

10-26-2015

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 26, 2015

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2015 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](http://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, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 26, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 10.

[http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/10](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/10)

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 # 1771  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE**  
**Oct. 26th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. – 4: 46 p.m.)**  
**Oak Room, Maucker Union**

**SUMMARY MINUTES**

**1. Courtesy Announcements:** Summary of Main Points

A. Press Identification: Christiana **Crippes**, *Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier*

B. Comments from Provost **Wohlpert**: (delivered by Interim Associate Provost **Dhanwada**) **Dhanwada** reported four issues from the Board of Regents meeting in Iowa City last week: (1) that the moratorium on new programs has been lifted. (2) that the new peer group was approved. (3) The Arctic Center –the Remote Cold Territories Center housed in the Department of Geography and applied for by Andrey **Petrov**, was approved. (4) That the Board of Regents received two reports, one from the Pappas Study, and another from the Ad Astra group regarding improving efficiency in scheduling. These reports will be added to the Provost’s website. **Wohlpert** would like to have faculty working groups formed for discussion on the topics of enrollment management and distance education.

C. Comments from Faculty Chair **Peters** were on two issues: the Pappas Report, which recommended “extremely aggressive expansion of online offerings,” and the issue of a possible financial literacy course for students that would address student debt. The Council of Provosts is researching what other universities do about student debt. **Peters** recommends that faculty stay informed and engaged about the expansion of online course offerings at UNI. He added that the Board of Regents has only received the Pappas Report; it has not yet made any recommendations.

D. Comments from Senate Chair **O’Kane** followed up with information about a financial literacy training workgroup created by the Council of Provosts to look at the possibility of an online module about financial literacy. The workgroup is made of two individuals from each university, including Tim **Backula** and Dick **Follwill** from UNI.

2. Summary **Minutes/Full Transcript** Oct. 12, 2015 approved(**McNeal/Walter**).

3. **Consultative Session:** Discussion of Emeritus Policy

<http://uni.edu/senate/draft-material-emeritus-policy>

\*\* Motion to return to regular session (**Zeitz/Pike**). Passed.

4. Docketed from the Calendar

1285 College of Business Administration Curriculum

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-business-administration-curriculum>

\*\* Motion to docket in regular order (**Kidd/Terlip**). Passed.

1286 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposal  
(docket in regular order) <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-social-and-behavioral-sciences-curriculum-proposal>

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-social-and-behavioral-sciences-curriculum-proposal>

\*\* Motion to docket in regular order (**McNeal/Burnight**). Passed.

1287 Petition of support for University of Iowa's censure in the hiring of their new president (requested to be considered at head of current docket) <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/support-university-iowas-presidential-search-censure>

\*\* Motion to docket at head of current docket (**Swan/Terlip**). Passed.

1288 College of Humanities, Arts and Sciences Curriculum Proposal

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-humanities-arts-and-sciences-curriculum-proposal>

\*\* Motion to docket in regular order (**Burnight/McNeal**). Passed.

1289 College of Education Curriculum Proposal and curriculum for Interdisciplinary programs <http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-education-curriculum-proposal-and-curriculum>

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-education-curriculum-proposal-and-curriculum>

\*\* Motion to docket in regular order (**Dolgener/Zeitz**). Passed.

5. **New Business – No New Business**

## **6. Consideration of Docketed Items**

**1287/1181** Petition of support for University of Iowa's censure in the hiring of their new president. (Head of the order 10/26) (**Swan/Terlip**)

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/support-university-iowas-presidential-search-censure>

**\*\*** Motion passed with amendment (**Swan/Walter**) to delete 'and other groups' from the last line of the petition.

**1277/1172** Receipt of Senate Budget Committee Report (previously tabled)

<http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/receipt-senate-budget-committee-report>

## **7. Adjournment**

**\*\*** Motion to adjourn (**McNeal/Pike**). Passed.

Time: 4:46 p.m.

### **Next Meeting:**

**Monday, November 9, 2015**

**Oak Room, Maucker Union**

**3:30 p.m.**

**Full Transcript follows of 47 pages, including 0 Addendum.**

**Regular Meeting**  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT of the**  
**UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**Oct. 26th, 2015 (3:30 p.m. - 4:46 p.m.)**  
**Oak Room, Maucker Union**  
**Mtg. # 1771**

**Present:** Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Xavier **Escandell**, Lou **Fenech**, Senate Vice-Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Senate Chair Steve **O’Kane**, Joel **Pike**, Nicole **Skaar**, Jesse **Swan**, Senate Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**. Faculty Chair Scott **Peters**, Associate Provost Nancy Hill **Cobb**, Interim Associate Provost Kavita **Dhanwada**.

**Not Present:** Senators Aricia **Beckman**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Todd **Evans**, Gary **Shontz**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, Renae **Beard**, Vice-President NISG.

**Guests:** Frank **Thompson**, David M. **Grant**, Ruby **Grant**, Jill **Uhlenberg**.

**O’Kane:** Good afternoon everyone. It’s a beautiful fall day and it’s time to convene the University Faculty Senate. May I have call for press identification, your name please?

**Crippes:** Christiana **Crippes**, *Waterloo Courier*.

**O’Kane:** Okay thank you. Any others? Comments from Provost **Wohlpert** will have to wait because he’s out of town at a meeting. I do have some things I’d like to say on his behalf later during my comments.

**Dhanwada:** I have a couple of things that he had asked me to make some comments on if I can, so hopefully I won’t say what you were going to say.

**O’Kane:** Hopefully you will so I won’t have to.

**Dhanwada:** Hello, everybody. The provost did ask me to just provide a few updates from the Board of Regents meeting that took place last week in Iowa City. First of all, as you may or may not have heard, there was actually a moratorium on the introduction of new programs when the TIER efficiency program started and so they said they would remove that moratorium after it’s concluded. So at this meeting there was a presentation of the academic projects and so therefore, they decided to actually decided to remove that moratorium. So that moratorium is lifted on new programs. Okay? Secondly, in May 2014 there was a group of faculty and staff from across divisions at UNI who worked together to create a report on developing a new peer group for UNI. The older peer group—there was differences that happened, and so to find a group that would much more align with us. And so, they had submitted it and it was actually approved at this meeting. And so the new peer group that we will be using was approved at this meeting, so that was good. Then the third thing, there was the Arctic Center, which is the Arctic Remote Cold Territories Interdisciplinary Center. This is through a grant, an NSF grant that received by Andrey **Petrov** in the Department of Geography. So this center, which will fund that center, I believe for six years, but I’m not 100% sure of the six-year part of it, but it will be funding that Center; that Center was approved as well by the Board of Regents, and finally the Pappas Report, or the Academic cases that had gone forward. There were actually two different groups that were working on this. One was the Ad Astra group, which was on scheduling and space allocation across the University;

how we could do that more efficiently, so that was presented and so the board has accepted their proposal as well as the Pappas report, which included two different areas. One was Enrollment Management and one was Distance Education. So, right before I came I had a chance to read an email sent by Faculty Chair **Peters** regarding kind of the state of the University. He does a great job talking about it, so I won't go into detail, but I think the one thing that the Provost did want to do is, he wants to set up working groups that we can have faculty provide input and feedback on these three different reports. One would be the space allocation, space scheduling; one would be enrollment management and the other one is distance education. So we will be working to get that set up as well as putting both of these reports on the provost's website, so that there is access by everybody for these two reports as well. So those are my comments on behalf of the Provost.

