments, and so you're anticipating then that we may then vote before Spring Break?

Kogl: Well, we have...we want to leave that up to you, but I guess in the past, we have hoped that if you think that there are terrible problems--If you want us to go back to the drawing board, we would prefer that you tell us that, than you just vote it down so that we continue a process of refinement. Especially now that we seem to be closer to things that people...It seems that people get where we're going and they're in agreement, they just think that we haven't worded it very well, or it's unintentionally exclusionary, or vague or something. So yeah, we thought we would leave the timeline kind of up to you all.

Petersen: Thanks.

O'Kane: We did envision having it on the Calendar for docketing at possibly the next meeting. But we don't want to rush this onto the docket. We really want to have people have lots of time to think about it.

Petersen: Okay. If we put it on the Calendar for docketing, then everyone would have the final materials two weeks prior. We could check with all of your constituent groups. We could then have discussion on March 11, and potentially decide if we are ready to move forward for a vote, or to send it back. Does that sound agreeable? So if we as a group don't feel ready; confident to vote based on all the feedback we've received, we would then send it back to the Committee

with some direction around particular areas or outcomes; things that we would want addressed.

Kogl: Were there any questions about the ethics? The ethical reasoning-- John **(Burnight)** I'm looking at you. I read the specific comments, but that's an area that...So, for instance, there were a number of comments that said, "I don't know what 'assess personal values' means, and I don't see why it's not subsumed in Outcome 13." I don't want to put you on the spot if you haven't had a chance to a...

Burnight: I'm looking at my notes from the philosopher that has been in communication with you, and he doesn't have anything on this one in the notes that I have.

Skaar: I see those as very different things. So, in School Psychology we talk about both of those very separately. So I would see 'Assess Personal Values' as a time when we talk about our own personal values around identity and dependence, security—lots of different things that we value. And then that's separate from and used for analyzing positions on ethical issues such as who are our clients, and if we have this case, what do we do about that? If somebody breaks confidentiality, what we do about that? Those are ethical issues that are broader than my own personal values. But, I use my personal values to inform how I think about ethical issues. So, I see those two things as very different.

Kogl: That's helpful. I asked the question partly because the comments on those were kind of all over the place. It was very hard to pull out themes on those, so I was just curious if anybody could help honestly. So, that's helpful. Thank you.

Mattingly: I think 'assess' might be part of the problem, because we hope when we assess something that we can evaluate it. Assess is very close to the same word as evaluation; a similar meaning. And so I'm not sure when I read that if we're going to try to teach people to put a score on someone's values. You know what I'm saying?

Kogl: Oh. Yeah, I don't think that's what...

Mattingly: I think there's probably a better descriptor than assess; a better action than 'assess,' that we want our students to do.

Cutter: And when you were talking about it, I was thinking do you mean 'understand your worldview'? I was having the same problem with it—with the word 'assess.'

Kogl: Yeah.

Smith: 'Identify' might be a better word choice.

Kogl: Yes. Thank you.

Skaar: As a person who teaches teachers how to write these things, I keep hearing words that make me cringe a little bit. 'Understand' [Laughter] That's the one. 'Understand,' isn't generally a measurable verb. So when we think about 'assess,'—I totally see your point and I like the word 'evaluate' better, because

evaluate means deeper, really kind of digging into your personal values; 'identify' means I know what they are—but not digging into them. So as you guys have chosen your verbs, I have been appreciating the fact that it doesn't say 'understand.' That you have really dug into some of the deeper kinds of things that we do in the classes besides simply identifying things, or describing things, but really getting into analysis, creation, evaluation, and some of those deeper cognitive things that we want our students to actually be able to do, and they're not sort of the shallow level of learning, but a deeper level of learning. So, I want everybody to be mindful that they are charged with—the Committee is charged with creating measurable outcomes, and the word 'understand' is really hard to measure. How do we know if you understand? How do we know that? We have to see you analyze something; create something, describe something, explain something, evaluate something to know whether you understand, and I think that's where...I could be wrong.

Kogl: No. Thank you. That's exactly right. We have tried, and some of us are more well-versed in the language of writing good outcomes than others, and those that are good at it have to remind the rest of us—you can't measure 'understanding.' Which continually frustrates me because I just want to say, "I understand things."

Skaar: I know. I know.

Kogl: But I didn't realize that 'assess'—that...

Cutter: Has a different meaning.

