

3-25-2019

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 25, 2019

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright ©2019 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](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, March 25, 2019" (2019).  
*Faculty Senate Documents*. 1251.  
[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/1251](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1251)

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

**Regular Meeting**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**3/25/19 (3:30 – 4:36)**  
**Mtg. #1822**  
**SUMMARY MINUTES**  
**Scholar Space (301) Rod Library**

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

**Guests:** Brenda **Bass**, Dale **Cyphert**, David **Grant**, Ana **Kogl**, Doug **Shaw**.

**Courtesy Announcements:**

UNI President **Nook** detailed the committee members and their ongoing search for a UNI Vice President for Advancement. Campus interviews will be held May 21-24. **Nook** spoke about the legislature's current budget for Regents universities, and lauded the interview content given by UNI wrestler Drew **Foster** after clinching the 184-pound national title this weekend. **(See pages 4-6)**

Provost **Wohlpart** announced that Acting Director Julianne **Gassman** has been named Director of Community Engagement following a search, and that candidates for the Dean of the Library will be on campus before the end of the semester. **(See pages 6-7)**

Faculty Chair **Barbara** Cutter explained that survey results on Faculty Voting rights will be sent out via email. Receiving faculty feedback, the Voting Rights Committee will finalize their proposal which faculty will vote on at the Fall Faculty Meeting. **(See pages 7-8)**

United Faculty President Becky **Hawbaker** reminded faculty of the Saturday April 13<sup>th</sup> Faculty Appreciation Dinner. Faculty may nominate anyone—administrators, department heads, politicians, journalists, other faculty members who have taken a stand for faculty members. **(See page 8)**

**NISG Vice President Kristin Ahart** told faculty that students are invited to provide feedback about College Hill parking needs. Students are working towards sexual assault prevention education that is, “more holistic and continuous.” This week , students meet with the Executive Director of the Board of Regents to review student priorities. **(See pages 8-9)**

**Minutes For Approval:**

March 11, 2019 **(Stafford/Mattingly)** All aye.

**Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing:**

**\*\* (O’Kane/Gould)** Motion to docket as bundle for April 8. Passed. All aye.

- 1448 [Effort Certification Guidance and Procedure Update](#)
- 1449 [Consultation on Department Head and Assessment by Faculty Committee Recommendations](#)
- 1450 [Cancellation Policy 4.07 Proposal](#)
- 1451 [Committee on Committee Recommendation to Discharge Writing Committee](#)
- 1452 [Emeritus Request for Mary Christ](#)

**Consideration of Docket Items:**

**\*\* (Burnight/Stafford)** Motion to move **1445/1324** to last on the agenda.)  
Passed. All aye.

[1444](#) [1323](#) [GERC Consultation](#)  
Committee will return on April 22. **(See pages 12-16)**

[1445](#) [1324](#) [Regents Award](#)  
**\*\* (Stafford/Burnight)** Motion to move to Executive Session 4:29 p.m.  
**\*\* (O’Kane/Stafford).** Motion to accept two named nominees. Passed.

[1446](#) [1325](#) [Emeritus Request for Gerald Smith](#)  
**\*\* (O’Kane /Stafford)** Motion passed. All aye. **(See pages 16-17)**

[1447](#) [1326](#) [Writing Committee Update](#) **(See pages 18-34)**

**Adjournment: (Burnight/Gould)** 4:36.

**Next Meeting:**

3:30 p.m. Monday, April 8, 2019      Scholar Space (301) Rod Library  
University of Northern Iowa

***A complete transcript of 35 pages and 0 addendum follows.***

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

**March 25th, 2019**

**Present:** Senators Imam **Alam**, John **Burnight**, Cathy **DeSoto**, Faculty Senate Secretary Gretchen **Gould**, Kenneth **Hall**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Faculty Senate Vice-Chair Jim **Mattingly**, Senators Amanda **McCandless**, Steve **O’Kane**, Faculty Senate Chair Amy **Petersen**, Senators Mark **Sherrad**, Gloria **Stafford**, Sara **Smith**, and Shahram **Varzavand**. **Also Present:** NISG Vice President Kristin **Ahart**, UNI Faculty Chair Barbara **Cutter**, United Faculty Chair Becky **Hawbaker**, UNI President Mark **Nook**, Associate Provost John **Vallentine**, and Provost Jim **Wohlpart**.

**Not Present:** Senators Peter Neibert, Nicole **Skaar**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Andrew **Stollenwerk**, Leigh **Zeitz**, Associate Provost Patrick **Pease**,

**Guests:** Brenda Bass, Dale **Cyphert**, David **Grant**, Ana **Kogl**, Doug **Shaw**.

**CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Petersen:** Welcome back. Let me call our Senate meeting to order. I don’t believe there are any press, but I know we have a number of guests with us today. I will give you just a moment and then I’ll let you introduce yourself. I know we are also missing a number of people. The College of Education is having their annual Spring Meeting, so I know we are missing Nikki (**Skaar**) and Leigh (**Zeitz**). So that’s why we have fewer people here today. Let me go back to our guests; give you all an opportunity to introduce yourself, state why you are here, and then we can move on to our announcements.

**Wohlpart:** And she's not asking existentially why you're here. [Laughter] If you have an answer to that post-Spring Break, we would like to hear it.