**Cobb:** I had one thing to add: The Ad Astra Report was informed by the group of faculty that met in 2013-14 so there was a significant report. I think we calmed them down just a bit.

**Dhanwada:** We had been working towards efficiency and so forth. Right now, both of those reports were just accepted by the Board of Regents. They have not approved it. They have not provided their own recommendations. But, we want to have the faculty and staff be able to provide input, so we will start that process soon, once we get those things going.

**O’Kane:** Thank you.

**Terlip:** I just had a question. Are the new peer institutions going to be posted online somewhere so everyone can access that?

**Dhanwada:** We can certainly do that. Yes.

**Terlip:** Thank you.

**O’Kane:** Comments from Chair **Peters**?

**Peters:** Thank you. I’m going to have to do this from memory because my technology is failing me here. I can’t connect to the faculty Internet. But on the Pappas report.

**O’Kane:** Scott, you can. Go to ATT.

**Peters:** Okay. On the Pappas Report, the thing I think for faculty to really keep an eye on there is the part about the expansion of online education. If you had a chance to read the email I sent out earlier today, they recommend extremely aggressive expansion of online offerings and I think that there’s very little appetite for that level of expansion of online offerings on campus. And I’ll also say, I didn’t put this in the email, but I’ll also say that the recommendations that come from that report, you can read it-- I linked to it in the email. I suspect that if you read it you’ll have the same evaluation that others I’ve talked to who have read it had, and that is those recommendations on based on very little data. There’s no market analysis for example that shows that this is possible. There’s nothing like that. It’s just sort of based on a hunch that we can grow rapidly



in this area. So that's the piece where faculty probably have to be the most engaged and pay the most attention I would say. And then, just to follow up to an email I sent Senators last week about the news item about the financial literacy course that came up at the Board. This question about a possible financial literacy course came up at a Council of Provosts meeting I went to over the summer and it seemed like that was going to be the end of it, and I think it came up at another Council of Provosts meeting that Steve attended. And the provosts agreed to get together and kind of research what some of the most effective ways are to counsel students about debt. Now as it happens here at UNI, we have found a pretty effective way to counsel students about debt, as you probably know the Live Like a Student program has resulted in our student debt decreasing by 13% since 2010. Nonetheless, President **Rastetter** made a comment at the Board meeting last week that he believes that the universities should have a required course on financial literacy. This was not a Board decision, at least at this time. It was a comment from the President of the Board, but not a Board decision. So my understanding is, and maybe Steve (**O'Kane**) has a little more information, but my understanding is that the provosts were going to continue to do what they were doing, which is looking into what other universities do to counsel students about debt. That's another one to just watch and see how that develops. That's it for me.

**Zeit:** Going back to your distance education, that concerns me a lot. Now our whole program's online. The thing that concerns me is that often administrators feel, 'Heck, we can put 20, 30, 40 people in a class.' Anything

over 20 is unmanageable. There's research that shows it. And so I think we have to fight for the size whether we go online or not. If there's a market, I don't see a problem with going for it, but I really believe that we need to fight for the size of class because it is too easy to just think that all you need to do is just lecture into a computer rather than lecturing into your class. It is a whole different world.

**Peters:** Yeah, and I'll say one thing that I forgot to mention, is that the Board merely received the report. The Board has not adopted its recommendations. Based on what I understand, I don't think the Board has figured out yet what it's going to do with the report. So I should be clear: I have not heard any indication from the Board that it will adopt that goal. But it's clearly—I would assume its going to do something with the report, right? It paid a lot of money for the report and so that's-- for exactly the reasons you raise, are the reasons we need to stay on top of it and stay engaged, because if they do start to go down the road of the report's recommendations, I think that's problematic.

**Zeitz:** What is the actual acronym? Pappas?

**Peters:** That is the name of the owner of the consulting group.

**Zeitz:** Thanks.

**Terlip:** Scott, I was wondering in terms of that potential for a required financial literacy course, are they talking about academic credit for that or...would it have to go through a curricular process? How would that work?

**Peters:** I was not at the Board meeting, but it sounded to me like...

**Cobb:** What I heard, and I actually thought our provost did a really good job because this was on the heels of a discussion about why students weren't graduating in four years and so forth, and so when that question came up, after Jim (**Wohlpart**) having been questioned about why our students weren't been graduating in a more timely basis (which by the way they are graduating faster than most of our peers. I hope everybody knows that.) But, when Bruce **Rastetter** said this, he said, 'Well, by the way, on the heels of that other comment, now you're going to add another course and it will take them longer to graduate?' I think their idea is just a credit course. But I think the provosts are really, 'No, let's don't,' because it's got to go through curriculum processes.

**Dhanwada:** Thanks, Nancy.

**Cobb:** That's just what I heard in public in the meetings.

**O'Kane:** That leaves me with just a few comments. One of them concerns this issue. At the September Council of Provosts meeting, it was decided along with Diana **Gonzalez** of the Board of Regents Office, that what we would begin to work on is a module to be taken online for just a few hours, like one to just a few hours, on financial literacy. In fact, the Board of Regents ...[laughter] In fact, instead of a course, is what I meant. Anyway, the Council of Provosts did put together a financial literacy training workgroup that has two people from each of the universities--Tim **Backula** and Dick **Followill**, from our University-- to begin to look at this. It seems

that the provosts really do want to stay away from the Board of Regents dictating, 'Thou shalt have a particular course,' and how many credits it would be. So this is also in the works. It's unclear what the provosts will eventually work out for the Board at this point.

**Pike:** Not having been here for earlier discussions on this, can you define in some way, what's meant by the term financial literacy?

