

12-9-2013

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 9, 2013

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2013 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, December 9, 2013" (2013). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 27.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/27

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.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
12/09/13 (3:32 p.m. – 4:52 p.m.)
Mtg. #1746

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

No press were present today.

Provost **Gibson** was absent today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded everyone of the opportunity to view the results of the Library Feasibility Study tomorrow between 2:00 and 5:00. He also encouraged everyone to complete the survey on Student Assessment Instrument.

Chair **Smith** commented on the Library Feasibility Study he has already had a chance to view and encouraged all to attend the Open House tomorrow afternoon. He then reported on his presentation at Cabinet this morning via PowerPoint of Faculty Senate activities this semester and issues planned for next semester. The PowerPoint can be found as Addendum 1 to these Minutes. He also provided other details from that meeting which can be found verbatim in his comments below.

Chair **Smith** then previewed a policy coming again from the EPC for next semester and then turned the floor over to Senator **Shontz**, UNI's Transparency Officer, who explained opportunities for anyone at UNI to come before the Transparency Task Force for a hearing on any issue they would like to reach the Board of Regents.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

No Minutes were up for approval today.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1214 Consultative Session with LAC Director Deirdre **Heistad**
Motion to docket in regular order (Edginton/Nelson**). Passed.

4. New Business

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

No docketed items today.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Edginton/Hakes**). Passed.
Time: 4:52 p.m.

Next meeting:

Date: Monday, January 13, 2014
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 45 pages, including 2 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**
Date
Mtg. 1746

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbart**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Kim **MacLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz** , Jerry **Smith**, Laura **Terlip** (22 present)

Absent: Gloria **Gibson**, Melissa **Heston** , Syed **Kirmani**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter** (6 absent)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Smith**: All right. I’m thinking we can get down to business, so I’m going to call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And begin with press identification of which there appears to be none.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: I know Provost **Gibson** told me this morning that she would not be able to be here today, and guess what? She’s not here.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: And Faculty Chair **Funderburk**, who I thought would be here is not here but maybe he'll come, and we'll let him talk when he does.

[Arrived shortly. See his comments below.]

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: Which leaves it up to me for some comments, and most of my comments have to do with—relate to this morning's Cabinet meeting. We had a meeting of the Cabinet over in the Library this morning. Here comes Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**]. We'll give him a few minutes to settle down, and I'll do my stuff first.

The first and largest agenda item at that meeting was a presentation by Chris **Cox** and the architects regarding a study as to the feasibility of doing really a massive remake of Rod Library. It was really massive, when you heard the price tag at the end. I believe there is going to be an open-to-the-campus-community event tomorrow afternoon that will make public what is being talked about and considered. I assume that's over in the Library, and it's getting publicized, so if you're interested, that's one place to get it firsthand. I suspect you'll get the same thing that we got at the Cabinet.

I was next up on the Agenda, having been asked to provide an update on Faculty Senate matters. And I did that by means of a short PowerPoint presentation that summarized what the Senate has been doing this semester—consultative sessions, policy stuff—and what we would hope to accomplish—and certainly what I would hope to accomplish—during the rest of the academic year. What I'll do is attach a copy of those slides to the Minutes for this meeting so you can look at them, but—just so you're—for your information. [see Addendum 1] I don't think there will be anything surprising, although, yeah, some of it gets a little bit.....ok.

Terry **Hogan** talked a little bit about a conference that went into how to org—how universities might organize for enrollment management purposes, and that connects to this VP of Enrollment Management that, I don't know, they are thinking about hiring or whatever—I'm not sure—followed by Christie **Kangas** who talked about—presented some of the current statistics pertaining to next Fall's incoming freshman class. I thought you might be interested in knowing that, thus far, applications and admissions are up 7% over the previous year. Housing contracts are up 5%. So it looks like, you know, compared to last year, the enrollment thing, at least the incoming class enrollment is on a positive trend. There has been something like a 30% increase in campus visits by prospective students and parents, I presume at least in part as a result of the open houses that we've held this Fall.

Tim **McKenna** spoke with regard to several policy proposals that I had previously distributed to you. The only one that got interest from us, from the Senate, was Policy 13.19, Retaliation and Misconduct Reporting. And Senators raised two issues about that, and I passed them along to him. First, there was a question about reporting instances of retaliation or misconduct that come from the Office of the President and its direct reports. There's concern, how are you going to have these people kind of investigate issues involving their own behavior, and there seems to be some sensitivity to that, that they're willing—that President **Ruud** expressed, “Yeah, we have to provide some sort of mechanism to deal with that,” but nothing was decided this morning. Second was whether this Policy would cover situations of grievances filed by students against faculty members, or whether those would still be governed by the Grievance Policy. I know that Scott [Senator **Peters**] had raised this point. Tim [McKenna] deflected it kind of back on me, which means we'll have to research the matter and make a recommendation. Scott, you and I can kind of talk about it or look into it, whatever. So that particular Policy is kind of being held up pending resolution of those concerns. The other two policies were ones that no Senator expressed any particular concern with, and they were, you know, kind of off to the side, at least from the academic part of the University.

And finally, Michael **Hager** talked about the Budget Process and distributed a sheet that lays out a rough timeline for FY 2015 budget planning. And I made copies of that to pass on to you guys because this is something that is relevant to us because of our expressed desire to have input into the Process. [see Addendum 2] His timeline does include points for Faculty Senate input. In fact, in February and March, they would be—you know, it's specified here that you would have input from the Faculty Senate, P&S Council, etcetera. But the implementation details have to be worked out. And this is—it's kind of a first cut. I don't think it's—you know, there's some flexibility in this. I know that Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] had mentioned that the plan that VP **Hager** put out doesn't currently include a step for Cabinet input, which VP **Hager** seemed to feel that, yeah, that probably has to get in there somewhere as well. So, just to give you a feel for what they're looking at, our sense of what a Budget Process will look like, and then we've got to talk, and this is something I wanted to talk about later today, of how we're going to go about positioning ourselves to have input into this process.