**Kogl:** I'm Ana **Kogl** for the Gen Ed Revision Committee.

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

**Wohlpart:** Those are existential crises. [Laughter]

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

**Cyphert:** Dale **Cyphert** from the Writing Committee.

**Grant:** Dave **Grant** from the Writing Committee.

**Petersen:** Thank you all for joining us again today. Announcements, President **Nook?**

**Nook:** I've got three that I want to share with you. As most everyone knows, we've started a search for Vice President for Advancement. There'll be an email out to the campus tomorrow to update everybody on where that search is at. The Committee's been formed. It's a twelve or thirteen-member committee. We had a person who was named to it who has since resigned from the University, and her last day is coming up so she won't be on it. So we're looking at whether or not we fill that position. There are a couple of faculty members on this search--two faculty members, Bill **Henninger** from the School of applied Human Sciences and Suzanne **Riehl**, a faculty member in the Department of Mathematics; a student, Chet **Adams** is representing students on that committee. The one thing I really want to bring your attention to in this search is the on-campus interviews are

going to be after the end of the semester unfortunately. It's just the way the timing is going to work out—May 21 through 24. So I wanted to make sure you knew that as soon as we knew it and got the timeline worked out for that. We'll have a website up and running here probably within the next few days on this search as well. It's being chaired by David **Harris**, the Athletic Director and by Katie **Mulholland**, an alum from the College of Education; a former superintendent at Linn-Mar. She'll be serving as the Co-chair with David (**Harris**). I'd be happy to answer any questions about that. The other just quickly, legislative House budget came out from State Legislature and the system—the three Regents institutions that asked collectively for \$18 million: \$4 million for us, \$7 million for each of the others in their budget, they sent \$15.9 million to the Regents to decide how they want to move it around. Everything we've heard is that we'll most likely get the \$4 million. The reduction of \$2.1 will come from the other two institutions. Of course that's not known until the Regents actually vote on it, but it's leaning that way. Still waiting to hear really on what might happen with our infrastructure request on the ITC. Some of the big news on campus: I wouldn't normally share this, but I want to share a story associated with it. So on Saturday, Drew **Foster** won the national title in wrestling, and is our first NCA champion in over 20 years at 184-pounds. The thing that I really want to share about that is you really ought to listen to his interviews. You'll be extremely proud of him and of being a Panther with what he said after that, and in particular, this one kind of got lost in all the shuffle: They interviewed the wrestler that won the weight class just before him and they asked him about going on to the Olympics and he had this grandiose training plan all set. They asked Drew (**Foster**) "Are you going on to the Olympics?" and he said, "I've got to student teach first." So, it's

too bad the College of Ed isn't here today, but it was really heartwarming to listen to him talk about the people around him. Immediately after the match, he's still sweating, breathing hard, he's sitting on the edge of the raised platform, they ask him what it's like. He says, "I just need to shout out to my teammates and to Steve—Steve, keep up your fight, you'll win it." And the guy asked him, "Who's Steve?" and he says, "He's a kid back home that's fighting cancer." He's just won a national title and he's thinking about other people. He talks about his mom. He talks about the other guys in the wrestling room, his coaches and this other person who means an awful lot to him. So--extremely proud of this--not just this student-athletes, but all the students we put out there. And by far he gave the best, most real, down-to-earth interview of all the champions that were crowned this weekend. So if you have a little time and want to see what he had to say, it's kind of worth a listen. You'll feel pretty good about what's going on at the University of Northern Iowa

**Wohlpart:** I think he went on to say, "I'd like to stay in wrestling. I'd like to give back with wrestling. So much has been given to me, but student teaching is also a really good way to give back, and I'm honored to do that,"—or something like that.

**Nook:** It's worth a listen. If I can get a hold of the tape, we'll post it a few places. I haven't been able to get my hands on it yet. That's all I have to say.

**Petersen:** Provost **Wohlpart?**

**Wohlpart:** Two searches that we are in the midst of and one we just finished: Director of Community Engagement. I don't know if you all will remember this,

but before I came, Pat **Geadelmann** created that position and appointed Julianne **Gassman** into that role. One of the things I promised was that we would do a search for that if it was a core component of our Strategic Plan, which it became. It's the third goal in the Strategic Plan. We've developed a civic action plan around that in the Master Plan. So we did run the search. Julianne **Gassman** has been named the permanent Director of Community Engagement—no surprise there, but I did want to that as a public search. And the Dean of the Library search is moving forward. I think we just finished phone interviews with several very strong candidates and will invite candidates to campus here in the next couple of weeks. [Says to Gretchen **Gould**] Do you have anything more specific to add to that?

**Gould:** You know more than I do. [Laughter]

**Wohlpart:** So look for those candidates to be coming to campus before the end of the semester. That's it.

**Petersen:** Faculty Chair **Cutter**?

**Cutter:** I just wanted to give a quick update on the Voting Rights Committee's work. You may have forgotten by now, but thank you for filling out the survey we sent you almost a month ago, and we've had time to get all the results together and we had a 36% response rate, which is apparently quite good. So thank you again for that. We met and started talking about the results, and we decided what we're going to do is send out another email to the community summarizing results so you know what people thought, what the major themes were. We want to address some questions that came up, and so we want to do that in the next week or two, and then we're going to meet again and try to, using the feedback



from the survey, develop our final proposal to be ready for the Fall Faculty Meeting for a vote when we do that on changing the Faculty Constitution. That's all I have.

**Petersen:** Thank you. United Faculty President **Hawbaker**?

**Hawbaker:** Just another reminder about the Faculty Appreciation Dinner, which will be Saturday, April 13<sup>th</sup>. The RSVP will be coming out in a day or two, once we've finalized our speakers. I also want to invite people if you have someone you want to nominate for an award; someone who has supported faculty in some important way this year. People have asked what the categories are, and we don't give the same ones out every single year because—but generally, we honor administrators, department heads, politicians, journalists, other faculty members—so anyone who has taken a stand to stand with faculty or to support you or someone you know in an important way, we can make that an award. I think that is all.