Skaar: I like 'evaluate' better than 'assess' in that context.

Kogl: And it is tempting to just fall back on ‘analyze’ then all the time.

Skaar: It is, but those are different things, right? You analyze something—it’s different than evaluating. Evaluating is judgement. You’re really judging these ethical issues, and putting judgements against one another rather than just breaking them apart. So, they’re two different things.

Mattingly: I think it also makes a difference that you said, “What we really want is for the student to evaluate their own personal values,” rather than...this makes it seem like we’re going to put a bunch of people together and say, ‘score them.’

Skaar: That would be terrible.

Mattingly: That’s the thing that ran through my mind as I read this.

Kogl: That would be terrible.

Mattingly: We don’t want to do that.

Cutter: I do worry about the same thing with ‘evaluate.’ ‘Analyze,’ I think would be better because you don’t necessarily want--It suggests that if you analyze something, you may or may not want to change it, and I wouldn’t expect that all students are going to be changing all their personal values by learning about them.

Kogl: Yeah.

Koch: I was wondering why Outcome 4 was the demonstrating an ability to work with others in inclusive settings, and then that kind of dovetails or links to this one on ethical reasoning, because you identify the sources of your personal

values, and you understand the sources of your values, and that kind of works with that one.

Kogl: Yes.

Koch: And so you would perceive the sources of your values, and you recognize strengths and weaknesses in them.

Kogl: I'm in absolute agreement, but it sort of...Welcome to our world. We're trying to tease these things apart, because ultimately Critical Thinking is in so many of them. Communication is in so many of them. This self-assessment in a sense or of one's own... 'Why do I think this way about that? Where did that come from? Is that upheld by science or logic?' All of these things are so interrelated, and yet if we have to make them measurable outcomes, we have to articulate them I think as very separate, sometimes in ways that as instructors, it feels artificial. At least to me, it feels very artificial to sort of identify this is the outcome I'm trying to achieve here.

Shaw: It's very reductionist.

Kogl: Yeah.

Koch: I was just saying eventually, they would see connections between like...

Kogl: One would hope.

Skaar: And thinking about ethical reasoning, like I think it's so important to separate it out from other things, because there's ethical reasoning happening in science, in math, in the Human World stuff, in all the things, and so you wouldn't

want to incorporate it just into one, because that means that we're not necessarily having to do it in all the things, and we want it to be something bigger and broader. I think that's such an important one that we want to see potentially happen in science courses, potentially happen where we typically see it a lot in philosophy and that kind of thing. But we want to encourage ethical reasoning in those other maybe places where maybe that maybe it doesn't exist right now, or it only exists a little bit, and we want to encourage that happening and that continue to happen and grow.

Petersen: Excellent discussion. Are there other questions, comments?

Zeitz: I have one I haven't been able to figure out an answer to it though, but the idea of using 'critical' in the definition of "Critical Thinking" is a problem, because you're defining it with the term that your entering with.

Shaw: You're saying in Outcome 6, the word 'critical'?

Zeitz: Yeah in Outcome 6, where it says, "Engage in Critical Thinking." So what does that mean? It says they need to engage in effective, meaningful, critical inquiry to address complex topics.

Shaw: It's not a definition though, it's an outcome.

Zeitz: That's a good point. I'm sorry. Good point.

Shaw: And the reason you're saying it maybe because in an earlier time we visited, we were putting together lists to help define things. But we're not doing that now. This would be the actual outcome.

Zeitz: Good. Okay. Thank you.

Petersen: Any other comments?

Wohlpart: I only want to remind everybody that I think the Provost has closed campus in 35 minutes. [Laughter] I don't want to cut off this conversation. It's been fantastic.

Petersen: Thank you so much. We'll look forward to those final draft documents.

Shaw: Thank you very much.

Petersen: Thanks, Doug (**Shaw**). Joyce **Morrow** is here to present on the Purple and Old Gold Award, and I'm wondering in an effort to get to that agenda item if we might want to consider that Consultation before the Proposal to Revise the Emeritus Status? Would that be okay? So could I have a motion to move the Purple and Old Gold Award Consultation up to the top of the Docket? Thank you Senator **Burnight**. Second by Senator **O'Kane**. All in favor of making that move, please indicate by saying, 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. Joyce?

Henninger: I'm actually here to introduce it. Do you want us to come up here?

Petersen: Oh sure, yes please do.