Finally, VP **Hager** mentioned the Board of Regents efficiency study and directed our attention to the web page for purchasing where you can find the RFP and specific details of what the Board of Regents is looking for. He subsequently sent a link to that page to members of the Cabinet, and if you'd like, I could forward that to members of the Senate, if you want me to do that, and you can see the specific details of what they're calling for from potential consulting firms who would do the study. So, it will give you a feel for what we're looking at there. So I'll pass that along to you all. [http://www.vpaf.uni.edu/obo/purchasing/rfq_documents/RFPforOrganizationalEffectivenessV2.pdf]

Ok, so that was the Cabinet meeting this morning. One other point, Francis **Degnin**, the Chair of the PRC [*sic*, EPC] has informed me that they are about finished with the Administrative Grade Change Policy that we sent back to them in the Spring. If you remember, we had a meeting on that. It just kind of metastasized, but we sent that back to them, and they're ready to come back to us with something. So I would expect—I didn't—it hasn't gotten to me yet that I could petition it and put it on the docket, but I'm thinking we'll be dealing with that in either January or February.

And now to conclude my comments, I want to turn the floor over to [Senator] Gary **Shontz**, who is UNI's Controller or chief accounting officer and also a member of the Senate. And earlier this semester, Gary had asked me for some time to talk to the Senate about the Regent's efforts to promote transparency, and this seemed like a good time to do that. So, Gary?

Shontz: Ok. Back in February of 2013, the Board of Regents appointed a Transparency Task Force. They met several times, and their work product was a report that they gave to the Board of Regents I think back on about June 19th. One of their recommendations was that the Board of Regents receive input from interested parties once the Agenda came out. But the Board decided to do that, rather than allow persons to come to their Board meetings to present information, to have hearings. And there are hearings at 6 locations, the 5 institutions plus the Board Office. They are approximately 5-7 days before the Board meeting, and they're generally like 2-3 days after the docket material comes out. The hearings on our campus are in Room 30 of the CEEE, is that the right building? Yeah, yeah, CEEE, yeah, [*sic*, correct building is Business & Community Services (BCS) Room 30] and the next hearing is on January 31st at noon. The hearings rotate between noon, 4:00 o'clock, and 6 o'clock. The idea is that persons with jobs might have a chance to get to one of those possibly during non-working hours. So January 31st, March 7th, and April 17th are the 3 upcoming ones. I was appointed the Transparency Officer for UNI back in August. I had 2 of the 3—I already performed 2 of the 3 functions. One was to receive public information requests and to post those to a website, and now I acquired a third job which is to conduct the hearings. I'm not trying to drum up business, but I just want people to be informed that the public hearings do exist because at our first hearing we had 2 persons and, at the 2nd one, we only had one person. So, if you have matters that you'd like to present to the Board, do come to those. And they are videotaped and posted to the Board of Regents website.

Smith: Any questions for our Transparency Officer? [none heard] Thank you, Gary.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Ok, next item on our Agenda, Minutes for Approval, and there aren't any, so got that done quickly.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

O'Kane: Did Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] have a comment?

Smith: Oh, yeah, I should go back to Jeff and ask for his comments.

Funderburk: Yeah, just briefly. Part of it you already did. The Library Feasibility results are tomorrow. That is open. I hope you'll get a chance to go by and have a look at that. Just so you know, those are conceptual drawings. It's not hard and fast of what's going on, but it gives you an idea of the things that were being looked at for the process, and there's many stages where this will ever happen, of course. But that's 2:00 to 5:00? Is that what it was? [heads nodding] And behind the Reference Desk, I think, is where it was. [voice saying "yes"] Yes, you got an email.

And the other is about the survey regarding the Student Assessment Instrument. I hope you'll take a chance to do the survey. It is quite long, but it's also the first chance we've ever had to actually weigh in on this as a full campus with everybody, so if you haven't already done that, you'll have a look at that and then also encourage your colleagues and students, because it's open to students as well, to try to get some input on that.

Those are the two items I had.

Smith: Thank you, Jeff.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1214 for Docket #1110, Consultative Session with LAC Director Deirdre Heistad

Smith: Ok, next item is consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing of which there is one, this would be Calendar Item 1214 which, if docketed, would be Docket #1110, Consultative Session with LAC Director Deedee, or Deirdre, **Heistad**, and I suggested to Deedee that she meet with us during our second session in January, that being on January 27th, so I was planning to ask for a motion to docket this at the head of the order for our meeting on January 27th. However, since we haven't yet received curriculum proposals and consequently won't have that work to do at our January 13th meeting, I think we're better off meeting with Director **Heistad** on January 13th. I'll have to clear with her that she'll be available then. I think she will be, but I think it will fit our schedule better if we can meet with her then, and then have the 27th available for heavy duty on curriculum. So, in view of that, I'd like a motion to docket this in regular order.

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Edginton**. Second?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Nelson**. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] And let me say Deedee asked to meet with us primarily so she could talk about what the LACC is doing to improve Student Outcomes Assessment in that Program, which has been a long-standing concern with our accreditors. I suggested to her that we would also want to talk about other and potentially larger issues as well. This Program, the LAC, is the responsibility of all the faculty on this campus. We represent all the faculty and consequently are responsible for insuring that the Program is effective. So I would hope that we can have an in-depth and far-ranging discussion with Director **Heistad** on the 13th. Any further discussion of the motion to docket Calendar Item 1214 in regular order?