**Petersen:** I don't have any announcements, but let me ask Kristin (**Ahart**)—do you happen to have any announcements from our students?

**Ahart:** Yes. Just a quick couple of announcements. On Thursday we'll be meeting—it will be a stakeholder meeting about parking on College Hill and so we have a couple of students who are voicing some feedback on our needs for parking in that area, and so we're excited to have a voice at that table, to be considered a stakeholder in that. Then moving forward, we've had a phenomenal group of students that are working towards sexual assault prevention education that is a little bit more holistic as well as continuous throughout our careers here

at UNI, and so if you know the students that are working on that, give them a pat on the back. They've been doing a lot of hard work and I'm excited to see where it goes moving forward. But if you have any questions about that, feel free to reach out and I can get you in contact with our leads on that project. Tomorrow morning we'll be meeting with the Executive Director of the Board of Regents to go over student priorities, so we're excited.

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

**Petersen:** The minutes for our meeting from March 11 have been disseminated. Is there a motion to approve these minutes? Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Mattingly**. Is there any discussion needed? All in favor of approving the minutes from March 11, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions. The motion passes.

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

**Petersen:** There are no committee reports this afternoon, but we do have a number of items for docketing for our next meeting on April 8<sup>th</sup>. I did send you all some short context, so you have a sense of these items. I'm going to request that we docket these as a bundle. Is there a motion to docket these items as a bundle? Thank you, Senator **O'Kane**. Is there a second? Thank you Senator **Gould**. Is there any discussion needed? Any of these items need further explanation or do we need to pull any of these out to bundle separately?

**Vallentine:** This is a question maybe for you and maybe for Becky (**Hawbaker**): You have the Consultation on Department Head and Assessment by Faculty

Committee. Are you talking about the administrator and faculty committee, or are these just recommendations coming from the faculty? Because it was a group of three administrators and three faculty members.

**Hawbaker:** It was a committee--it's just a little wordy. It's the assessment of department heads by faculty committee. [Laughter]

**Petersen:** So the committee...

**Hawbaker:** It's a committee made up of administrators and faculty.

**Vallentine:** Okay. Great. Just clarification.

**Petersen:** And I think I did indicate that in some of the context I provided through email.

**Vallentine:** Thank you.

**Hesse:** Am I understanding that 1450 is being put forth by a student?

**Petersen:** Yes.

**Hesse:** Does the student understand that the Faculty Senate does not have the final say on that, since that's a University policy?

**Petersen:** Yes.

**Hesse:** Okay.

**Petersen:** What her intention is, is to bring some issues around our cancellation policy to bear, and to provide some feedback in hopes that we might perhaps take that feedback and perhaps propose some revisions.

**Hesse:** Okay.

**Wohlpart:** I have no idea what's being proposed, but I do get a lot of feedback on that. [Laughter]

**Petersen:** Kristin (**Ahart**) do you know a bit about...I don't have her final slides, but I've seen a draft.

**Ahart:** I've been working with her to work through what this could look like, and I've seen the final slides and I think it will be a productive conversation.

**Petersen:** Alright, all in favor of docketing these items as a bundle, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

**Petersen:** We have four items to consider on the docket today, and what I would like to request is a motion to move the consideration of the Regents Award to the end of our docket, because we will need to move into an Executive Session, and if we do that, it allows those individuals here who will not be a part of that Executive Session to adjourn from the meeting. Is that a motion? Thank you [**Burnight**] and a second by Senator **Stafford**. Any discussion needed? All in favor of moving the Regents Award to the end of the docket, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes. So the first item on our docket for consideration then is the General Education Revision Committee.

**Shaw:** An update on where we're at right now. If you remember last time, we had 16 proposed structures and we wanted to eventually whittle down those to about two or three that we could present for feedback. So, we've examined all 16 of them. We've extracted commonalities from the things that we all agree we would like in a structure to include and then we are in the subcommittee stage of drafting three things that are coherent that we're going to kick around. In June, we are going to the—a group of us were accepted to go to the National Conference on Assessment which will be the next big thing after we adopt this, we have to assess it. That was part of our HLC requirements. These are people who are experts at that, and we'll have trained a bunch of faculty on those issues. When we get this two or three positions and we're able to present something further, we would like to present that to you, but the problem is, it's such an auspicious thing that can't do it on any normal day of the week. We have to do it on a day that's really special, that symbolizes the importance, so we chose Earth Day, April 22 which is when we're going to come back and present. What we would like from you today is--we would like to bring back to the Committee any broad principles or broad ideas that you think are essential to such a Structure for the General Education Core. We're here to listen at this point, as opposed to speak.

**Hesse:** Are you going to discuss the option of having mandatory classes for all students or like some schools, have a common read for all students? Is that going to come up?

**Shaw:** It is now. Can you say a little bit more about that?

**Hesse:** Here we have a Humanities sequence, which is required for all students to take, regardless of their major. Other universities have a freshman read, where incoming freshmen are told to purchase a book over the summer and then then they discuss it in the fall semester—their first semester there, and so I’m curious if we’re going to have anything similar to that?

**Shaw:** Do you think that’s a good idea?

**Hesse:** Yes. Partially because it builds a bond among students. If you talk with alumni, they’ll often be asked, “Who did you have for Humanities?” because it creates a common culture. And if you don’t have students taking the same classes or reading the same books, it tends to separate them a bit more.

**Shaw:** Gotcha, and thank you for taking that up.

**Cutter:** One think I think is important, and I’m assuming you’re doing this because it’s in your Mission Statement, but to make sure that students have to take a core with—and be exposed to a variety of different disciplinary approaches. I’m not talking about content. I mean this because critical thinking itself varies by discipline, and so just a broad array.