Henninger: I'm sorry I wasn't here for introductions. I was down at the UNI Days at D.M.A.A.C., and winter is coming. The White King is coming. So, we have the Purple and old Gold Meritorious and Conspicuous Achievement Awards. They've been around at UNI for a while. This issue came up basically because whenever people—entities, wanted to have another Purple and Old Gold Award, it went through and there weren't real set standards for who should be able to give one:

Was it to a unit; was it to a program? So we attempted to kind of codify that. With that being said before we get into the definitions, it is given by the Registrar's Office, so this is a Consultation with the Senate. And also, no one is losing their award. So all awards that are out there right now, stay—no matter what this changes to. So no one is getting one taken away. This is for moving forward if somebody wants another award.

Morrow: I don't have a lot more to add other than what we have up above on the screen. Hopefully you've had a little chance to read it. The definitions are first. We didn't change anything with the definition of who qualifies for it. All we did was fine-tune the process. After I took this role, and after we had some new people in the Provost's Office, we started being asked, "Can we have an award? Can we have an award? How do we get an award?" So we wanted to put a little structure to it, and then looked at the history. I know that Patrick (**Pease**) had worked with the Library and they dug up some history of the past history of it. So we wanted to keep the integrity of it, but just give it a little structure of when it would be re-evaluated. So anytime the catalog or the curriculum changes substantially, it would be looked at as to who is getting the awards. If there is a real definite opinion that an award should be offered, then there is a process for that, and we just wanted to add that to the piece.

Henninger: We will take any suggestions from you all.

Hesse: I actually received this award 20 years ago, so I'm glad that no one is going to be taking it away. [Laughter] I just wanted a clarification: On the UNI Cumulative Grade Index, that is just UNI classes, correct?

Morrow: Correct.

Zeitz: There's nothing here that identifies whether it's graduate or undergraduate.

Morrow: It is undergrad. I'm sorry. I'll make sure that...Good point. Thanks.

Zeitz: You might want to put it in the title maybe, or someplace where it really jumps out.

Morrow: Perfect. Great. I did want to all share that this is Nicole **Lehman**, and if you haven't met her, I wanted to bring her here to get to know Nicole. She works closely with Commencement and all of these functions, so I wanted you to have an idea who Nicole was.

Petersen: Thank you. Welcome Nicole (**Lehman**).

Morrow: Thank you all.

Petersen: That brings us then to the Proposal to Revise the Emeritus Policy, and this proposal will require a vote on our part. Senator **Koch**, would you introduce what it is you are proposing?

Koch: I was asked to carry this football, and organize a petition to take to the Policy Review Board, and so I created the Preamble for justifying this change; the removal of a word—removing the word 'non-temporary' from the policy. And so it needs an originating body, and so I brought this to the Senate to ask if they would be the originating body, and then take this to the Policy Review Board.

Petersen: So this is like any other policy that has sometimes come up from Educational Policy Committee, sometimes originates here. We can have discussion about this proposed revision. If we feel that we are all in agreement, we can go ahead and take a vote to make this revision and it would move on to the Policy Review Committee.

Mattingly: One question, just for clarification. It seems to me Bill (**Koch**) that the only change we're making at all is that now, adjunct faculty members will also be able to be emeritus.

Koch: Yes. Non-temporary would imply the adjuncts so, and it does say they've been here for at least 10 years.

Mattingly: It would be the same rules.

Hesse: And 20 years in Higher Education. I would point out, if you've been in Higher Education for 20 years, you're not temporary. That's part of the idea behind this. Plus, if you've been here at UNI for 10 years, you're not temporary.

Strauss: I have a question. For emeritus faculty—and thank you all for voting for me. [Laughter]—Well, for full time faculty, you generating so many hours per week, or so many hours per year. As an adjunct faculty, you would be teaching one course per/? Two? Three? Four? So how does that factor in in your thinking?

Koch: I can only speak from my experience, and those adjuncts I know. The life of most of the adjuncts I know is pretty much a full-time pre-occupation; occupation

and pre-occupation. We're thinking about our classes all the time, and changing classes trying to improve our pedagogy and things like that.

Strauss: I'm not questioning that. I'm just wondering when you say 'full-time' what does that mean? What does a full-time adjunct teach? How many classes?

Koch: Three classes.

Hesse: No, four.