[none heard] Then I guess we're ready for a vote. All in favor, say "Aye."
[ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." And that motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Now, if you saw the Agenda, you saw we don't have any docketed items, and as I explained in my email, we don't have that regular kind of business to do today. What we have is a lot of things to talk about and mainly to kind of set things up for the next semester, and I'm proposing to do that as New Business in a fairly informal, open kind of discussion. Most of the topics are ones that I had indicated in my email to you, so if it's ok with you, that's what I'd like to do, just start going through those. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: Yeah, I just have a question about that. My understanding is that, I mean, does—are—is anyone more familiar than I am about the parameters of discussing things without them being on the docket already?

Terlip: You can't take a vote on anything, but we can discuss.

Cutter: And have we typically—I mean, what had been the sort of standard parameters in the past for like how far discussion goes?

Smith: We can go as far as we want, but as Laura [Secretary **Terlip**] pointed out, we can't officially act on things.

Cutter: Ok, but, I mean, I'm just thinking in previous years

Smith: We could if we chose to.

Cutter: like if Scott [former Chair **Peters**], can you tell us about what the [Faculty] Senate was—did on this kind of thing last year?

Peters: There was only one thing on the Agenda that might require a decision, right? Am I right? Only one thing on the Agenda that might require a decision?

Smith: We're going to vote members on the—for the Senate Finance Committee [*sic*, Senate Budget Committee].

Peters: So, you can make a motion under New Business to do that and as long as two-thirds of people agree, then it could be docketed immediately. And then you could proceed to discussion about it.

Terlip: Question. Wasn't that tabled from another meeting? Because if it was tabled, we need to bring it off the table.

Smith: I don't know that it was tabled. I think we had the issue. We brought it, and we decided the last time we talked about it that we, in fact, were going to elect new members. It was—I never put it up as a petition kind of item, and so at some point—and if I'm not mistaken, we've elected members before pretty much just by electing members. I don't know that we've ever gone through docketing with some of those things. But—so I think what we had decided on the Agenda item when it was a petition, we decided, yeah, we're going to go ahead and, you know, re-charge this Committee, and re-staff it, and so that's what we're going to hopefully do today. Are you comfortable with that? But if you want to, when we get to that, we've got some other things to do first, but when we get to that, if you want to go through the thing of setting it up as basically an item to be docketed, we can do that.

So, the first thing I wanted to talk about, and I'm going to go through the items pretty much as they were presented in the email I sent out last week, curriculum packages that we're going to begin receiving. Because they aren't yet in hand, I can't docket them today. And we will want to docket these. These are things that you don't like to just act on right away because you want to give Colleges and Departments notices of when their curriculum proposals will be discussed by the [Faculty] Senate. So, I'm assuming we'll be able to docket some or all of the curriculum packages on our first meeting in January, the 13th, and then address them, begin to address them, maybe address all of them, on the next meeting, on the 27th. But I wanted to have a discussion of how we handle these. And it's been a topic of discussion/disagreement among the Senate before.

This is something like the third, at least the third time that I've been involved in dealing with curriculum packages on the Senate, and the way they've been dealt with have very real extremes. I mean, I remember one year, the first time I was doing it, I think Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**] was actually the Chair of the Senate at the time, we approved everything just like that. There was no discussion of anything, just one—you know, a couple of motions and bingo, highly efficient. The other times, as some of you know that have been here, we've had in some cases fairly extended discussions more-or-less productive. And it's kind of, I think, an issue of what matters should we talk about? I know, for instance, Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**] has told me that now in the current system it doesn't always indicate consultations, and so if somebody's going to raise an issue, "Well, was a consultation done with this?" and that has happened before, that could be a waste of time because the consultations have happened. They're just not reported on the online system. So, I suggested in an email to the Chairs of the UCC and GCCC that they identify for us curricular matters that they felt deserved our attention, perhaps because they had policy implications or controversial or for whatever reason or something that we should look into. And I know Mike has kind of been thinking along those lines. So we may have that kind of to focus our attention. But I wanted to kind of put this issue out for you, get your thoughts on how we might approach the curriculum packages when we get them. Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: Thanks. I talked to Diane **Wallace** about this because we had an issue where we were not consulted as a Physics Department on a course change, and from what she told me the system is supposed to automatically send consultation requests for every Department listed or referenced in the course catalogue for a particular course or Program. So—and she was able to see actually that this consultation did not go through for some reason. So it appears that the system is supposed to do this automatically, but sometimes it doesn't. And she can actually tell if it's happened or not. So I'd just like you to know that.

Smith: Ok. Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: While I appreciate wanting to do this efficiently, I am bothered by us not asking about consultations, because if it's something new, they may not have known who to consult or who it might have impact on. So maybe we can arrange a system where we can check that before we come to the meeting, but I think if anybody has a question about consultations, we—that's our job to do it here.

Smith: Yeah, let me be clear here that anybody's entitled to raise any question they want with regard to curriculum proposals. We could approach it kind of as a consent agenda where there's kind of default that if somebody doesn't raise a question, it's ok. But do feel free to raise questions if it's about consultations or whatever. It's just that I know—I mean, many people have said that maybe 2 years ago or 4 years ago there was time wasted on Senate questioning that wasn't all that productive. So, it ultimately comes down to the Senate of saying, "Yeah, I think that's—you're right. That question should be raised." Feel free to bring it up, and the Senate will kind of collectively decide if we—how far we want to go into it. Other discussion of that? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: The starting point for the Senate's role here is to look at the Curriculum Handbook and Policy, which, of course, I didn't do before today, but which my memory says more or less the Senate's role is—that the Senate "shall approve UCC recommendations except in a few cases where the Senate should pay more attention," and one of them would be if a Program is essentially appealing or if a Program has an objection that in some way it didn't think it got heard at a lower level, and that would be something like a consultation that wasn't properly done, one of whom I believe is a new Program. There's 3 or 4 things on there. And so, you know, my own view on this is that we should definitely use the Senate's time as productively as possible, allow the Senate to focus on big picture University-level kinds of things like resources and new Programs, but also—and allow appeals from lower bodies, but, barring such things, also assume that our colleagues in the lower bodies have done their jobs well. And so, you know, I think as we pick and ch—as we look through the curriculum packets, we should just be mindful of the fact that if a College Senate and a UCC or a GCCC has already approved a new course and has already vetted it and everything that, if it's just a new course, it's not a substantially new

investment of resources, there's no one else who objects to it, is it a really wise use of the [Faculty] Senate's time to pull that out and spend a lot of time on it?

