1. Chair Degnin Calls to Order.

   Agenda:
   1. Approve Minutes from previous meeting
   2. Additional Curriculum Reviews/approvals
      a. Communication Studies
      b. Industrial Tech
      c. Languages & Literatures
   3. Committee Updates
      a. Strategic Planning
      b. Awards
   4. Dean's Update
   5. Discussion of directive to re-define programs and acceptable terminal degrees

2. Chair Degnin motions to approve Minutes 1 from October 3, 2011. Senators Strauss and Vanderwall second. Motion passed.

3. Announcements:
   a. Senator Dooley announced that the Art Department's Faculty work is on display.
   b. Senator Strauss reminded the Senate of Paul Siddens presentation for the 2011 College of Humanities and Fine Arts Faculty Excellence Award on November 15th at 7:00 PM.

4. Chair Degnin introduces Chris Martin, Interim Head of Communication Studies for Curriculum Review.

   Dr. Martin indicates that the University Curriculum Committee passed the department’s curriculum packet contingent upon presentation to the CHAS Senate. Changes include the following:
1. First-year elective seminar is changed from 0 hrs to 1 hr.

2. COMM 1600 moves from 0 hrs to 1 hr.

3. Reinstatement of the Electronic Media major for 54-55 hours

Senator Vanderwall motions to approve; Senator Riehl seconds. Unanimously passed.

5. Languages and Literatures Curriculum
   a. adjustments are based upon SIS issues that do not allow for repeats exemption in the catalog. If hours are arranged, SIS defaults to the lowest number of the range.
   b. Proposal to change credit hours to 3 for Creative Writing courses and reinstatement.

Senator Siddens motions for approval; Senator Dooley seconds.

6. Industrial Technology Curriculum
   1. Dr. Maxwell, Department Head, and Dr. Recayi Pecen presenting.
   2. Proposing to keep MS in Teaching with revised emphasis.
   3. Once the revisions were reviewed by the Graduate College Curriculum Committee, minor changes were recommended.
   4. Moving Dissertation credit from 15 hours to 12 hours (different program from doctoral program)

Chair Degnin indicated that the Senate cannot review as we did not receive the information in time.

Dr. Pecen requests that the Senate approve the changes based on the minor changes as well as securing appropriate library consultation approvals.

Senator Riehl and Chair Degnin indicate that review by the CHAS Senate is not necessary. No motion to approve needed.

7. Senator Strauss mentions that the UCC noted that degree audits are coded. If (2000) or 100-level course, the system only counts the courses at the 3 or 4 level. Departments are likely to run into difficulty if courses are just renumbered, but not changed in level.

8. Strategic Planning. Chair Degnin noted that eight faculty have volunteered to serve on the CHAS Strategic Planning Committee and that a Chair was needed. The Senate requests that Dean Haack closely oversee the group. Dean Haack gladly agreed to participate as needed or requested.
9. Awards Committee

1. Senator Riehl mentioned that there were discussions, but no proposals.

2. Senator Deisz asked how long we were going to give awards based on former CHFA and CNS approaches. This is not only in the short-term, but in long-term. In addition, he noted that we do need nominations quickly.

3. Senator Siddens stated that a change was needed and to look at the composition of the College and move on that.

4. Senator Riehl asked which awards are to be given and how are they selected?

Regents award nominations are due by December 2, 2011. Senator Deisz will send reminders to Senators to solicit nominations and Chair Degnin mentions that nominations should be from faculty.

Senator Riehl has concerns regarding College-Level awards. There are never enough people due to work involved in the nomination (Chair Degnin), so perhaps we should award fewer.

Dean Haack discussed the role of a student advisory committee in selecting teaching awards with representatives visiting each nominee’s class.

Senator Riehl again mentioned that there should be awards for lower division-LAC excellence and upper (Jr, Sr., Grad) level excellence.

Discussion followed.

10. Dean’s Update

1. Dean Haack mentioned that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) met with Associate Dean Dhanwada in attendance. Senate discussion followed with concerns regarding program elimination and the criteria used to make the decision.

2. Senators mentioned that morale is affected as this decision trickles down to the departments. Discussion followed.

3. Recommendations may not be based upon the APA review. Senate discussion followed on the role that the student numbers plays as a primary criterion in the cost of a program.

The Senate reiterated concern for the recent request to assign faculty to a single program and that each department must define what an acceptable terminal degree will be in each program. *In addition, Humanities and Liberal Arts Core courses are not to be considered programs.

The Senate is concerned with faculty elimination and are worried that a narrow definition by program makes reassignment difficult for those who are eliminated.
The question was raised as to how programs are defined. Chair Degnin indicated that if a department is eliminated, those faculty who are eliminated can then no longer teach in the LAC. Discussion followed regarding the possible responses of the United Faculty.

Senators discussed how this might affect future hires and to monitor this closely.

Iowa’s R&D School (former Price Laboratory School) is also a “program.”

Dean Haack mentioned that the necessary cuts could approach $2 million with Chair Degnin asking if auxiliary spending has been targeted. Dean Haack mentioned that UNI spends more per student than its peers, which is expected based upon the quality of UNI.

The Senate needed a solid definition of a “program” prior to assigning a committee.

Senator Strauss motions to adjourn. Senator DelCarlo seconds.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd A. Bohnenkamp, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
Secretary, CHAS Senate