Strauss: Four? So, when you say 10 years, does that mean as a full-time adjunct for 10 years? Or could you be considered as an adjunct if you teach one class per semester for ten years? Is there any way it's going to be measured?

Smith: In the statement it says, "Eligibility requirements include a minimum of 20 years creditable full-time or part-time service in Higher Education, with a minimum accumulation of 10 years at UNI."

Strauss: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that.

Smith: It says, "Eligibility requirements include full-time or part-time service."

Strauss: So, you could just teach one per semester, instead of being full time for 20 years or 10 years. Okay. Thank you.

O'Kane: Is it too late to request that be changed? Just delete part-time?

Petersen: That would be an amendment to this proposal, and that would change the entirety of the criteria for all faculty.

O’Kane: I think Senator **Strauss** has a good point to make. If you taught one semester, your one class for ten years, as opposed to full-time.

Petersen: It would change it for all faculty though, so our part time tenure-track...

Hawbaker: Or the phased retirement in your last few years, and you needed that to get to your ten years...

O’Kane: Oh, so it wouldn’t...

Koch: Don’t you think the department heads have to sign-off on this, and so maybe this kind of concern would be cut off right there at the department level and...

Mattingly: And we vote on it, too. In this body, too.

Koch: And we vote, too.

O’Kane: That’s true.

Strauss: I don’t understand. How does this change it for full-time faculty?

Petersen: So the current policy reads that the criteria is full or part time, and so if we change that, it would change it for any faculty that would be using this policy to apply for emeritus status.

Strauss: How is it now?

Petersen: Full or part-time.

Strauss: It is full or part-time?

Petersen: Yes.

Strauss: I see.

Wohlpart: It does not include adjuncts, non-temporary faculty. So a faculty member could be here for full time for eight years and then go into phased retirement for two years, and still get emeritus. If they were here as a part-time faculty member, they would be an adjunct. We don't have any part-time, full-time faculty members. We have some full-time, part-time faculty members. [Laughter] How is that for language?

Strauss: This is getting above my pay grade.

Zeitz: I was having a problem trying to figure out how would a full part-time person be—that was in the case of phased retirement that would still count.

Wohlpart: I assume so.

Petersen: But we do have many adjuncts. We have a number of adjuncts who have served for a number of decades here in roles that extend beyond merely part-time, very consistently.

Smith: Are Term considered temporary? They're full-time. I just wondered how that's affected, because they can be here for a long time, too.

Petersen: Term and Renewable-Term are currently eligible.

Zeitz: So adjunct is the only thing we're adding.

Petersen: Yes.

Gould: I believe Iowa State does give emeritus status to adjunct faculty, but I can't find it off the top of my search.

Hesse: We've given emeritus status to at least one adjunct. I think that person slipped through the cracks, but he has emeritus status officially. [Laughter]

Petersen: Is there a motion to approve the proposal that we remove the term 'non-temporary,' so as to include adjuncts as eligible for emeritus status when they meet all other current criteria? Thank you, Senator **Hesse**, and seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Is there additional discussion?

Zeitz: So what came of that discussion of what you pointed out as to whether they're going to be full-time adjuncts? Full-time, Temporary: I think that needs to be included in the verbage, so that we're looking at full-time rather than a person whose been an adjunct one class per semester for 10 years or 20 years.

Strauss: I think you start to get in trouble if you do that. It puts the whole policy into...

Petersen: I think you would have to propose some additional language that would put that type of caveat in the proposed revision.

Stafford: If someone was part-time over 10 years, then that would disqualify them.

Zeitz: Some way so that the—you're right. It's tricky.

Petersen: It is, but one way to alleviate this is I think someone suggested that at the department head level, perhaps the department head might choose to reject such a proposal because the department head is not comfortable moving an application forward if someone has served in only one section for a number of years. The College Senate Chair also votes, and then it comes to us. We certainly would have that discretion as well, and then it goes to the Provost and the President. So, there are some other layers where they could be weeded out if that were the desire to do so.

Strauss: I'm sorry, but that sounds arbitrary and capricious now. Either you have a policy where you have a clear view of who gets emeritus or not. And so if you have one department head that says 'yes,' that looks good, and another one who doesn't—when you start to act in an arbitrary and capricious manner, that's when you end up in the courts.

Petersen: Senator **Strauss**, your point is interesting because I think we had a very similar discussion last year in the Senate, but I think the concern there was that we simply merely approve all of these without much consideration.

Stafford: Right.