**O'Kane:** I cannot.

**Zeit:** May I point out that it is a full section in the Iowa Core? So it is something that's covered in the K-12 schools. But if you want to change behavior, you're not going to do it in three hours.

**Pike:** Right.

**O'Kane:** Any further comments on that matter? If not, could I have a motion to move into Consultative Session?

**Zeit:** So moved.

**McNeal:** Don't we have to approve the minutes?

**O'Kane:** Oh we should, shouldn't we? We need to approve the minutes. Do I have a motion to that effect?

**McNeal:** Senator **McNeal** moves that we approve the minutes.

**O'Kane:** Second?

**Walter:** Second.

**O’Kane:** Senator **Walter** seconds. All in favor, ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye’? Motion passes. Now, I think I have a motion from Senator **Zeitz** to move into Consultative Session. Is there a second? Second Senator **Swan**. We are now into Consultative Session to talk about the Emeritus Policy and I hand it off back to Scott (**Peters**).

**Peters:** Thank you. This is the...Emeritus Policy being reviewed. Associate Provost **Cobb** can jump in if I screw anything up here, but it’s being reviewed because the auditor, who really works for the Board of Regents is going through all policies requiring that they be updated and it was noted, if you look this one up in the current policy webpage, it hasn’t been updated since 2000. And so there’s really two components to this: The first one is the policy itself-- the policy language itself, and then the second component is whether there need to be or whether there should be changes to the rights and privileges granted to emeritus faculty as it pertains to emeritus or emeriti faculty. The policy language itself is all that’s actually moving through the policy process, right? So what’s up on the screen right now is all that’s moving through the policy process. I’ll talk about that language in a second. I will say that I’ve gotten some emails from an emeritus faculty concerned about some of the changes to the rights and privileges. I think that Nancy (**Cobb**) has a meeting already with the president of the emeritus faculty.

**Cobb:** Michelle **Byers** and I...Could I insert something here?

**Peters:** Absolutely.

**Cobb:** So the policy was held in Human Resources. But as one of the processes as we were going through this, she and I both agreed, and other people agreed-- that when we do get this policy approved it should be moved to Academic Affairs. It shouldn't be held in Human Resources. So, that's why she was involved in it—because it was held in HR.

**Peters:** So Senator **Fenech** and I met with Associate Provost **Cobb** and with Michelle **Byers** of Human Resources and Toliff...I always forget his last name...

**Cobb: Hunt.**

**Peters: Hunt**—Easy last name, why do I always forget it? ...from Sponsored Programs and we reviewed the language and came up with what you see before you. The major changes from existing policy are this: Under the policy statement, the words 'academic administrators' are inserted there. Those words aren't there in the first sentence. And then there's a clause-- it is the clause that begins, 'the provost and executive vice president': 'The provost and executive vice president may grant administrator status to deans and directors who otherwise would be eligible for emeritus status as stated above, except that they retired or terminated service their to the university before accumulating ten years at the University of Northern Iowa. They must have served a minimum of 20 years in higher education. Note that that doesn't grant them emeritus faculty status, so they would be an emeritus dean, presumably, they might be able to help with fundraising or something like that. Those are the major changes to the policy statement

itself, so that's one thing to discuss. The other thing I thought is since the policy's up for review, and since Senate has sometimes wondered about how it should handle emeritus petitions, I thought this was as good as time as any to give the Senate a chance for input on whether it wanted the procedure to stay the same. Whether it wants the Senate to have to vote on emeritus petitions. Some universities, it's pretty automatic: You retire and you get emeritus status. And then second, whether that ten year requirement; 20 years in Higher Ed, ten years at UNI, is still appropriate or should be adjusted. I have no...I'm coming in with...there's no agenda here, I just thought if we're reviewing the policy, we might as well review the policy.

**Cobb:** We consulted the policies from Iowa State and Iowa when we were working on it, even before we had the session.

**O'Kane:** Scott, I've gotten some emails from people concerned about changes to rights and privileges, and unfortunately now the Internet really and truly does seem to be down, so I can't get them.

**Zeitz:** Before you address rights and privileges, can I ask a question? When I look through the materials they say what it is, but nowhere do they say why we do this. I think that might be something that's getting lost in all the cutting and things like that is why we're doing this. I have my own ideas as to why, but does anybody have an official line about why we have 'professor emeritus'?

**Cobb:** I think it's an honor for service to an institution over a career. Our emeritus status doesn't affect the benefits because there has to be a certain amount of time. You have to have that in order to get the benefits, but that's totally separated from the emeritus policy.

**Zeitz:** But are we trying to simply say, 'Thanks for being here and we loved what you did and here's your emeritus status,' or are we trying to say, 'Hey, you're retiring but we still want you to be part of the gang'?

**Cobb:** That's a really good question. We didn't really talk about that, so maybe that's something you guys want to talk about. I think it's pretty common among universities to have emeritus faculty.

**Zeitz:** I understand. But I'm still saying if we want them to be part of the gang, then they should still have access to things here at the university—parking and things like that would then allow them to come back and feel welcome.

**Pike:** Yeah, I was just going to say, kind of in support of that, that I think that might be a useful preamble to the policy to say why we as a University benefit from, and see a value in—not providing an honor, but what's the value to us, what's the benefit to us—and then it's also pretty clear, when you're talking about rights and privileges, okay, those are the costs, do they outweigh the benefits? Right now its just costs. I'm just thinking that might help in the discussion.



**Fenech:** Thank you. I just wanted to mention that I was on this committee with Senator [Faculty Chair] **Peters**. It seems to me that the changes that have been asked for are quite minimal. As far as I know, the only thing that they struck off was that parking privileges would be given to the spouse or significant other of the emeritus faculty noted. In terms of why, I think, for me anyway, as someone who does research and who has no desire to stop doing research. When I retire from teaching, I can't see myself not continuing my research and I want an institution to be associated with my name. And so it's partly because my reputation, I'm sorry I'm speaking about myself here, but that's what I know best, and that's part of the reason why I think emeritus status, at least to me is very important. In any event, as far as the changes for emeritus status go, they are very minimal. And Scott, please correct me if I'm wrong, here, it was in regard to very rare instances when emeritus faculty were leading programs before they became emeritus faculty and whether they could continue leading those programs, having retired from teaching but retained emeritus status. As far as I know from the numerous emeritus, emerita status people around, this occurs very rarely, so hopefully that answers some of your questions.

**O'Kane:** Further comments? Scott, (**Peters**) do we have a list of some of the changes to the privileges? I can't get at them.

