

9-11-1978

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 11, 1978

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1978 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, September 11, 1978" (1978). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 288.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/288

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.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

SENATE MINUTES

September 11, 1978

1235

1. Remarks by Vice-President Martin.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

2. Remarks by Chairperson Harrington.

DOCKET

3. Discussion of Faculty and Senate's roles in university governance (Senate Minutes 1234, 8/28/78). Approved motion for the Faculty Senate to continue under "business as usual."

The University Faculty Senate met at 3:00 p.m. on September 11, 1978, in the Board Room. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Harrington.

Present: Crawford, Gillette, Gish, Glenn, Harrington, Hendrickson, Hovet, Metcalfe, Schurrer, Schwarzenbach, D. Smith, M. B. Smith, Tarr, Thomson, Wiederanders, Wood (ex-officio)

Alternates: LaRue for Bro, Fortgang for Brown

Absent: Strein

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Jeff Moravec, Cedar Falls Record, and Julie Vorman of the Northern Iowan were in attendance.

1. Vice President Martin addressed the Senate concerning fall enrollment. He expressed special commendation to those responsible for facilitating enrollment in general education classes this fall and hoped that such efforts would not go unrecognized at assessment and evaluation time. The Vice President indicated that no one has been selected as of this date to serve as the negotiator for the university.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

2. Chairperson Harrington indicated that she has reactivated the Committee on the Mission of the University. She indicated that attempts are now being made to figure out the members' schedules in order to be able to call the first meeting.

Chairperson Harrington reported to the Senate that the material they recently received entitled "Successful Coexistence" was a reprint from a recent edition of the NEA Advocate and was being furnished to the Senate for its information by Senator Wiederanders.

Chairperson Harrington indicated that an item had arrived for the calendar too late for its distribution to the Senate. She indicated that the material will be provided to the Senators at a later date. The item was forwarded to the Chairperson by the Deans and Vice President for Academic Affairs and deals with the subject of emeritus status.

DOCKET

3. Chairperson Harrington reported that the item before the Senate was the discussion of Faculty and Senate roles in university governance. Chairperson Harrington introduced Dr. Paul Rider, past president of the University Faculty, whom she had invited to attend the Senate meeting so that he could provide information and expertise to the discussion at hand.

Thomson moved, Tarr seconded, that the Senate resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.

Senator M. B. Smith indicated that there are four axioms concerning governance of a university as it relates to the Faculty Senate.

1. That governance means to govern, to exercise power, to regulate, and to create policy, and that these actions create responsibility.
2. That there never was and is not currently such an operating principle as faculty governance.
3. That the governance of UNI is the responsibility of the State of Iowa and the Board of Regents and its delegated officials, namely the President of the University.

That all power in the governance of the university is exclusively that of the President.

4. That certain aspects of governance have been opened to bar-
gaining, not governing, between the President representing
the state and the United Faculty representing the faculty.

Senator Smith reminded the Senate that there are three powers specifically that are not the role of the Faculty Senate.

1. To legislate.
2. To administer.
3. The power of consent. Senator Smith indicated that he felt that the Senate was misnamed because the name implied the consent of the Faculty which the Senate cannot have or possess.

Senator Smith outlined three alternatives to the Faculty Senate.

1. To dissolve the Senate.
2. To ascertain what aspects of governance are left for the Senate from the powers of the administration and are excluded from the master agreement.
3. For the Senate to renew its efforts as elected advisors in all areas to the administration and to the entire faculty. That the Senate's role is to seek out and examine the policies of the administration and of the agent and to express the conscience of the Faculty.

Senator Smith responded to his own suggestions indicating that he felt option 1 to be an act of cowardice and that option 2 casts the Senate in the role of a scavenger but that option 3 was the correct approach with the Senate acting as the voice of the faculty with the powers of commendation and condemnation.

Senator Glenn addressed the Senate as follows:

"Having been associated with the Senate for about 10 years in one capacity or another, and having heard most of the statements concerning faculty governance which have been made by Senators and others at meetings of the Senate and the faculty, I feel constrained to make some comments of my own with respect to this subject.