Varzavand: So why not, for the sake of argument, quantify it? Whether based on a class; hours, it's easily done.

Petersen: So it would read, "Eligibility requirements include a minimum of 20 years of credible full-time or half-time service in Higher Ed, with a minimum of 10 years of service at UNI."

Zeit: That would take care of the phased retirement, wouldn't it? That's good.

Hesse: I would be okay with that, but I will point out that the number of people who only teach one class for 10 years is a very, very small number.

Wohlpert: I don't think that's true.

Hesse: Really?

Wohlpert: I don't think that's true. Absolutely. I don't think that's true. We have about 170 adjuncts. The average number of sections taught per adjunct is 1.9, and there are quite a few adjuncts who teach three, which means there's quite a few adjuncts that teach one.

Zeit: I have two adjuncts that have taught the same class for eight years, one class per semester.

Wohlpert: It's very different in the Humanities and very different in CHAS than it is say in Business, certainly. A lot of them teach just one class, and just once a year sometimes.

Hesse: Those numbers can be pulled down by the Music folks, who do music lessons, which is actually less than a class.

Wohlpert: So we are actually pulling the numbers if you want some data. We are pulling adjuncts, and the number of sections they have taught for the last five years each semester.

Hawbaker: On the other hand, if they've taught that long, even if it's one class, they've made a contribution to the University. I mean, why not give them emeritus status?

Hesse: And tenure somewhere else, too.

Mattingly: It still has to be 20 years total.

Stafford: That's a significant life contribution.

Petersen: So, I would be willing to entertain a motion. Either the... The current version.

Zeitz: Without that modification about half-time.

Petersen: Without?

Skaar: Can we add the friendly modification?

Zeitz: Can we make an amendment?

Hesse: We've motioned on the current version.

Petersen: So all in favor of the current version, which would remove the non-temporary, which would make it possible for any adjunct to seek emeritus status through the typical criteria, all in favor...

O'Kane: Does a 'no' vote mean that I'm for the next revision? Do you see what I'm saying? In other words, if you want to revise it, should we say 'no'?

Petersen: I would suggest saying 'no' if you want to revise it. I think I might have to count. [Laughter] All in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye' and perhaps maybe a hand would be helpful. I don't think I vote. So there is nine.

Wohlpart: You'll have to ask for 'no' because people may abstain.

Petersen: We've never gotten this complicated. [More laughter] All of those opposed? Five. We need to record names, right? Probably?

Mattingly: I don't think so.

Petersen: This is going to be an interesting transcript. Any abstentions? Three abstentions. Alright, so the motion passes. Thank you, all. It got a little complicated on me. I think we could take on one last issue before 5:00, and that would be the Revocation of Emeritus Status for John **Longnecker**. He retired from UNI in 2000, after 33 years as an Assistant Math Professor. In 2016, he was arrested and convicted in Arkansas on sexual abuse and rape charges. Our emeritus policy gives us the opportunity to recommend revocation of an individual's emeritus status. And so this would be a motion to revoke that we would vote on, and then we would pass it up the chain as a recommendation.

Strauss: So moved.

Zeitz: Second.

Petersen: Is there any additional discussion?

Alam: Can I ask something? He was an Assistant Professor for 33 years?

Petersen: Yes. Yes. That was Senator **Strauss** who made the motion. Senator **Zeitz** seconded it. Yes. Is there any additional discussion?

Zeitz: I think he was given 90 years in prison.

Petersen: 99.

Stafford: Some serious stuff.

Strauss: Is he still checking out books and things like that?

Zeitz: It's his parking pass that we're looking at.

Mattingly: Using our electronic databases for heaven knows what.

Petersen: All in favor of recommending The Revocation of Emeritus Status for John **Longnecker**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? And any abstentions? Thank you, the motion passes.

Strauss: Are we going to inform him?

Petersen: There has been some correspondence with some family members that have had an interest in this and so I will update them and let those individuals know.

Strauss: Can you characterize their interest?

Petersen: I think that we could do one more potentially, or at least get the discussion started, that is the Revision to our Senate Bylaws. If it seems to be a long discussion, we can table it and continue it at our next meeting. This petition is a petition that Jim (**Mattingly**) and I have put forth. We have been working all year on trying to shore up our infrastructure just a little bit to improve how we

work as a Senate so that we can be confident in our shared governance and our activities. And what we are suggesting is that we do a few things to our current Bylaws. The first addition that we would like to make is to make the position of a Former Chair, so that we have three consecutive years of individuals who are in a leadership role, and that there is continuity and consistency in sharing information across those years, so that it doesn't feel as though when you take on the role of Faculty Chair, that the learning curve is so great, and then you're done.