**Koch:** I’m kind of piggy-backing on what Barbara (**Cutter**) said. While there’s a variety of critical disciplines—maybe some kind of extraction of what’s common to all of them too. Because you often hear people say—students say everybody thinks differently or has their own point of view, but it seems like there has to be something common among them if we’re going to be able to understand each other. So that’s another thing I’m thinking in terms of diversity but commonality.

**Shaw:** What is an example of something you think is common among all?

**Koch:** The use of words, whether you're explaining a painting, words are used, or numbers is like a discursive term, you use words when you say numbers. So there's something along those lines.

**Petersen:** The Committee did such a wonderful job of visiting so many groups across campus...

**Shaw:** Extraordinary, really. [Laughter]

**Petersen:** And listening to those groups as well. I'm wondering if you'll make the rounds again, related to structure.

**Shaw:** Yes.

**Petersen:** Because I'm thinking about my own College for example. There are some initiatives there around restructuring—some of our Professional Ed sequence, and it would be helpful to understand and know potential linkages and overlaps, and I'm wondering if that might be the case in other Colleges--that might help the process of developing a structure.

**Bass:** The Committee definitely is just starting that conversation of what the feedback loop should look like with this go-around, and that's definitely on the list of the potentials. And it's one of the reasons—the feedback part is the part that takes us the greatest amount of time, and so it's also one of the reasons that this is going to take us longer than just getting to the end of this semester. Even if

we've got models to present, and even if people feel pretty firmly about one of the models, it still going to take time to get around to those groups.

**Mattingly:** I'd like to maybe recommend some connection between the General Ed Revision Committee and the Interdisciplinary Working Group, because it seems perhaps that part of the Structure conversation should or could involve what kinds of cross-curriculum or co-curricular things should we make sure that are part of our structure, like writing for example.

**Grant:** I'll take that back to the Interdisciplinary Committee, too.

**Mattingly:** Thank you.

**Hawbaker:** I'm wondering about connecting with our Community College partners. I know that there will be students who will transfer in, and that the structure that we put into place—we want it to be unique and a signature of UNI, but we also don't want it to be so different that it makes it impossible for people to transfer in because that's what—40% of our students, and so just to be practical, I would want to make sure that all of those articulation agreements that we're thinking about that population of students as well.

**Shaw:** When you say 'connect' what does that look like?

**Hawbaker:** I'm not sure. I just would want that there's someone who knows the details of those agreements and...

**Wohlpert:** We do have an office that does this Doug (**Shaw**), so Kristin **Woods** and Patrick **Pease** are charged with Community College Relations, and they can help



with this work. They do house all the articulation agreements. They have relationships and they can and would take this curriculum out to the community colleges.

**Bass:** In addition, internally, it's been very helpful to have Heather **Asmus on** our Committee from the Advising Center, because she's very familiar with degree audits and what transfers in as what, and what it typically looks like. So I know that's been really helpful that's definitely on our list.

**Mattingly:** I wonder if that might not also be a good issue to explore among the people that go to the conference this summer. I would think we could learn a lot in asking what other universities are doing in that regard.

**Petersen:** Are there other comments? Points of discussion? Thank you.

**Shaw:** I'll see your April 22<sup>nd</sup>. Don't use plastic straws.

**Petersen:** The next item then on our docket today is the Emeritus Request for Gerald **Smith**. Is there a motion to approve this emeritus request? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**, and seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. Now we can open up the conversation here, and I've asked Senator **Mattingly** to share with us the letter that was provided in fact by Dale **Cyphert**.

**Mattingly:** She asked me that because I volunteered.

**DeSoto:** I'm actually unclear over which Gerald **Smith** it is.

**Mattingly:** It's the one in Management. Jerry **Smith** with the beard.

**DeSoto:** Not the one with the southern accent?

**Mattingly:** That's right.

**DeSoto:** Thank you very much. [Laughter]

**Mattingly:** We already gave him emeritus last year.

**DeSoto:** I just wanted to make sure.

**Mattingly:** Good question. Thank you, Cathy (**DeSoto**). I've worked with Gerald **Smith** for 16 years. He's been here much longer than that, but I've worked with him for 16 years. So I volunteered to read this letter about him that was written by Dale **Cyphert** who is sitting in the back of the room actually:

"Dr. Gerald F. (Jerry) **Smith** has been on the faculty since 1995, when he joined the Department of Management as an Assistant Professor. He was tenured in 1997 and has since served the College of Business Administration and the University of Northern Iowa with distinction.

"Dr. **Smith's** teaching and research activities have focused on improving managerial thinking in complex business situations. He has published over twenty papers in such high-quality refereed journals as *Management Science*, *Decision Support Systems*, *the Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *the Journal of Management Studies*, *the Journal of Creative Behavior*, and *the Journal of Management Education*. His book, *Quality Problem Solving*, was published by the ASQ Quality Press.

"Dr. **Smith's** thirty years of scholarship have been complemented by significant service to the University of Northern Iowa. With a commitment to developing students' critical thinking skills, Dr. **Smith** has served on several task forces and committees related to the Liberal Arts Core and chaired the University's Education Discussion and Initiatives Team. He spearheaded the College of Business Administration's learning assessment activities for over a decade, chairing the Learning Assurance Committee and representing the College on the University's Student Outcomes Assessment Committee. Dr. **Smith** further served as a representative to both the College and University Faculty Senates, and as Chair of the UNI Faculty Senate. Please accept my support for Dr. **Smith's** application for emeritus status on behalf of the Department of Management and the entire College of Business Administration."