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: And I would basically agree with that, having spent, you know, a lot of time on the UCC. Those bodies have a lot more time to look into detail and ask a lot more questions than we can ask because they're going through curriculum a lot slower than we are. And so, yeah, the Senate, I think, it makes sense as a Body to resolve disputes, to be a place of appeals. So consults are one of those areas, if somebody didn't notice that somebody wasn't consulted at the lower level, like we should certainly bring that up here. I mean, resources, I'm a little less concerned with if there's no dispute, because the Deans of each College are supposed to approve proposals as regards resources. So, I mean, I would think if the—if—you know, but there's—if there's a major issue, I mean, there's no reason we can't weigh in on that kind of thing. But I think, you know, if—in a lot of cases these kinds of concerns should come up at the UCC or the GCCC. So I don't think we should have to start from scratch for every proposal.

Smith: Senator **Evans**.

Evans: A few years back I had the privilege of chairing the College of Education Curriculum Committee, and what we ended up doing was just kind of using our Minutes as a report to the College of Education Senate. So we addressed—we showed everyone what our questions were and then, you know, we met with each Department or Program, and we had their responses, and we had how we voted, so we kind of shared with the College Senate what we found, what the questions were, what came out. I don't know if there is any way of having that available, but it might be useful to see what kind of questions came up, what the discussion was, you know, and it just saved a little bit of a reading and kind of read—picking through the same stuff that you guys did.

Licari: I can respond to that. Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] did ask for a memo with some kind of written statement as a result of our work from both the UCC and the GCCC, and so once the UCC has met for hopefully the last time on Wednesday I will basically compile the Minutes into a more readable report and transmit that to Jerry. If he wishes to share that with the Senate, as I presume he would, then you will be able to see the deliberations and what the UCC found challenging or difficult to work through, for example, this will be—this coming Wednesday will be the 3rd time that some of the material has come to the UCC. So, you know, we certainly are not rubberstamping things.

Smith: And I've looked at the Minutes before and found them helpful in kind of raising questions or resolving questions. I will say having looked at the Policy, as written, I think it's quite frankly much too restrictive on the Senate's role. It kind of makes it like the Senate just rubberstamps.

I think there are important things the Senate should do, and I think in the past, recent past, it has done some important things. For instance, policy issues of what do you grant academic credit for? It wasn't too long ago there was a proposal from a Department to give people an hour of academic credit for putting together a portfolio, something that arguably they should do on their own or they should do as part of another course. Last year there was a proposal to give students credit because they came here speaking Spanish and get 20 hours of credit for it. That's fine to maybe do, but we should at least talk about it, and we did, and I know there are universities that won't do that, which is suggesting that that's something we should talk about.

So those kinds of things. I think it is our responsibility to raise those because we're the final Body of faculty. We're much more broadly represented than either the UCC or GCCC, and we've got a responsibility to weigh in there. But, you know, again, it's a matter of doing it selectively. People bring up ideas that they think deserve some attention, and the Senate kind of decides, "Yeah, should we go into this or not?" And you kind of judge it from there. So I'm hopeful that we'll have, you know, we'll do our jobs but in a way that is efficient and effective. And I think we can do that. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: Yeah, but I am actually looking at the Policy, and it does sort of suggest that that wouldn't fit into what we do, so I'm not quite sure how we can go against our Policy.

Smith: Yes, and I'm saying that that Policy's been in place, and we have routinely violated it [laughter around], and I think we should, if necessary, violate it again, because I think I was on the Senate when that Policy was adapted. I'm still kicking myself for not having done enough deliberation to kind of challenge it, because I think it is much too restrictive in what the Senate's role is.

Cutter: So, can we do that with all our policies now? [light laughter around]

Smith: Everybody else does, why can't we? No, we'll decide this on a case-by-case basis. It doesn't bar Senators from raising particular issues, and the Senate itself can decide, "Do we want to go into this or not?" Ok—oh, yes, Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I think the appropriate thing and something that maybe we haven't done very well as a Body is sometimes after we've gone through a curriculum cycle think about whether there may be a need for a new policy. For example, maybe there is a need for a new policy about what qualifies to get any academic credit at all. And actually Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] and I had a conversation about that after the last curriculum cycle, and then the "troubles" hit, and I think we both kind of forgot about it, because we've all been sort of treading water ever since then, but, you know, that might be—it—if something comes up, if there's a proposal that comes up that sort of reveals a gap in the Policy, you know, we should take that opportunity as a Body to then say, "Wow, maybe we need to define as a matter of University Policy that the faculty says that to get a unit of academic credit, you gotta do at least this." So, I would say that maybe some sort of post-game review process. I don't know. I can't think of the right way to call it, but some sort of after-curriculum-passes review process might be wise to at least think about whether there's any policy gaps that might need to be filled.

Smith: That's a good point. I had quite frankly thought that we would be revising this Policy as part of the other things that we're talking about with curriculum, and in the course of that revision, we would reconsider some of the language that we're talking about right now. Ok. Any other questions about curriculum? Yes.