Mattingly: And to spread the workload across another person. It's a lot.

Petersen: The second change that we are proposing in the Bylaws is with the Secretary position. And what we would like to do is to open that position up to any UNI faculty member across campus, just so that it does not necessarily need to be someone who is currently on our Senate. That helps a bit with the workload as well, so that you don't necessarily—you're not voting so you can do some of the behind-the-scenes kinds of work if you're not coming from the Senate. And the other revision is very minor. In the Bylaws, the Chair is--some of the Chair responsibilities are articulated, and those Chair responsibilities name a number of committees. Jim (**Mattingly**) and I serve on a number of committees. What we would like to do is articulate that committee membership and those responsibilities in our Faculty Senate Handbook, as opposed to them being in the Bylaws, so we have a little flexibility with who is serving. Again, depending on the workload and what might come about.

Gould: I'm trying to find that change.

Petersen: I think I took it out. It was deleted. It was a strike out: 3.2.3. So, to summarize: The addition of a Former Chair position, the opportunity to recruit a Senate Secretary from any UNI Faculty on campus, and removing the responsibility of the Chairperson to serve as the Co-Chair of the Committee on Committees.

O’Kane: What would happen in the case where a Chair was in their third or sixth year? So when they step down from the Chair, the Emeritus Chair then presumably could be here, but I don’t know that they would have a vote. They will have not been elected.

Petersen: Let me take on this example. So if this were my second year on the Senate...

O’Kane: So if this were your sixth year... [Interrupted by Library closing announcement.]

Petersen: Hypothetically—this is actually my third year on the Senate, so I’m technically done. So next year if I return as the Former Chair, I don’t have a vote. If I return, if this was my second year, and I return to complete my term as both a Senator and a Former Chair, I believe I would have a vote in that.

O’Kane: I agree. Do we need that language in there? Or is it...

Petersen: To clarify that? I could certainly write some additional language.

Mattingly: Actually, I believe the way it stands right now, when an officer of the Senate remains a voting member of the Senate until they're no longer an officer.

O'Kane: There is that language? So it could go longer than six years?

Mattingly: It could go longer than six years. So if they're elected and an officer...

O'Kane: See how tricky it is. That means that the college has to elect another... do they elect another Senator?

Mattingly: Not until the person is no longer an officer of the Senate.

O'Kane: Doesn't that then throw off the rotation and then you end up with everybody's new?

Mattingly: I don't know. It wouldn't do that. It doesn't mess up the staggering because what we do when somebody has to come off of the Senate in the middle of their term, like if they retire for example, then somebody else comes into that seat. Either we elect them or we can appoint them—the Committee on Committees can appoint them to finish that term, and then they could be elected for their own first term when they finish someone else's term.

O'Kane: Got it.

Mattingly: So they are in their zero term when they're finishing someone else's term. Does that help?

O'Kane: Yes.

Mattingly: We keep very close track now of the staggering of every seat.

O’Kane: As long as that language that you said is in there is in there. I don’t remember seeing it. But if it’s in there, we’re good.

Mattingly: It’s in there that they actually would be a voting member, until they are no longer an officer of the Senate: until their term is finished. Where is it?

Petersen: Other discussion, questions?

Mattingly: Here it is: If the rising (This is in 3.0) Chairperson’s service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as Vice-Chair, the term shall be automatically extended. But this says for one year, so we have to change that to be two years.

O’Kane: Yes.

Petersen: Are you making that friendly amendment, Senator **O’Kane**?

O’Kane: Sure. I make that motion to make that friendly amendment.

Petersen: Thank you.

O’Kane: I think it needs a second.

Petersen: Senator **Burnight**, a second. Thank you. Okay. Do we feel comfortable? I think we have a motion. We’ve had discussion. All in favor of the proposed changes to the Bylaws, please indicate by saying ‘aye.’ Any opposed? And any abstentions? Alright, the motion passes. Thank you. Is there a motion to adjourn, Mitch (**Strauss**)?

Mattingly: There we go.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Monday, February 25, 2019
Scholar Space (301) Rod Library
University of Northern Iowa