When I joined the staff of this University 12 years ago there did not seem to me to be the adversary relationship between the faculty and the administration which I perceive to have been growing for the past 7 or 8 years. It is a relationship which I would not have imagined possible between men and women of the stature which I believed University professors and administrators to have.

I seem to note at times a feeling of distrust, not only distrust by faculty of the administration, but also distrust of faculty by faculty. It appears that some seem to feel that others have ulterior

motives for what they say and do, rather than having confidence that we all are trying to do what is in the best interest of the whole University community, particularly the students.

So much for the way things appear to me.

Now to be specific about this business of faculty governance, and the roles of the faculty and this Senate, I want to quote, in part, from the Faculty Constitution. In Article IV, Section 2, it is said, ' . . . The general principle here operative is that the faculty assumes the major role in decisions regarding educational policy and curriculum, subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the veto power of the President of the University. In personnel decisions . . . it functions through consultation and review. The faculty's more general concern with the total program of the University is expressed in the form of recommendations and advice to the related components of the University.'

From Section 3, ' . . . the University faculty shall function as the regular decision-making agency of the University for matters of educational policy and such other matters as are traditionally within the jurisdiction of University faculties. Moreover, the University faculty may adopt recommendations and resolutions on any matter touching on the general welfare of the University It shall advise in the form of consultation and review in the nomination of academic administrators'

From Section 4, ' . . . the instructional faculty assumes the major role in decisions relating to 1) curricular matters . . . , 2) standards for granting of academic degrees and academic credit, and 3) educational policies Moreover the instructional faculty shall advise in the form of consultation during the nomination of, and review during the evaluation of instructional administrators. . . . '

In Article V the Senate is delegated to act for the faculty on all matters within the faculty's jurisdiction, with two exceptions which are not particularly relevant here.

So, as I read the Constitution, the faculty and the Senate have the major decision-making roles in those matters relating to educational policies, curriculum, academic credit, and standards for granting degrees. In all other matters they act in a consultative and advisory capacity, making recommendations and resolutions, but not decisions. This Senate needs to keep this always before it. The faculty and the Senate are very explicit in denying to anyone other than instructional faculty the right to vote on any of the matters for which they claim the decision-making authority - and I believe this is as it should be. But I also believe that the faculty and the Senate should recognize that there are some things for which the administration is responsible to the Board of Regents and that many times decisions must be made which are not popular with everyone. I'm quite certain that no administrator would want to try to tell a

faculty member how to teach a course or what the content of the course should be. By the same token, I don't believe the faculty should try to tell the administration how to administer the matters that are without the primary jurisdiction of the faculty. It seems to me the Senate should spend its time dealing with those matters which are within its primary jurisdiction. This could result in fewer meetings of the Senate with more time being spent on matters of educational policy, etc.

I apologize for taking this much of the Senate's time, but this is something I've been wanting to say to the Senate for a long time. I simply don't like to see women and men of intelligence and, I believe, inherent goodwill, engaged in the kind of struggle I think I see taking place. Thank you for listening."

Senator M. B. Smith stated that decision making is not one of the functions of the Senate. That the power of the Senate should rest with the power of moral suasion.

Senator Fortgang addressed Senators Glenn and M. B. Smith concerning their viewpoints on the Faculty Constitution. He asked if the constitution says that the Faculty Senate can act out the will of the Faculty.

Senator Smith responded that he responds to the will of his college and that the constitution has no standing in the eyes of the Board of Regents or in the legislature of the State of Iowa.

Senator Glenn said he had cited the Faculty Constitution because it had been approved by the Faculty to be a document in which the Faculty had defined its role in University governance, and he felt that the Faculty and the Senate should abide by the definitions spelled out in the Constitution.

Senator Crawford indicated that semantics are part of the problem. She said she saw the role of the Senate as an advisory body to the administration. She also indicated that because the Senate is an advisory body does not mean that it has no role in governance.

Paul Rider spoke to the history of the creation of the current faculty constitution. He stated that it is a document that should be taken seriously. He also indicated that while the Senate advises it is also involved in decision-making.