Terlip: Yeah, in addition to that, I know that it seems to me having done this a couple of times before both at the College Senate and here, and in front of the GCC, I think, one time when they—I ended up on curriculum there. Some things tend to get debated initially like “Do you have to drop a course for every new one you add?” and we seem to have that discussion every time about whether it's mandatory. It might be wise for us on email to kind of lay out our assumptions so we don't have to have a whole session that somebody's trying to share their curriculum with, and we're debating on whether we really have to do that or not even though we know what's come up the line. Similarly, with resources, I know in the past rarely—I mean, everything that gets to us always is stamped that it has the resources. When is it reasonable to question that? I think is something we might want to think about, if we are going to be responsible fiscally as well as with the curriculum, which the Administration has asked us to.

Smith: Ok. The other big curricular matter for the Senate, and one I discussed again at today's Cabinet meeting, is curriculum management. And myself and other senators—and that would include Laura [Secretary **Terlip**], Barbara [Senator **Cutter**], and Todd [Senator **Evans**]**—**are members of the Committee that the Senate established a year ago to address this matter. We kind of almost got done in April but had some consultations to do and made—you know, presented stuff to the Senate, but it kind of got stalled and whatever. And as you know at the start of this semester, we were kind of—it was suggested that our Committee re-form, finish its consultations, and then come back to the Senate with a proposal. We have met with the GCCC. We still have to consult with the UCC, and, of course, we've had troubles because they're in the middle of the high part of their curriculum cycle, which is why we've had trouble getting air time with them. But I'm thinking we're going to get that done in January. And then this Committee will be coming to the Senate with a set of proposals,

arguably, plausibly, conceivably, the most significant of which will have to do with the formation of a committee that will be responsible—report to the [Faculty] Senate, be responsible for reviewing all UNI academics on an ongoing basis and, through the Senate, offer recommendations to the Provost regarding those Programs. I know Senator **Cutter** had some concerns about where we're going with that. And actually you may or may not want to talk about them here. You might want to talk about them in the Committee, but, you know, if you want to talk about them here, we can as well. But I just wanted to put that issue—that's something that's coming down the road, a big issue for us in the Spring. So discussion of that?

Cutter: And I don't want to talk about the details here, because I think we should have that in the Committee, but I'll just explain that I was on PDA in the Spring when the proposal changed quite a bit, and then when we reconvened in the Fall, I had some concerns with the proposal as it existed. And unfortunately we tried to have a meeting and things happened and half our Committee met, was there on one day, and half our Committee was there on the other day, so we actually haven't had an in-person meeting.

Terlip: One person got to go to two meetings.

Cutter: [laughter around] Yeah, for Laura, yes, that's the case. So I sent my comments via email, and we have not had a conversation as a Committee since then. But I am a little concerned that we've got a document going through all the consults, and there's still a discussion, you know, to be had about the final version of it in terms of our Committee.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I just want to urge the members of the Committee, most of whom are here, that I know there's, you know, the question of "Do you form another committee or not?" That's something that some people have expressed reservations about. But just as you're going through your deliberations, keep in mind that—how much consensus the Committee has been able to form over the past year. There's been very little objection to getting rid of the 2-year curriculum cycle and allowing proposals to begin

any time. There's been very little objection to the idea of triaging things so not everything has to come to the [Faculty] Senate. There's been very little objection to another part of the proposal that I'm blanking on. The Administration has agreed to change the official policy about making it clearer about the ultimate responsibility for curriculum decisions, if the Senate can kind of show, the faculty can kind of show, that they may concern (??) more data-driven decisions. So, I mean, there's a lot of agreement there. So, you know, I just wanted to stress the agreement, and, you know, the details are always hard, but there's a real chance here to make some changes to the process that a lot of people think would be good changes.

Smith: Ok, thank you. Other comments on that particular topic? [none heard] I'll move on. The other important matter on this year's agenda for the Senate, as I explained again this morning, has to do with University budgeting and financial management. And there are several components of this, the first of which involves the Senate Budget Committee. We agreed to re-staff this Body, and that's our next item of business today. Now, you want to—I mean, the issue was raised whether we can just do this informally and vote people. My recollection is that we've done it that way before, and I'm quite willing to do it that way again, unless there are objections, and you want to go through some kind of formal docketing, whatever, kind of thing. But basically, if you are willing to go this route, we've got three open positions, the first of which is a [Faculty] Senate representative on this Committee, and we have one nominee for this position, that being our vice-chair, Tim **Kidd**. Is there anyone else who would care to serve as the Senate's representative on the Senate Budget Committee? [pause] Hearing none, I think we can agree that Tim **Kidd** is appointed as our representative on that Committee. Are you comfortable with that?

Then there are two other vacant positions, and these would be from the faculty-at-large, one of whom would be a replacement for Joe **Gorton** who ran for and was elected to the Committee but no longer wishes to serve, and the other is to replace Bill **Callahan**, whose term expires. Bill has expressed a willingness to serve another term. I've solicited nominations from the Faculty, which were identified in my preview e-mail, and I'm going

to put these up on the screen [projected]. So, let's think about how we want to do the voting. Now, in some ways, the simplest way of voting would be to—I mean, I've got ballots—to send them around and ask you to write two names on the ballots. Then we count up, and the two highest people get on it. A little downside to that. You might want to get balanced representation across Colleges, which you can't do if you're doing two at once and you don't know. You could argue vote for one person and then whoever gets on the first time, that might affect your vote on the second one. So which way would you rather do it? One vote for two people, or do you want to vote for, let's say, first for the remainder of Joe **Gorton's** term, and then for a three -year term for the position that has been held by Bill **Callahan**, who has agreed, as I've said, to run again. Which way would you rather vote? One vote for 2 positions or two sequential votes? How do you prefer to do this?

Smith: Senator **Cutter**

Cutter: I would think that voting for two at once means that the people who get the most votes actually get it, so that would make more sense to me.