**Peters:** Are there any comments, we need to make sure, so that we can take it back to the committee. As far as there's no desire to change the fact that the Senate votes? No desire to change the 20/10 rule? No objection to the ability to appoint emeritus administrators?

**Swan:** I think we should stop voting on the emeritus status. It's just so perfunctory that I think it detracts from any possible honor that might be associated with this status. There could be a way to object to somebody, if that's what we're worried about in the new policy. But, to keep bringing it through the Senate now, when we don't do anything with it, and it seems to be well, even more perfunctory than approving the minutes, that doesn't seem necessary; it seems a waste of our time and a degradation of the process. So I would support reforming the process so it doesn't have to come through Senate.

**Zeitz:** I'd like to disagree with Senator **Swan**. What that would mean is if I were to get a professor emeritus it would be bestowed on me by a clerk in the front office. If nothing else, it takes a little bit of time but, if nothing else, we as the have the Senate, who are representatives of the whole faculty, we are saying, 'Yes, this person should be acknowledged.'

**Walter:** I'd like to add also that when these folks come up, we often have someone come in and represent the emeritus candidate and say stuff about them; a little testimonial, and I appreciate that. As a central body of the University, I appreciate hearing about someone's efforts in a different department that I may never have even heard of.

**O'Kane:** More comments?

**Peters:** We'll go ahead and move the policy through, as I see the other stuff you've got lined up. In terms of the rights and privileges, the... since people

are having trouble with the Internet, I'll just try to quickly summarize. We don't publish telephone books anymore and we don't publish a catalog anymore, so that's taken off. Library access privileges remain, but since basically nobody gets free photocopies anymore, emeritus faculty members don't anymore, either.

**Zeitz:** This also says that they wouldn't get their name in the electronic telephone book either. It says, 'Listing in University catalogs and telephone books...'

**Cobb:** It's good to hear the comment about that. It's how the electronic telephone directory is created these days. It's all through employee processes. So we have to...

**Zeitz:** But there's no additional cost...

**Cobb:** Oh, I think there probably is because it involves personnel. I'll check on that. We can certainly check some more.

**Zeitz:** I understand that, but once you create the file, I know a little about technology-- once you create the file then you add five people a year. It's not that big of a thing. Once again, there may be a little cost at the front, but I'm imagining the cost is there already. The system's already there because we have the policy.

**Terlip:** I was just wondering because later in the document it says they won't be listed on departmental webpages anymore. It seems to me that

maybe you could link that to the directory very easily. Do we have them on our websites?

[Pause]

**Zeit:** do you have a Mac or Windows open, Steve?

**O'Kane:** This is Windows. It just doesn't want to link to the Internet.

**Terlip:** Listed on the appropriate...

**Peters:** Where's that?

**Terlip:** Number six.

**Peters:** I guess I was reading that in a different way. I think we need to find a way. I agree. We need to find a way to get emeritus faculty, I mean if they're associated with the University, they should somehow be listed with, in some form of University directory, at the very least in the department's home page, at the very least. So, we need to work on that.

**Cobb:** I'll check on that one.

**Pike:** At the risk of repeating myself, this kind of goes to where I do think it's really useful, because I do think that it's valuable that we have emeritus professors. If we had a statement there, then that would lead to why we want to incur some additional cost to have them listed, accessible and so on. It would make sense then.

**Cobb:** Could you create something for us? I'm serious. What did you have in mind and then it would go in there.

**Zeitz:** Just a sentence or two.

**Cobb:** Just a couple of sentences.

**Pike:** Sure, I could do that.

**Cobb:** That would be wonderful. That's a really good idea.

**Peters:** Some benefits are shifted to a category that people have to apply for. You have to apply for a parking pass, which you already have to apply for a parking pass anyway; Apply for shared office space—as you know, office space is increasingly a premium on campus. And apply to be a P.I. through Sponsored Programs. Some of these are exed off, not because emeritus faculty aren't entitled to them, but because they're...for example, participation in campus seminars, colloquia, et cetera. Those are open to everybody anyway. It wasn't an attempt to exclude anybody it was just thought that it was redundant.

**Zeitz:** [Question regarding emeriti auditing classes]

**Cobb:** Nobody's been doing that. If somebody wants to do that they're able to do that. I asked the Registrar.

**Zeitz:** So they won't be restricted?

**Cobb:** Right.

**Terlip:** Since we don't do formal registration or keep an official record, why can't we let them audit whatever they want with consent of instructor?

**Cobb:** I think the Registrar thought it was happening and nobody cares now. Maybe that should be something stated so that if a professor cares...that they could attend.

**Peters:** We could do something about that, like with consent of instructor, informally audit courses, or something like that?

**Terlip:** I had another question. Why did we take off 'service on graduate committees'? Number 5.

**Peters:** That's maybe that's just a question of editing. The thought was that the language as it reads now would include all committees, including the ability to serve on Master's. It's not meant to take off it's just meant to more generally say 'the ability to serve on committees.'

**Kidd:** Emeritus still could serve on committees?

**Cobb:** Yes. So it's just you don't need that in there. Trying to make it concise.

**Zeitz:** Sorry. I have a question about the very first one. It says you no longer call them 'Professor Emeritus'?

**Peters:** That got shifted to the actual policy. It's in the policy itself. It says, 'Titles approved for emeritus status are, Professor Emeritus or Emeriti for Instructional Faculty. It's actually more protected in a sense, because that's now officially in the University Policy.'

**Zeitz:** Okay. Thank you

**Terlip:** For the work-study assistants, that's struck, that they can't apply for that any longer? What if that's part of a grant?

**Cobb:** I think that would be handled through the grant process.

**Peters:** We can check on that.

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

**O'Kane:** Okay?

**Peters:** Thank you all.

**O'Kane:** Could I have a motion to go back to regular session? So moved by Senator **Zeitz**, seconded by Senator **Pike**. All those in favor say 'aye,' all against say 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' We are back in regular session and we're moving on to consider where we're Calendar Items for Docketing. Calendar Item 1285 is the College of Business Administration Curriculum. Do I have a motion to move that to the docket? So moved by Senator **Kidd**, second by Senator **Terlip**. Any discussion? All in favor say 'aye,' all opposed 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' Calendar Item 1285 will be docketed in regular order as Docket Number 1179.

**O'Kane:** Calendar Item 1286 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposal. Do I have a motion to docket that item?

**McNeal:** Senator **McNeal**.

**O’Kane:** Senator **McNeal**, seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Any discussion? All in favor say ‘aye,’ opposed ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ Motion is docketed as Docket Number 1180. Calendar Item 1287 is a petition of support for University of Iowa’s censure in the hiring of their new president. This has been requested by a number of faculty members and it has also been requested to be considered at the head of the current docket. Here is that resolution. Give us a chance to look at it, in case you have not.