**Petersen:** Are there any other comments? Does anyone else know of Dr. Gerald **Smith**? Okay, all in favor then of approving the emeritus request for Gerald **Smith**, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes.

**Petersen:** And the third item on our docket today is an update from the Writing Committee in anticipation of the Committee on Committee's Recommendation to discharge this committee. I invited the Committee back to share additional information, additional update. You'll recall they were with us last fall and provided us with their committee report, and so now I want to give them an opportunity to provide any additional context or information for us. Yes, you can come up front.

**Cyphert:** I volunteered to start. I thought it would probably be worthwhile to give a—considering it's ten years, a fairly brief overview of our committee and what it was supposed to be doing and what we reported, and that has changed a little bit. Our assumptions have changed a bit. In 2010, the Committee was created, tapping individuals charged with writing or communication instruction from all the Colleges and Student Services. Our charge has been to conduct research and analysis of writing instruction at UNI, which is pretty simple. Our results, reported annually to the Faculty Senate, have consistently demonstrated a lack of sufficient curricular attention to student's development in writing. In 2010, which was our first year of existence, we studied the UNI Writing Curriculum and Outcomes data, which was from NSEE and MAPP, and determined that learning outcomes were not being adequately assessed with the self-report instruments in use. Over the next two years, we created and distributed a survey—a faculty survey, with

respect to the NSSE goals and outcomes, and found that faculty consistently found that students were only “minimally proficient” in writing, and supported additional instruction, that most writing assignments were designed to display knowledge rather than develop writing skill, and that writing instruction overall, did not align with LAC 1A learning goals.

**Cyphert:** In 2013, we reviewed the data generated by the English 1005 assessment, which indicated that although those courses were meeting their own learning goals, they addressed only the lowest levels of writing instruction on national assessments of what writing instruction needs. We spent the following year benchmarking writing goals and instructional practices of peer institutions—and this was a specific request from the Faculty Senate that year: that we look at peer institutions which on average, they require more than 6 units of writing instruction—a lot of them have slight differences by major, so the actual average was 6.127.3 I think, years of instruction in our peer institutions. Best practice typically called for three writing courses, or nine credits of writing. In 2015 then we were asked to develop—again, a specific request from the Faculty Senate, to develop a reasonable plan to address the anticipated need for curriculum design, assessment processes, and faculty development that would support a nine-credit writing requirement. With Senate affirmation of the resulting proposal, we spent the next year meeting with the UCCC and the LAC Committee to determine faculty support for both increased writing requirements for a UNI undergraduate degree and the proposed model, which I won’t go into. It’s all on record, but we had what we thought would be a reasonable way of going about it here at UNI.

**Cyphert:** Discussion affirmed faculty support for both, but strong caution that we not do any additional research or developmental work without the Academic Master Plan Steering Committee and UNI administration's commitment to the necessary resources. In 2016, our request to meet with the Steering Committee was denied with direction from Provost **Wohlpart** to instead participate in the general faculty feedback process. We provided the Senate with updated data from NSSE and the National Census of Writing that indicated UNI had slipped further below national averages with regard to writing requirements, but no Senate action was taken. We were asked to update our data regarding faculty support and required resources—this is the following year—and a survey of faculty with 180 responses was conducted in 2017. Results indicated that although most respondents did not teach a writing-enhanced course, they felt their programs—that is, their major programs, did include courses that could be redesigned to meet a nine-unit credit writing requirement. The most common support requested involved training in instructional methods, with most faculty reporting a general understanding of the writing expectations and processes in their own discipline. Last year, the Faculty Senate requested that we prepare an overview of the University Writing Committee, addressing our charge, outcomes, and future efforts. We reported that while we had fulfilled our role to provide expertise in writing instruction to the Faculty Senate, a Senate committee cannot play a meaningful role in developing student's writing skills. We thus recommended that our disciplinary expertise would be better utilized within the structure of Academic Affairs. Provost **Wohlpart** has subsequently communicated to us though, that this is not an option. So, we are still a Faculty Senate committee.

**Grant:** And one of the reasons we wanted to come too is to differentiate between what happens in the curriculum and then what happens institutionally as far as institutional structures, not just curricular structures. So, with that in mind, it's also a plea to think carefully about what happens on April 8<sup>th</sup>, if we de-list or reorganize, which is still an option under that proposal. Right now we've lost structurally—in terms of resources supporting communication here on campus—we've lost a reassignment in Languages & Literature, and one in the College of Business for faculty to attend to communication coordination among staff, program assessments, and the stated outcomes. We have no doctoral level communications staff supervising Cornerstone. There has been a strange change in official the outcomes for LAC 1A without having faculty approval, which de-listed a whole outcome; the outcome being the ability to recognize in one's own writing possibility for improvement. There have been changes to limit the time tutors spend with drop-in students at the Writing Center. We have continued to invest in alternative and smart-thinking two programs that have off-resources. That's not to diminish those programs, but just to say that we are off-shoring a quite a bit of our work and support. We have a culture of assessment, which is completely unknown and as far as I can tell, without any expert knowledge regarding communication pedagogies, or how to assess them, and we have the potential for de-listing of the University Writing Committee. So, what do we lose by doing this? If we continue on this, I think we lose a community where teachers, and administrators learn about writing and about how communication affects all of us. I think we lose the local culture of communication—not too dissimilar to what Tom (**Hesse**) said about a common culture among students. Right? We