Smith: So you think that's a better, more representative

Cutter: I mean, I don't know. I think it's more representative. Am I missing something?

Smith: And would you feel that the person who gets the most votes should get the 3-year position or anything about that? How do we decide who gets the 3?

Female voice: That makes sense.

Smith: Are you comfortable with that? Any objections to that approach?

Edginton: I don't have an objection. The last time we conducted these elections, we tried to structure it in such a way that each of the Colleges was represented. So, if we move in the direction that's being

recommended by Senator **Cutter**, we're going to move away from past practice.

Smith: And let me—I should tell you who is currently on the Committee and who will be on the Committee going forward. Adam **Butler** from CSBS is on. Like I said, Bill **Callahan**'s term expired, but he's willing to be re-appointed. Joe **Gorton** from CSBS is going off. Hans **Isakson** from the College of Business Administration is on. So, basically, you're going to have Adam and Hans, then you've got the Senate Chair myself, and now we've got Tim [Vice-Chair **Kidd**] replacing Chris [Senator **Edginton**] on the Committee, so we don't have anybody from College of Education, and we've got Tim from CHAS, but otherwise we do have somebody from College of Business Administration, and we do have somebody from CSBS. So we've got pretty broad representation. So that kind of lets you know.

MacLin: I think this might also be a Committee—you talked about it briefly at one point—where expertise and true interest in the topic is critically important, and I think it trumps making sure it's completely even steven across colleges. I really want the best people on this Committee, the best able to understand and to use this information.

Smith: Are we comfortable with doing this single vote where each of you are going to write down two names on the ballot? Are you comfortable with doing it that way? [heads nod around] All right. Let me send out the ballots. And I'm going to count on my Vice-Chair and Secretary to do—collect the ballots and tabulate the votes. Do I get to vote in this? [voices expressing thoughts] All right. Give me a ballot. That's all right. I'll get one when they—there's a whole ton of ballots floating around. I'll get one. Those are your candidates [projected], people who were nominated or whatever. I do have pencils up there. [talk of getting everyone a ballot and something to write with and then counting of ballots, etc.]

Edginton: Well, I want to make a comment relative to what Kim [Senator **MacLin**] had to offer. I agree with, you know, what Kim was saying. We need two with great expertise, but I'm looking up there, and I only know two people on that list. I don't know the others. So I don't know whether or not people have expertise or not, and since we've already done the

ballots—I mean, I know Bill **Callahan** has great expertise as formerly the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Education where his primary responsibilities were Budget. I know Frank [**Thompson**] has great expertise. But, you know, there are other dynamics there that play into this. So, I’m feeling uncomfortable because I don’t know, you know, who these people are. [joking among some of campaign speeches but now it’s too late]

Breitbach: I’m going to hope that they volunteered because they do have an interest and an expertise, and I think maybe some new faces and some new blood is a good thing. [more time elapsed while counting ballots]

Smith: I suppose we could share seasonal stories while _____
[loud laughter all around covered last words] That’s something I’m particularly good at.

Terlip: We have two clear people with majority counts.

Kidd: Yes, with the most votes we have Bill **Callahan**, and then second would be Frank **Thompson**.

Smith: So, the way it looks Bill **Callahan** will be reappointed for another 3-year term, and Frank then would serve out the remainder of the term of Joe **Gorton**’s term. And what I will do is notify all the candidates of the result of our election, and then I’m going to contact the Committee members to get them going early next semester. Now, the formal charge of this Committee is quote “to inform the Senate about UNI’s Budget and finances and assess how UNI’s Budget priorities affect Academic Programs.” We’ve had troubles in the past kind of getting these committees to do valuable work and for various reasons. What I’d like to do, with your permission and advice, is to charge the Committee more specifically to work with Vice President **Hager** and his colleagues to determine how the University is doing vis à vis its current Budget. And in doing so to identify significant variances both positive and negative against the current Budget as well as identifying major reallocations that have occurred across Budget categories and major deficits that are being carried forward in certain categories. And, in addition, I think the Committee should determine the extent of the University’s financial reserves, its “margin of safety” that it

could fall back on in the event of, say, future declines in revenue. Finally, not only should it do that for, you know, where we are now, but it should establish a process whereby this information can routinely be produced and provided to the faculty and other members of the University Community. Any suggestions in this regard? Are you on board with this way of directing this Committee? [none heard and then joking about a noise from outside the room]

Edginton: Jerry [Faculty Chair **Smith**], I think that it would be important for you to sit down with this Committee.

Smith: Yeah, I intend to do that.

Edginton: You know, and have the conversation with them, because as you're aware, you know, last year the Committee disintegrated in terms of its membership, and then its focus got really off track, and I mean, you were invited in for some meetings, and you understand the dynamic there. And even a greater dynamic is going to be created with the new constitution of the group that will create some challenges, I believe. So, I think, you know, you're going to need to be a very forceful—you know, with your direction.

Smith: Yeah, I mean, I agree that it's important to have expertise, but I think it's also important for the members of this Committee to be kind of non-partisan, and I do have a concern about that. But, you know, these are bright people, and I think we can get them to present an accurate and fair account of the University position. I don't think right now there are all sorts of roilings so that political agendas are going to be coming into the foreground, so hopefully we can do that. And once we set it up and get it set how this works, then presumably that can happen regularly on a—you know, going forward. So, give it a shot. This Committee's got one more year in its life, because it's up for review by the [Faculty] Senate Spring of 2014 [sic, 2015] and at that point we can see how things have gone and decide whether it's working or not. So, that's what we'll do. Any other suggestions in that regard? [none heard] I take these silences as support, so we'll go ahead with that.