Vice Chairperson Tarr indicated that he had trouble with the term decision-making because the Senate will be making decisions no matter what topic is discussed. He indicated that decision-making is not the same automatically as creating policy.

Professor Howard Jones rose and addressed the Senate. He indicated that there were two types of powers, de jure, of which the Senate has none, and de facto powers, which in this case is the power of

the Senate in their attempt to mesh the ideas and efforts of the faculty and of the administration and of the students and others in the conduct of the University. He expressed the belief that the representative groups had gotten off the track into adversary relationships creating the desire to define powers. He expressed the belief that the function of the Senate had been changed by collective bargaining and that the resulting areas that remain for their consideration should be curriculum and educational policy.

Dr. David Crownfield rose and addressed the Senate. Professor Crownfield stated that the Senate could and should discuss any matter of their interest and, acting as representatives of the Faculty, voice their opinion on any topic. He said the Senate should not view itself in the middle between the administration and the bargaining agent and that their role is not to try to bring the two sides to closure. He expressed the belief that the role of the Senate is to impart the Senate's collective knowledge and opinions to the policy decision makers. He expressed the belief that it is the duty of the Senate and of each member of the faculty to make their opinions known and to share their knowledge.

Senator Metcalfe stated the Senate does not need permission to speak on the vital issues of the university. He encouraged the Senate to continue to pursue events as they have in the past.

Vice President Martin rose and addressed the Senate. He expressed his appreciation of the concern of the Senate concerning the University Statement of Mission. He believed that the Senate, rightly so, should look at educational policy and asked the Senate for its patience in dealing with the administration. He mentioned that the adjustment to collective bargaining has been difficult for the Senate, U.F., A.F.T., and others but that the department heads have a very difficult collective bargaining role which they have performed with admirable poise.

Senator Wiederanders expressed the belief that the greatest frustration on the part of the Senate came when the Senate became involved in areas that neither the administration nor the agent wanted them involved in. He encouraged the Senate to decide which battles are worth fighting and then to fight them.

Professor Jim Skaine rose and addressed the Senate. He indicated that after one year under collective bargaining there are many areas of interest that are unclear as to which area of purview they fall under. He encouraged the Senate to review and to discuss any area of interest without fear of stepping on someone's toes.

Professor Frank Downes rose and addressed the Senate. He expressed the belief that the value of the Senate to him was to hear the collective thinking of the Senate. He said that the exchange of ideas and the banter of debate were often more important than the actual decision made.

Professor Michael Millar rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that since many areas are interrelated, the Senate should not be afraid to discuss any and all matters of interest to the Senate.

Professor David Crownfield rose and addressed the Senate. He said that the Senate can talk about any issue but that the Senate should realize that in some areas the Senate may not speak as the authority of the faculty; that in those areas the voice of authority is that expressed by the United Faculty. He continued by saying that there will always be some ragged edges of overlapping concern.

Several Senators stated that the Senate acted on behalf of the entire faculty not just that part of the faculty comprising the bargaining unit. The opinion was also voiced that if the Senate fails to act out the will of the faculty that the items of concern are then likely to appear in contract negotiations.

Senator Daryl Smith encouraged the Senate to move forward as an advisory body. He encouraged the Senate to take under its consideration all matters of its interest and not be diverted from discussing areas that others may not want to be discussed.

Chairperson of the Faculty, Evelyn Wood, indicated that she felt that the approach of moral suasion was the correct approach; however, she suggested that the concept of moral suasion be changed to moral persuasion.

Metcalf moved, Thomson seconded, that the Senate rise from the Committee of the Whole. Motion passed.

Senator Daryl Smith moved, Senator M. B. Smith seconded, that the Senate should continue business as usual. Motion passed.

Chairperson Harrington thanked the Senate for its thoughts and for providing guidance to the Chair.

Crawford moved, Glenn seconded, to adjourn. Motion passed. The Senate adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted.

Philip L. Patton
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Thursday, September 21, 1978.