replace that common culture with John Warner calls “Potemkin Essays”—fakes designed to pass service-level muster that are revealed as hollow facades when inspected more closely. We learn all kinds of things about the assessment: the connection between reading, writing, listening, speaking, reasoning, research and delivery of the content being communicated; between communication in different modes, different disciplines, different traditions; the responsiveness to changing educational paradigms and their implication for our students, such as the implication of No Child Left Behind, and what students can and cannot do when they come on our campus. We lose experience and how to get disciplined practitioners—you guys--disciplined practitioners to talk about what your own writing expectations and unacknowledged norms. There is quite a bit of ill-advised advice that I think leaves students very confused, such as “Don’t use ‘I’ in this paper,” or “Avoid using passive voice.” Or “I’m going to subtract points for every typo or arbitrary grammar error I can find.” And it leaves them confused and disheartened. That relationship I think really diminishes student’s persistence here on campus. It really disheartens them, and they don’t know what to do and then they stop coming. So, this kind of thing that we’re supporting is something that reaches into our bottom line. Is it as came out with the GERC? There’s a lot to be done in terms of articulation and transfer about what happens with writing through Community Colleges or PSEL options, and what they come to our local campus expectations. There’s issues of diversity, and as we get more and more international students, what happens with them in regards to their home cultures; their home languages, and the kinds of expectations we have for standard academic English here. How do we help them rather than penalize them? There’s a whole list of other things, from having better experiences for ELC

tutors so they can learn to do their own online things rather than off-shoring these things. But at the heart of it, I think our peer institutions, and that's one of the documents I know that's in there—there's a list of our peer institutions and the ways in which they support and invest in good communication expertise. And they do that because it affects their bottom line and they realize that. They realize that it takes scholars to do the integration work, because they know that these coherent messages and institutional structures that align communication, delivery, and learning support will lead to student success, retention, and persistence to graduation. As a personal opinion, I've seen that now as my kids approaching college age, a lot of my peers are looking at colleges, and that seems to be that what I hear echoed as one of their bottom lines: is where do we send these kids? Where do we show them off? Does that have a clear plan and a good, consistent fundamental? And if there's nothing more fundamental to college education than communication, I don't really know what is. Teaching is communication. Learning the outcomes that they have. Can they communicate them in their discipline, that's communication. These are the kinds of things that we hope you'll consider as we move forward, as we do all of the very complex things and necessary things to work with the General Education Curriculum, to work with the resources that we do have. We understand that they're declining, but we hope they are part of the conversation that you'll have next in two weeks at the next meeting. Thank you.

**Petersen:** So, David (**Grant**) there are within the Mission, the Vision—the Learning Outcomes that we approved, there are communication-related outcomes. I'm wondering if there is potential there in creating the structure for something to



emerge related to the concerns that the Writing Committee has and this process of revisioning our General Ed curriculum.

**Grant:** I think there's great potential. There's wonderful potential. I think that it's quite a long time, but that we should really—we looked at our curriculum quite a while ago, but we're doing it now and it's great. I love that that conversation is happening. One of the things that I'll say though, is that good communication instruction doesn't happen without some resources and some investment and support. I think that's what the University Writing Committee—Dale (**Cyphert**) has outlined. That's what we have provided to the best of our ability, and because we felt that we could be more effective under the offices of Academic Affairs, we said, "Well let's do that."

**Cyphert:** And we didn't make a specific: Should it be part of the LAC Core; should it be part of the Assessment Team. I mean, there's a lot of room in the Academic Affairs. Our point was really just that as a committee of the Faculty Senate, we have no actual impact on the curriculum, and all the Faculty Senate really can do is pass something like a nine-unit writing requirement. But, there's no way to actually say how that would work from within this structure.

**Wohlpart:** So, if I can respond to some of that. First of all, let me say how much I appreciate the work that's happened over the last ten years. It's been very good work. It's unearthed a great deal of very important information about writing across the curriculum, writing in other institutions, and writing here at UNI. And I just want all of you to know how I operate as Provost. This is something that does not necessarily happen at every campus, and I'll give you an example of this, but

when I make decisions about setting up administrative structures or providing budget to things, I do it in very transparent ways. I always ask for feedback from Dean's Council and faculty. I'll give you an example of this. On many campuses and before I came, a dean would meet with the Provost and they would decide what faculty lines to hire. No one would necessarily know what happened in that room. We don't do that any longer. Within the Colleges, the leadership team comes up with a list. They prioritize that list. That comes to Dean's Council and that's where that decision is made—at Dean's Council, of which faculty to hire. It's very transparent; lots of data is shared. It's very open. When I have gotten requests for things like this, I take it to Dean's Council. I talk with faculty. And what I've heard is there is not an interest on the campus to create a bureaucratic structure around this. That's the feedback that I have received repeatedly. And this is I think the third time we've brought this to Dean's Council, and I again heard this time really definitively there was not interest. This is not just on the part of the deans, but what they've heard in creating a bureaucratic structure within Academic Affairs for this.

**Grant:** And that may be true, but we have data that shows something different.

**Wohlpart:** And the deans and faculty, and department heads—and you all have seen that data, and there is not desire on this campus, from the feedback to me to suggest that we should move in that direction.

**Cyphert:** I think that's what we've been hearing for the last ten years too.

Everybody wants better writing, but nobody is willing to commit any resources to do that at any level. Anywhere, or at least what resources have been committed

have been chipped away at over the last ten years, and certainly not resources to increase our writing requirement.

**Koch:** This kind of dovetails with what was said before: Something common to all of this is the use of words, whether spoken or written, and so maybe we should have a Words Committee. [Laughter] There's four verbal arts, and one of them is writing, and it's nice that on the outcomes list, it mentions reading, writing, speaking and listening.