Senator **Swan** seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Is there any discussion about docketing at the head of the current docket? All in favor say ‘aye,’ against say ‘nay’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ This will be docketed at the head of the current docket with Docket Number 1181. Okay. Calendar Item 1288, College of Humanities, Arts and Sciences Curriculum Proposal--do I have a motion to docket in regular order? Moved by Senator **Burnight**, second by Senator **McNeal**. Any discussion? All in favor say ‘aye,’ opposed ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ Motion passes. Moved to docket in regular order as Docket Number 1182.

**O’Kane:** Calendar Item 1289, College of Education Curriculum Proposal and curriculum for Interdisciplinary programs. Do I have a motion to docket in regular order? So moved by Senator **Dolgener**. Do I have a second? Second by Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion? Moved to the docket in regular order with docket number 1183. This particular week we do not have any New Business, so we will move to Docket Number 1181, Calendar Item 1287, a Petition of support for University of Iowa’s censure in the hiring of their



new president. Do we have anybody here who may have been one of the petitioners? Yes, please introduce yourself.

**Grant:** Sure. David **Grant**, Languages and Literatures. I didn't contacted the University of Iowa folks not their full Senate, but their smaller, more tighter Senate body that they have, and discussed with them, basically copied a lot their language. Shifting things around just to say that we don't necessarily question their findings, is the first thing, and that we support them based on their findings. But we're not saying anything about the Board of Regents ourselves. We're not saying anything about their action, but simply that as fellow members of the State higher education system we are in support, and that's sort of the long and short of it. I don't know if you wanted to open it up for questions, but that's about all I really wanted to do.

**Pike:** One quick question and this concerns me a little bit, where it says in the very last line, 'The University of Iowa faculty and Senate and other groups,' not really knowing what other groups might weigh in on this and how --- in what manner they may weigh in.

**Terlip:** The CHAS Senate voted to support it; The College of Humanities Arts, and Sciences and the College Senate voted to support it. That's one group I know of.

**O'Kane:** Clarification on that: Actually, the CHAS Senate voted to censure the president himself—the new hire. I don't recall them censuring the

Board of Regents or the process. I believe they censured him for irregularities in his resume.

**Terlip:** Yeah. I've got it here—I have the language.

**Swan:** Would you read it for us, please?

**Terlip:** Sure. 'Whereas the University of Iowa holds all members of the campus community to the highest ethical standards; Whereas it is our academic duty to teach and model the highest ethical standards to our students; Whereas professional ethics and responsibility in any field require accurate and honest self-presentation on a resume; Whereas incoming president **Harreld**'s resume inaccurately claimed the position Managing Principal of a company, Executing Strategy, LLC Avon, Colorado that does not exist; Whereas incoming President **Harreld**'s resume fails to co-cite authors for nine of 12 items listed as his publications as prohibited in the University of Iowa Operations Manual, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly censures incoming President **Harreld** for his failure in professional ethics.'

**Peters:** That was the University of Iowa's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences?

**Terlip:** That's ours. That's from UNI.

**Pike:** My problem isn't in supporting that. My problem is some other group comes out against censuring. Some other group comes out in support of the president, and we are supporting all of them.

**Swan:** Would it be all right with the petitioner if we amended this to delete 'and other groups'?

**Grant:** Yeah. That would be fine. We put 'other groups' in simply because it's such a fluid situation. You know there's the graduate students at Iowa, and... I knew our CHAS Senate was going to do something that was unknown. If we deleted that, that would be fine. Would the petitioner send that to me please?

**Swan:** Since we're talking about this, and it's right in front of us and it's just right there as Senator **Pike** pointed out and 'other groups' could be any number of other groups, so we could just delete 'and other groups' and then it's fine with the petitioner, so we're still supporting the University of Iowa Senate in this regard, so I move to amend this to delete, 'and other groups' from the last line.

**O'Kane:** Second by Senator **Walter**, any discussion on that change? All in favor say 'aye,' against 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' I will make that change on the Senate website.

**Walter:** There's also a typo.

**O'Kane:** They typo's not on the website. I found that one.

**Terlip:** We just voted on the amendment.

**Zeit:** I have a question: What is it exactly that we're supporting? It says we're supporting their Senate, but what does that mean?

**Grant:** I wanted to support them in anyway in any sense of the word that we could as a body. There is the...not only the narrow political questions of 'Do we support...What's our stance? With the Board of Regents or not? What's our stance with them?' I just wanted to show a sense of solidarity and them as individuals, as well, sort of beyond the narrow political, but the humanistic and more humane of that. I know a lot of people, I've talked with them, who are very concerned, very consternated, who feel that their careers may be hanging by a thread.

**Zeitz:** I understand the need for that type of support. But the question I have though is that you began with some caveats, saying that 'we're not saying the Board of Regents did anything wrong,' at least I think that's what I understood.

**Grant:** I'm simply saying that the statements there that are copied from the University of Iowa Faculty Senate basically saying, we trust them to have done their homework. I think we should trust them to have done their homework. They're our fellow colleagues. So that's all that we're saying at this point.

**Zeitz:** I fully...I think that we need to understand that we're not just supporting them, we're also saying, 'You're right.' That they didn't...that they were not ethical, that the Board of Regents was not ethical in the way in which they took care of hiring that president. At least it appears to me that if we're saying 'The whole reason we're doing this is because they're

saying that and we have it in this statement,' therefore we are supporting that point of view.

**Grant:** Not necessarily. I think we're supporting their right to have that point of view, irrespective of coming down with some facts or findings of our own.

**Zeitz:** Then perhaps it should be that we fully support the Senate's right to make these...I don't know what we should call them...what's the term-- charges. I was going to say accusations.

**Kidd:** The way I see it, there is an implication that we support that their findings are correct. I'm okay with that.

**Grant:** Beyond that, I think we could do much stronger wording, but after consulting with folks, 'Hey, okay. We can pull back.' But I think that's one of the things about this is they have a right to do it. They have a right to come to their own decision, and they did come to a decision and we should support them in that. Now that doesn't necessarily mean that we support it, though I think a lot of us do. I think we should, but as a member of the faculty...I think that's not something I can impose on anybody else. It's more of a moral stance; an ethical stance that we say, 'Hey, you know what? They came to this decision and that's their right to do that, and we support you.' That's kind of the long and short of it.