Now, the second budget and finance issue is kind of more at the front end, providing faculty input into the Budget Process at the University and Academic Affairs levels. And this is where the timeline distributed by Vice President **Hager** this morning and that I sent around [see Addendum 2] is relevant. Like I said, it includes consultations with the Faculty Senate in both February and March. We've talked about establishing another committee for this purpose that would parallel what President **Ruud** had used at Shippensburg, but quite frankly in talking to him—and Tim [Vice President **Kidd**] and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] were in the meeting—he didn't seem to support that. He'd rather kind of wait, and I'm inclined to agree with him that it may not be necessary to do another committee.

We're almost certainly going to have one for curriculum management. He suggested that the Senate or a subset of the Senate—a committee of ourselves—could specify and engage in the desired kinds of budgetary consultation for several cycles—do it through the upcoming year, do it maybe a year after that, and over the course of a couple years of experience we could find out: What does it take? How much work is it? Is it something that the Senate as a whole could do? Is it something the Senate could do through a proper committee of the Senate? And, if so, then, you know, if not, do we need a broader committee that includes other constituencies on the University to do this? Then we could decide on trying to establish that other body. But, for the time being, at least arguably we may be better served by trying to do this ourselves perhaps through a proper committee of the Senate. So I pretty much agree with that.

I would suggest that we form an ad hoc committee that will be responsible for operationalizing and implementing a Budget Consultation Process, and I wanted to throw that open to discussion. [pause] Hearing none....[pause] that was a joke. What do you think? [pause again] We—when I've talked to people before about—and actually talked to people on the Budget Committee about getting consultation, they'd say, "Well, you know, one of the problems is it's not a well-defined Process, and so you just don't know how to get into it because it's not laid out." But it's clear that Michael **Hager** is laying it out now. He's kind of pinning down "Here's what's going to happen by when." And so it may not be that big a challenge to say, "Ok,

here are the points and the mechanisms by which the faculty through the [Faculty] Senate can have the kind of input we want into the Budget Process. It may not be that big a deal. And so I'm suggesting that, you know, let's try it and see if we can do it. And if it turns out to be pretty easy pickings, then we set it up and roll with it. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I'm very skeptical that it can happen at the Senate. It's too big, and it's not—it's—we're not as a Body, a deliberative Body bound by Robert's Rules of Order, it's not set up to work like that. It's not set up in a way—I mean, I'm trying to figure out how would you—I mean, you can have Vice Presidents here and you can have them talk and we can all sit around and ask them questions, but then what decision is made at that point? What do we do with that? You know, the key to, in my opinion on this, is that if you want faculty to be involved in the planning stage, not just reacting to Budget decisions that have already been made but actually having—helping to shape the Budget decisions before they're made, then you have to build some sort of faculty input into the early stages, but it can't just be—it can't just be sort of like, "Oh, I think we should spend money on this. Or I think we should spend money on that." It's gotta be through a mechanism with a group of people who have access to the overall budgetary goals of the University—the overall planning goals, the overall budgetary requests. You have to weigh one request against another. And I just don't know how that happens at the [Faculty] Senate. Now, maybe you could have a committee of the Senate that does that and then make—somehow makes recommendations. But, again, the key is somehow building it into the process so that that committee would see all the Dean—all the requests to Deans that got turned down as well as the ones the Deans agreed with; all the requests to the Provost that got turned down as well as the ones the Provost is forwarding on; all of the decisions about allocations that are going from one Unit of the University to another. So, somehow that committee would have to be—would have to be blended into the process fairly early on for it to be effective. You have to be able to get that kind of comprehensive view, I think, or else I just don't—otherwise it's just we sit here and we express outrage about this decision or that decision. It's not really planning.

Smith: Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: I agree with 50% of what Scott [Senator **Peters**] just proposed, and I think there are some really good ideas there about having more budgetary input up front at the primary steps of this process. But I think there's nothing wrong with having representatives of every branch of the University that's spending money, the top representative, report to us on a given date. It looks like it might fall in March, and say, "Overview. This is what we did. I'm the expert in my section of the University. This is the choices—this is a rundown of the choices we made for the current budgetary process." And then I can take that back to the constituency in my Department that I represent, and I can say, "Here. Head's up. This is decisions that are in the process of being made." I think that that flow of information—I think it would be really greatly appreciated, if I could take it from this Body back to my Department, and say, "This—head's up. This is what's happening."

Smith: Thank you. Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: Some of the decisions are made at a College level, particularly things that might relate specifically to a Department or Division. The flow seems to be to the Dean, and the Dean, perhaps in consultation with the Heads in that College, makes some decisions. So I see our role more as advocating for big picture types of Budget Policy. And an example is, you know, the comments we've asked to have from the Athletic area in terms of, you know, how much of the General Fund should be going to Athletics? What are other sources of revenue for Athletics that might not tap into the General Fund? And so on, and so I see the [Faculty] Senate as having a definite role in the Budget Process but not necessarily at the level that occurs at the College level now but more at a bigger level.

Smith: Yeah. Let me comment to that. I suggested, and I'll talk about it, that for College and Departmental things, we draft a policy that basically mandates inclusion of the faculty at the College and Department levels which will address some of those concerns, but I agree with you. What we're talking about right now is University and Academic Affairs levels for the most part. Jeffrey? [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**]

Funderburk: I was going to note on the plan that VP **Hager** gave out today that you have [see Addendum 2], if you notice, we've got two consultations for the [Faculty] Senate currently, and the first one is listed as step 21 in February, and that notes that normally we would have that consultation in September. I think if we do move forward with something where he actually comes to the full Senate in September and talks, especially while we're dealing with a moving target of how the University's doing things, we might be able to decide this September whether or not we need to form a separate committee or if we can deal with it in the Senate. If we're uncomfortable with forming a committee immediately to deal with this, that might be the way to go about it. I do like the idea, tying in with what Jennifer [Senator **Cooley**] said that there's at least two occasions during the year that a report comes to the Full Body of the Senate regardless of whether or not we have a committee working on it as well. So I think that's good, because I do think it will be appreciated by the campus to have wide-spread information and a lot of people talking about it more than just a committee.