**Cyphert:** We did as a University name communication as one of our primary learning goals. We at one point said, "Okay. Make us 'communication' if that makes people feel better. I guess it was the GERC group that were presenting some results from a conference that some of us went to; a couple of us went to, and this notion of discourse is a pretty complicated kind of thing. It isn't just learning how to make PowerPoint slides and calling that good oral communication. And I think there's an understanding of that on this campus. I think there's an appreciation for that on campus, but there is not the will or ability to put resources toward the kind of difficult work that that actually does involve.

**DeSoto:** I have a question, and I apologize because it may be something that has been gone over, as I'm new to the Senate. I heard you say several times that as a university, our peer institutions invest more in writing, and that the norm is six units, and nine is best practice. Just to help me to have a clear understanding of how we are discrepant, what would be an example of a peer institution's writing requirements compared to ours? Just a real concrete...

**Cyphert:** In very general terms, virtually everybody has a first year, freshman level beginning writing class, which we have.

**Desoto:** Like a Comp 101?

**Cyphert:** Like a Comp 101 or something along those lines. The norm is for a second-class, or sometimes a four-unit class. So that's why there's some discrepancy. Or sometimes it will be a little different depending on the majors. But the norm is to have a second level writing class which can vary across a lot of different scenarios. The best practices have a mid-level writing class which I would describe as a kind of an argumentation course, which could be within a major. It could be in a General Ed situation. A lot of universities have it administered by essentially their English department, or some sort of writing department that is maybe getting into not major-specific, but general discipline-specific communication, so science writing for instance, versus writing in the liberal arts versus business writing. So, you might have a second-level there. And then the best practice is there's also a discipline-specific requirement for writing within most or all of the majors. Which again, could be part of the Liberal Arts Core, so say like say a Capstone course, like we have with part of our Liberal Arts Core, but it could be discipline-specific, or it could be something like a major-specific course in writing that all majors have to take. But that is the best practice. Not everybody has nine units.

**Grant:** We did propose at first that our committee would vet syllabi at that mid-level. Like, are you doing the kinds of things and you're transferring this over to a

writing course, that we would just sort of vet it. The second one we did because Provost **Wohlpart** was kind enough to send some us to the University of Minnesota—is much more at that third level, where it's really how to get faculty to start having a conversation about “What is it that we mean by communication in our discipline?” What does it look like? What are the outcomes? And what might we do to better integrate that and align that with our own program objectives. That's sort of a third way that I know they do at U Mass-Dartmouth, whereas for example that second level core structure of science writing or business writing used to be done by the Department of Communication at University of Minnesota-Duluth, and they've now been re-absorbed back into the English Department.

**Cyphert:** There are a lot of different ways people—some universities will have designated writing courses or communication-enhanced courses, or something along those lines. Then sort of administered through the curriculum process basically. Others will have a writing-centered faculty that if not provide the writing instruction, works as resources for faculty who do, across the curriculum, and everything in between. There's just a lot of different ways you can skin that cat.

**O'Kane:** I'd just like to make everybody and particularly the committee aware that the GERC is very concerned about communication. It's way, way up on our list, and we're aware of your work, and I assure you that will be included. So let's wait and see.

**Cutter:** I have a question, and you can respond to it as well, but it's sort of for the Provost, based on your comments about the Dean's Council. Was there an objection to any kind of structure, like perhaps a writing program with a director who could do some of this coordination? Because I've seen that model at hundreds of schools. It seems pretty mainstream. I'm just confused as to why there would be some objection.

**Wohlpart:** Generally, a director of writing is really a director of freshman composition. Very few schools have a Director of Writing across the entire campus. So the question I would ask you all to ask yourselves, do you want a director to work with your programs to talk with you about how you teach writing in your discipline? You need to have one or two classes that teach writing and that person, working across the entire campus with all of your majors, tells you what to do or how to do it. So, most directors of writing are generally directors of freshman composition or in Gen Ed, not for the entire campus.

**Cutter:** And to follow-up, part of that question is that I came out of--I taught in a writing program like that for two years, and I did both the freshman comp and the writing in the discipline, and so maybe one director can't do it all, but I've seen models where at Rutgers and at other places, where there's the freshman comp classes where the director has more say, and then there's a more collaborative relationship with the different disciplines. So, I mean it's out there and it's been working in some places quite well.

**Wohlpart:** Sure. Absolutely. And what I would encourage you all to say is if you want to emphasize writing in your disciplines, you all are experts on writing in

your discipline and if you want to revise your curriculum to have one or two or three courses that focus on writing in your disciplines—this is what I've heard from the deans, the department heads who talk with the faculty, that this is an emphasis. It is important, and it's really up to the faculty in the disciplines to create those opportunities then.

**Cyphert:** Which some departments have. We have some departments that have much more writing required because they are that kind of discipline. Public Relations obviously has more writing classes, right? English majors have more writing classes. So the question that we were asked was: At a University-level, where do we stand in terms of writing instruction across the board? There are multiple ways of doing that. Some universities will have all of that writing done within the home departments. Others will have none of it done within the home department. The plan we actually recommended was to pretty much let the departments decide where they wanted to have the writing instruction. The only thing is we said that if we're going to make it a commitment as at the University-level, there had to be an additional writing requirement, which we recommended actually be determined at the department level or at the major-level. That each major could decide how they wanted to actually implement that themselves. But, even given that, the departments and the survey we said indicated that the faculty felt like they were going to need some faculty development and support. And certainly the reality is that in many departments, you need some smaller class sizes in order to be able to facilitate writing, whether it was in the department or done by some service from across the University.

**DeSoto:** That is the problem in our department, is that the class sizes have got so much larger so faculty are less and less willing. You have 20, and then you have 40.

**Cyphert:** Our classes are all about double what...so even the writing we formerly did just because we thought it was important, many of our instructors have had to pull that out because the class sizes are so big.