**Hakes:** If that's true, then all we need is the final statement. Remove 'and other groups' and we're supporting their Faculty Senate with their

arguments to the Board of Regents. But we don't need to restate all their arguments or rephrase. I'm just saying that if that's what we're to do, the final two lines does that.

**Dolgener:** I agree that the way it's written up there now it's not just supporting their right, it's supporting their conclusions as well. And so if we're saying we just supporting their right to make these conclusions, that should be stated.

**Kidd:** Just to reiterate, I like it as it stands.

**O'Kane:** Please introduce yourself.

**Thompson:** I'm Frank **Thompson**, I'm former President of the AAUP conference here in Iowa. I went down to Iowa this weekend. We had our fall conference and I did talk with the faculty at the University of Iowa. As of last week, there has been an investigative team from the National AAUP on campus looking at this particular issue. I think what you have to separate out is the fact that under AAUP principles there will be an investigation to determine whether or not corporate governance has been violated in this particular case. What the 'whereases' basically say is that there is a process and there are some concerns. The faculty has concerns over these issues. They have concerns about the way that the search process went--- some information that was withheld from faculty members. There's concern that the faculty members that were on the committee were very small in number. That the faculty committee, the search committee was disbanded before actual names went forward to the Board of Regents and that the

Board of Regents controlled that process after the committee was disbanded. And there are concerns about the way in which this individual presented their resume, and they signed a statement before they came on campus saying that this resume that they were presenting was accurate. So all of those things are things that will be investigated. What this particular petition says is there are these concerns and we support the Faculty Senate in its effort to get down to the bottom of it and to look at whether or not their corporate governance, or in this case, the shared governance that is found in the AAUP principles, was upheld, or whether it wasn't.

**Pike:** I have to disagree because the 'Whereas' states 'The University of Iowa Faculty Senate found certain things' including blatant disregard, found the reasons they failed to act. That's not an investigation. That's not...that's saying that they have reached those conclusions. I don't have a problem with supporting, to be honest, either their right to those conclusions or assume that we trust their Faculty Senate, perhaps supporting those, but I don't think as written this is either supporting their right to make those decisions, or the idea that there's going to be an investigation. It's saying they found these things as a result of whatever process they went through and we're supporting those findings.

**Grant:** I'm disagreeing. I have had friends and colleagues who--- and even my own kids who are like, "Well, you make a decision and you do it. Right or wrong, I support you." I'm not taking a stance on other people's actions but I will support you in making those decisions. I think that's the kind of

solidarity that was intended. We can defer to AAUP's findings later on as that goes through. But in the meantime, we can stand with them and not be divided.

**Hakes:** I couldn't agree more with what you're saying if that's what that says. But I understand. I'm just saying I don't think that's what that says.

**O'Kane:** Further discussion? We have a motion on the table to not only accept this proposition but also to fully support it, and I believe it's been seconded as well, so if there's no further discussion, it's time to take a vote on this as amended.

**Peters:** I don't know if it helps get to Professor **Grant's** intention or help us resolve this kind of dispute over slightly disputed words; slightly dispute over intention, but would the phrase 'expresses its solidarity with the University of Iowa Faculty Senate in its dealing with the Board of Regents,' would that be a way to thread the needle? I don't know.

**O'Kane:** Is that a motion?

**Peters:** I'm kind of asking for I think for a motion.

**Swan:** It sounds to me like any objection to this is to having the whereases in the resolution, and that's why that wouldn't solve the problem.

Eliminating the whereases would solve that problem for those who object to the whereases. To those who pretty much think the whereases situate the resolution plainly and clearly and that's all they do—is situate it—it doesn't say why you're having the resolution in the last sentence, right? It



doesn't say anything about their accuracy or inaccuracy. It just situates it plainly. But that seems to be the complaint. The one complaint, 'the groups,' has been taken out in the resolution. But the people who complained about this haven't complained about the actual resolution, which is the last sentence.

**O'Kane:** It's unclear to me how many people would like to keep the whereases, and how many people would not, so I suggest we vote on the original motion. And if you don't like those whereases, I suggest you vote 'nay.' Does that seem reasonable for everyone?

**Kidd:** If someone doesn't like them, they can make a motion to amend the proposal.

**O'Kane:** Okay. We can do that now if you wish. If somebody wants to make that motion.

**Peters:** I just want to say one thing, and that's you all I think saw the press reports where Regent **Sahai** himself spoke up at the Regents meeting to indicate his disapproval of the way this process was handled. I would say when a member of the Regents indicates such disapproval in such a public setting, that to me is a pretty good indicator that something about the process was broken and so looking at the resolution, I'm not...I guess I don't see how it's going out on much of a limb to support those statements.

**Grant:** Can I add just one more thing?

**O’Kane:** Please.

**Grant:** One, I think it does behoove us to stand united. The whole game plan is to divide institutions often, sort of divide and conquer, at least that’s my read of things. The other thing too is the sense of how—the political ramifications--how it might look if we voted ‘no.’ Right? Then it would be just clearly that we’re sort of taking sides. So we have to take that into account. And the third thing is, that I know I spoke with folks who were very put out and thinking like, ‘Well you know, University of Iowa faculty didn’t do anything when they closed Price Lab and so why should we...’ and I think that’s just something that we need to put behind and say ‘That’s in the past and let’s focus on now.’ So for those three things, we’re in a fluid situation and again I would echo what Scott (**Peters**) and Jesse (**Swan**) have said, that these whereases are just sort of a means to get us to...are we going to stand with the faculty at the University of Iowa or not?

**O’Kane:** Other comments? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion, say ‘aye,’ those opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ [One abstention.] Motion passes. Thank you very much.

**Grant:** Thank you.

**O’Kane:** Okay let’s move on to our last bit of business. I’m going to ask Senator **Kidd** to take that over. He will be introducing Docket Number 1172, which is Receipt of Senate Budget Committee Report. Unfortunately, we do not have Internet access.

**Swan:** It comes and goes.

**O’Kane:** It comes and goes? Mine’s mostly gone. I’ll try to click on it again.

**Kidd:** How about if I just summarize it then? Would that be okay?

**O’Kane:** Sure.

**Kidd:** The belated budget report wasn’t a very big endeavor like the year before, which is just fine. We examined some of the budget priorities, especially in a report given to the Board of Regents for this year. As normal for the past few years, it’s a tight year, not surprising to anyone I don’t think. It doesn’t look like it’s going to be a disastrous year, just a tight year. One of the problems that we’ve had is with the continuous deficit that we’ve been running, if you want to call it that, is the University has not been able to make strategic decisions. We’re kind of reacting. I think that’s a common view held by most people at the University that is in finance that I talked to. One thing that might be—I don’t know if it’s a good thing or not—but at least there’s some mechanism to address shortfalls and kind of hiding money in rollover—in these rollover accounts. I’m not sure that it’s the best way to do things, but at least it’s something that’s being used to address this issue. So basically the University is saving money they normally spend each year and putting it for next year, hoping that...in anticipation that the legislature may not give the full amount of funding. Two things which came up looking at the report: One was that in the report to the Board of Regents, the University showed a budget for 2016 which was about \$300,000 less spending on salary and benefits for faculty. Unfortunately, the group was faculty and administration-- a big combined

group. From the General Fund, and about \$600,000 less from non-General Fund sources, and so for a total of about \$1,000,000 it appeared less salary and benefit spending on the Instructional Category. However, what I did was ask Bruce **Rieks** from the Finance Office to examine the actual expenditures. So we took a look at expenditures. It's an addendum on the report that we can't see right now. [Internet was down.] When looking at expenditures for the past few months, say from August til now, over the past few years, we see the expenditures on adjuncts and full time faculty are actually pretty consistent. It doesn't look like a steep decline at all. So we looked inside the budget. We found that lumped in this category of faculty salaries, there are lump sum moneys at the Academic Affairs Office which is not normally spent on salaries. So, these are just pools of money. And in fact, it appears that this pool of money was actually rolled over into spending for this year or last year, so it wasn't actually spent on salaries. So it appears that, what it initially looked like was a significant decrease in spending on faculty salaries for this year as compared to last year, is actually just a budget category of this lump sum spending that's not normally spent on salaries, so I don't know why it's combined in there. That might be a question to ask. Bruce wasn't sure either. The other thing that came up was that the Athletics Department overspent their budget by approximately \$1,000,000. So this is significant. Their budget, combining the both General Fund and non-General Fund is about \$13,000,000 per year. And of course most of that is tied up in salaries, scholarships and things of that nature. So the actual amount, I guess liquid that they would

normally spend is not nearly that much, so \$1,000,000 is a large amount. It's not clear exactly why this occurred. I can say that.

**O'Kane:** Senator **Kidd**, would that \$1,000,000 come out of the General Fund then?

**Kidd:** No. This is what I was told by the Finance Office, and I would think it would be appropriate if we would actually get a copy of the loan agreement and that is that the Athletics Department will be paying this back at some interest rate—a low one—since interest rates are very low, using... I can't remember what the guy's name was, but the guy went bankrupt and had that fraud issue?

**Hakes:** Madoff?

**Kidd:** Yeah. Bernie. Not Bernie. The guy was local.

**Walter:** Wasendorf? Russ.

**Kidd:** He made a pledge to the Athletics Department, a rather large one, that's being tied up in bankruptcy court. So that's the collateral for their loan. And it's supposed to be paid off in four years, on yearly installments of approximately \$250,000 each, and I believe the first payment is to be made this fall. So that's what I can report on that. Supposedly this was covered through non-General Education Fund sources, but I don't have exact...I don't know what the sources were. So that would not be a bad thing for us to ask for. Are there any questions?

**Zeitz:** I have a question. Maybe I missed something. You're saying that they overspent by \$1,000,000?

**Kidd:** Yes.

**Zeitz:** And they're going to be paying this back \$250,000 a year for the next four years?

**Kidd:** Yes.

**Zeitz:** Well if they've overspent by \$1,000,000 where are they going to get the money to pay that \$250,000 next year?

**Kidd:** That's their problem.

**Zeitz:** Okay.

**Thompson:** I think the Athletic Department is to be commended for at least recognizing they overspent the budget by \$1,000,000 and they want to develop some type of loan arrangement to recognize that particular deficit. At least they're taking responsibility for that, in addition to the other deficits that they run every year for the last 20 years. However, we talk about financial literacy, I actually teach financial literacy and the students that I teach, whenever we talk about loans, particularly personal loans within a family, we always say you should keep it on a business relationship. And a business relationship means that you get to see and actually identify what that loan arrangement is: How much interest is going to be paid? What the penalties are if the interest isn't paid on a timely

basis, what the term of the loan is. I would agree that it would be very helpful if the Athletic Department were to come up with the actual loan agreement and have that as an addendum to this particular report. Thank you.

**Swan:** I can't call up the whole report and maybe you guys didn't look at this, but lots of my constituents and I are concerned with what appears to be a huge bureaucracy on campus. Did the committee look at the actual budget, where the money's being spent? You of course looked at faculty spending—spending on faculty and you've reported on that but was there any examination of the balance between non-instructional, non-faculty bureaucracy across campus?

**Kidd:** If you actually look at the expenditures there is expenditures on salary for P & S staff. Everything is actually in there and broken down. What we haven't done, which I would like for us to do, is to also have a comparison of the rates spent say on say faculty, P & S and employees, Merit, et cetera as compared to peer institutions using IPEDS (Integrated Post Secondary Education Data System) data. I think it's difficult to look at us just by ourselves. I think it would be more appropriate if we could take a look at how we compare to other institutions, and then I believe we could get a clearer picture. Does that make sense?

**Swan:** That does make sense. I'm sorry I don't have the report in front of me. You did see that 'x' percent of our spending...you could see those? It

didn't strike the committee as unusual even though I just heard you didn't compare it to comparable universities, so that didn't seem to raise a flag?

**Kidd:** I can say that a couple of year ago I went to a conference sponsored by AAUP where we took a look at the overall institutional spending, how it compared and...I'm not going to say we're good or bad, but there are a lot worse places as far as administration and bureaucracy than UNI. That's all I can say.

**Swan:** So you couldn't, the committee couldn't go beyond say, it appears that this is an area—here this part of bureaucracy that could achieve efficiencies or this appears to be redundant, that is, done two times by two different offices?

**Kidd:** I don't know that we have the expertise to really dig down into that level of detail, but what we can do is look at the overall picture and compare that to other institutions, and of course we could find out these institutions are seen as efficient operations or as bloated operations.

**Swan:** Very good. Thank you.

**O'Kane:** Any further questions for Senator **Kidd**? We do have an issue before us and that is that the budget committee was only put in place for a single year. So we need to decide as a Senate whether or not this committee should be a standing committee or at least proceed for at least one more year. So we would need a motion for that if someone thinks it's a good idea.