**DeSoto:** To follow up on that, the other problem that we have in our department, speaking to our specific discipline is that our main writing-intensive class has ended up getting pushed back to like the senior year, when it's supposed to be really the first class in their junior year. For various reasons, we don't have enough this or that, so they end up putting it off. So that's the problem in our curriculum. We do want to have more writing, but there's things like that that work against it.

**Cyphert:** What program?

**DeSoto:** Psychology.

**Grant:** To speak to what Barb (**Cutter**) said, the model for any of these directors or coordinators, or whatever you call them, really is a much more collaborative model, even in the teaching of freshman composition. It's much more nurturing, let's get you up to speed, let's get you training that you need and those kinds of things. So there's no reason to say that if there is a director, that someone's going to tell you how to do it. But it would be much more go into psychology and say, okay Cathy and Adam let's figure out what you need to do. What is the smallest



class size that you can get? And what might then be an appropriate writing exercise or series of exercises for that number? So, it would be working with, rather than saying, “Here’s how to do it. This passes muster. That doesn’t.” And again, that’s what as Dale (**Cyphert**) said, discourse that requires a great deal of expertise.

**Hawbaker:** I just want to echo what others have said, to thank the Committee for ten years of really excellent hard work. And to also emphasize, because there is nothing worse than being an expert in something, and to be asked for your recommendation and to apply your expertise, and to have it go into a black hole. And for me, the question is: How can we use this group of experts in a more efficient way to align them more directly with the General Ed curriculum work? To align them more directly with...Everyone’s going to say ‘No, we don’t want bureaucracy,’ and certainly the Union president is not going to say we need another administrator. [Laughter] But, everyone agrees that we need to improve writing on this campus. That is not a controversial position, and that’s where the General Ed Committee is working on as well. We need to use the expertise within our own campus more effectively and efficiently. For me, it’s how do we need to position this committee so that they can align with other things that are underway and that we can make better strategic decisions?

**Petersen:** The question that our Senate is taking on that we will vote on next week is if the Writing Committee will continue to remain. And if the Writing Committee remains, then we as a Senate need to be very specific about giving them a charge. We would want to think about what that charge is, so they would have directions as to their next steps. As I’m listening, one of the questions that

emerges for me is—so I hear you talk about structures, and I hear you talk about resources, and it feels as though there is a –that within the General Education Revision Committee there will be a structure that emerges that emphasizes writing by the very nature of the learning outcomes that have been articulated. Right? And so, what can the General Education Revision Committee learn from your work—your good work for the last ten years, that can inform the structure that they are beginning to create? And then the second piece of the conversation that I hear you talking about are resources. So, if we value these learning outcomes that we’ve now approved, and we’re creating a structure, then what are the resources that might be needed in the future in order to support how we deliver those learning outcomes? For me at this moment, because I don’t have a strong sense of the structure, I can’t begin to imagine what those resources are for any of the learning outcomes at this moment, but I do feel strongly that I don’t know that there should be—I don’t think this work should happen apart from—like I don’t think there should be a Writing Committee that’s not talking to the GERC. There shouldn’t be two different structures.

**Cyphert:** That’s basically where we came in. I very much appreciate Becky’s (**Hawbaker**) comment about doing all this work and giving advice which doesn’t go anywhere. If we didn’t actually get along so well, it would be a really awful committee to be on. [Laughter] But it’s our chance to come from all over the campus and talk about writing and communication and discourse and rhetoric—And it’s great fun to do that, except that when you feel like you’re beating your head against the wall--We really do recognize that a Faculty Senate committee does not have any ability to actually make any actual difference. So, we can give

you advice all day long, and you all agree with it too, but you can't really do anything about it either.

**Grant:** I also want to call out Kristin (**Ahart**) since she's right there. She's been part of the committee. We've included her, Katie Wempen is on the committee right now. NISG has been a strong and persistent advocate for us, and we're going to continue to work with them to see what the students want, because that's an important voice.

**O'Kane:** I appreciate you all visiting the GERC last fall, but you mostly talked about what you learned at that conference. I really think that the GERC would benefit from hearing the summary that you presented today.

**Grant:** Thank you.

**O'Kane:** I will bring that up with them, and we'll see what we can do.

**Cyphert:** I wouldn't wish anybody ten years of reports, because we write a lot actually.

**Grant:** We can talk a lot too, but I know that you have other business.

**Petersen:** Are there any other questions or comments? I do encourage you the next two weeks to reach out if you have additional comments, so that you can be informed when we come back on April 8 to vote on what to do with this committee. Thank you.

**Petersen:** The last item on our agenda is the Regents Award, and in order to consider the nominees, we do need to move into an Executive Session for the purposes of confidentiality. Is there a motion to move into the Executive Session?

Thank you, Senator **Stafford**. Is there a second? Thank you, Senator **Burnight**. All in favor of moving into an Executive Session to consider the Regents Award nominees, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? So moved. Thank you. (4:29 p.m.)

#### **RISE FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION 4:35**

**Petersen**: Is there a motion then to endorse the two nominees for the Regents Award? Thank you Senator **O'Kane** and seconded by Senator **Stafford**. Let's take our vote. All in favor of endorsing the two nominees for the Regents Award, please indicate by saying 'aye.' Any opposed? Any abstentions? Excellent. The motion passes. Any new business that we need to take on? Then, is there a motion to adjourn today? Thank you Senator **Burnight** and seconded by Senator **Gould**. All in favor, please indicate by saying 'aye.' We are missing Mitch today. How do we adjourn without Mitch (**Strauss**)?

Respectfully Submitted,

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