**Zeitz:** I move to make it a standing committee.

**O’Kane:** Motion made by Senator **Zeitz**. Second?

**Terlip:** Second.

**O’Kane:** Second by Senator **Terlip**. Comments?

**Peters:** Just a little bit of a clarification. When we restructured a few years ago, the Senate put a sunset provision in to force the Senate to review the new structure and see if it was working; make any possible changes and I think last year, the last academic year, was the last year of the sunset provision. So the committee right now is basically operating under the invitation of the Chair to keep doing its work. To make it a standing committee it would say, ‘The current structure is fine, get rid of that sunset thing,’ and just keep going.

**Kidd:** We did make some suggestions for what the makeup of the committee would be and the charge of the committee. And of course because we don’t have the Internet, you can’t see it. But I can describe it in general. In general, the charge of the committee would be to work with administration on this new policy we passed regarding getting financial information, about the faculty in general on the College and Senate level and then continue our charge which has been to look at the overall financial health of the University, comparing it from one year to the next and to look for unusually large transfers of money across divisions. That was actually the Athletics Department. So that would be the charge.

**O’Kane:** I would suggest you also add, we also add, the comparison with peer institutions to the charge.

**Kidd:** Comparison to peers. That would be great to have in the charge. You know currently what I would do is take what we’ve currently worked on the last two years and streamline this process so that we could have a report generated automatically by Finance to give us the information. The composition of the committee that we have...

**Pike:** Just a quick question. I was trying to track through, as you were talking about the goals and charge. Is one of those things—and maybe you said this—at least a faculty evaluation of the budget priorities?

**Kidd:** That’s part of it, yes. It’s not just the Senate Budget Committee. It’s also at the department level, the department and it also involves the college senates. So the Senate Budget Committee is at the University level, and to look at the overall budgets of the colleges, but we would not drill into things like departments.

**Pike:** I just was looking at the overall...

**Kidd:** The big picture. Yes.

**O’Kane:** Further discussion?

**Swan:** I think Senator **Kidd** was adding something further.

**Kidd:** Yes. Just on the suggested composition of the committee. Currently the committee is heavily weighed with members from the College of Business. Maybe not surprised. We think it would be very useful to have the composition of the committee to represent one person from each of the colleges. We would suggest that it be an elected position. I'm not sure if that's appropriate or not—if possible or not. We think that would be appropriate. We think that one member should be from the University Senate, appointed and one member should be appointed by Ed Faculty for the main reason that when you look at budgetary concerns, salary is an awful lot and you get these overlapping gray areas and so we don't want to step on anybody's toes that we don't have to. Does that make sense? So there would be four elected positions, one representative of each college who would work with the college senates and give information there.

**O'Kane:** And how many other positions?

**Kidd:** Two. One from the University Senate and one from the...

**O'Kane:** The committee would be six members?

**Kidd:** Yes.

**Swan:** I'm just throwing this out from what you've said: Would be okay to have four elected members and then have a limit to have no more than two from any one college? So if you had two from one college and two from another colleges, maybe a college isn't represented. But there could be good reasons that those four are the best, and leaving a college out that doesn't have anybody as rep might scare somebody out. I do see that you

wouldn't want even three of four from one college, but I'm just throwing that out as another possibility. Secondly, also because one of the four colleges is so big—that it's not really being represented in a scheme when you have one from each college. But that's not what's really important in this case. It really is interest, broad-based representation as much as possible, but interest and desire to do this kind of work.

**Kidd:** Of course.

**Swan:** So he says that would be okay...

**O'Kane:** I'm not sure how it would be implemented. Where would the elections occur, within the college senates?

**Swan:** Or it could be University-wide, as it is like a University-wide committee or the Senate would give a University-wide position, as it is now apparently. But that we would now limit to no more than two from each one.

**Gould:** Could you also consider adding the Library?

**Kidd:** Is that a separate college?

**Gould:** Well, we have a senate. We have a Library Senate. Library Faculty Senate and the budget is of high interest to the library.

**Kidd:** I'm sure it is. Yeah. No. I thought you were part of the four colleges. I apologize.

**Gould:** That's okay.

**Zeitz:** They've got their own dean.

**Kidd:** I guess that's true. Right. Yeah, that's something I would definitely consider. The problem is trying to find enough people to sit on the committee. That's the main issue, and that's what you're bringing up. I think a committee of four or five people is sufficient. I would not be opposed to having one person represent the Senate and the college, and one person represent the Union and the college. I do believe communication should be open, which I've tried to maintain, but I'd like that to be formal. And I think communication is important to each college senate. I think that's an idea that should be formalized if we're going to transfer of financial information to each college senate. I think that was the point of one person from each college.

**Swan:** Would then the membership come from the Senate itself maybe?

**Kidd:** I don't think it comes from the Senate.

**Swan:** Because a person elected from a college doesn't typically report to the college senate, but if you're on the college senate and the senate sends you, then you attend the Senate meetings, so then you would have that connection.

**Pike:** Just a quick observation, and maybe this is irrelevant, but I actually have to leave in a few minutes, which is why I'm making it. It seems to me that the item that was docketed was receipt of the Senate Budget

Committee Report, and that maybe as a separate item, we might want to docket and discuss the future of this committee, its composition perhaps with some written documentation about...

**Kidd:** There is written documentation in the petition.

**Pike:** In the report?

**Kidd:** As part of the file submitted with the petition, yes.

**O'Kane:** I think you have a good suggestion, and I think if I could ask you Senator **Kidd**, if you would file a petition that includes all this...the ideas we've been sharing.

**Kidd:** Sure. At this point, should the committee continue work or not, that's the question.

**O'Kane:** There is a motion on the floor that you continue. We could have a docketed item in the future with that charge and the composition.

**Kidd:** Yes.

**Swan:** My understanding is that there is a motion that was made to make this a standing committee. The committee could just continue as it is now by your invitation or request with the understanding that when we get the new petition to make this an ongoing committee, that we will probably consider that.

**O'Kane:** That is perfectly fine with me.

**Swan:** We don't have to vote on that. They keep going by your invitation.

**Kidd:** I don't recall who made the motion.

**Zeit:** I'm willing to withdraw the motion.

**O'Kane:** I like that idea. Senator **Kidd** would you take care of that?

**Kidd:** Right.

**O'Kane:** Do we have any other business to take care of today? If not...we received the report. Seeing nothing else, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Too many! One by **McNeal**, seconded by **Pike**. All in favor, 'aye.' Right.

4:46 p.m.

Submitted by,  
Kathy Sundstedt  
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

**Next meeting:**

3:30 p.m. Monday, November 9, 2015

Oak Room, Maucker Union

**Follows are 0 Addendum to the minutes.**