Smith: Other discussion? [none heard] So would members of the [Faculty] Senate be willing to form a committee, to join a committee that would pursue this, develop the process, try and get things going here? Do we have people that are willing to do that?

O'Kane: Can I ask a question?

Smith: Yeah.

O'Kane: I think you [to Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] suggested that we wait until next Fall, did you not?

Funderburk: That's one possibility I see, because the committee's not going to be able to do anything about FY 15, as I understand it anyway at the moment. And if this continues to go in this direction, September would be the beginning of the discussion for FY 16, and we might come out this year of a better understanding of whether or not the way this worked was useful to us and based on that in September, if we get that early

information, we've got time to get a committee up and running in the new system.

O'Kane: I agree.

Smith: So, then the suggestion would be that we hold off on this for now? We tell the Administration that we're going to kind of wait and try and get in the Process for FY 16? Are there things that we could do, though, now that will enable us to effectively get into the Process? Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: Well, I think we still want the consultations to occur, is what I'm hearing, and do I—is the role of the committee to explore the ways that the [Faculty] Senate could be involved in the Budget Process and not specifically to try to deal with the Budget and makes specific budgetary recommendations? Because it seems like first we need to think about what is the best role of the Senate? And to do that I think we could start that conversation? And if it is helpful to do so with a smaller group first that brings some ideas back to the Senate, I'm in favor of that. But I don't think we can jump into the Budget and actually make any kind of specific budgetary recommendations.

Smith: So, if I understand you correctly, you're saying, yeah—I mean, we don't need to—we don't—we're not in a position to do much with FY 2015 except that what the consultations that they're planning to have, but that at this point we could start kind of identifying a role and how it might be carried out for FY 16?

Nelson: Yes.

Smith: Yes.

Shontz: I thought you might want to get involved in '15, because if we get the \$10 million of new money, there will be a few million dollars to be programmed, as new money.

Licari: There's internal and external. Right. The FY '15 external, you know, the ask to the State Legislature which has already been done basically. But

you've got FY '15 internal, which is what Gary's [Senator **Shontz**] referring to, because if we get that money, we've got some internal allocation decisions yet to be made. There's an opportunity for the [Faculty] Senate there.

Smith: Ok. So we could have a substantive role in allocation decisions vis à vis the FY 15 Budget and hard to think we wouldn't want to get our feet wet and get engaged in that.

Funderburk: This also kind of came up in our leadership talk at one point—is I think that the bigger thing we have to decide is that there's kind of two things with the allocation. There's the allocation of what goes in the various Divisions, and then there's the question of if we want to be more active in overseeing the allocations within the Academic Affairs Division, and that is potentially two separate committees. And I guess my thinking was on that one, particularly, that would be that other _____, and I guess I was thinking in terms of this as the Big University Budget, but I guess it may not be that way, but that was just the set of assumptions I was making.

Smith: Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: That discussion suggests to me the idea that the role—one role of the [Faculty] Senate could be to identify initiatives that are campus-wide, because there will be plenty of advocacy of Departments for their individual needs and Colleges for their collective needs. But there may be initiatives that we feel need to be addressed across the campus, something big picture that goes across several Colleges, if not all the Colleges, and some of those initiatives might need resources. And I could see our role being trying to identify and advocate for something like that.

Smith: So, what I'm taking is that there may well be a useful purpose served by the [Faculty] Senate establishing a committee to pursue this, kind of develop what the Senate should be doing, kind of how the process will be implemented that's laid out here and going forward when we get to FY 16, how we're going to be engaged, the timing and the mechanisms. If we have a Senate committee that could do that, it would position us well to

actually have effective involvement in the Budget Process starting in FY 16, but there's also some things we may be able to do internally in FY 15 that we would want to do. And so, if you're comfortable with that, I'm open for self-nominations for people to belong on that committee, and if I don't get some, I'll kind of send emails to people that I would like to have on that committee and try and recruit people. But anybody who wants to nominate—you don't even have to embarrass yourself by saying so now; just send me an email if you're interested, and we'll get you on that committee. [joking and laughter about the embarrassment of it all] Ok, are you comfortable with that way of dealing? Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: Do we have a committee size?

Smith: You know, I'm—look, if 8 people volunteer, I'd have an 8-people/person committee, but I'd want at least 3, and hopefully to have 5. That's what I would think would be reasonable.

Funderburk: Are we looking to that committee to explain how they're going to inject themselves into the Budget Process as well? Do we have a mechanical idea of how that

Smith: I would see that committee not necessarily as being permanent. It might decide that it's just the temporary kind of thing to set things up, but it might also say, you know, potentially it transitions to a new body that the members could transition as well. But they would say, "Here's what we see going forward, how the Senate should be involved and engaged," yeah. Are you comfortable with that way of proceeding? Ok.

Edginton: I am, Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**], but I'd like one question to be asked. It seems to me that the goal here is to get the Budget Process driven up as opposed to driven down. You know, the feeling is someone's making the Budget up on top, and you're trying to get down to the rest of the University. And if curriculum really lies in the hands of the faculty, then it should be driven up from the faculty, and budgetary decisions should reflect the direction the faculty takes the curriculum. And that plays out on several levels. One, the relationship between the number of students in a Program and the resources that are allocated to implement the Program,

and then new Program Initiatives that might be considered. So, you know, whatever this group does, I would like to make sure that we, you know, as best as we can, change the flow up as opposed to pushing down this process.

Smith: Ok, and we can take that into account as we charge this committee going forward. And that gets to the final aspect of kind of the budget and financial management situation, and that is, again, for faculty involvement in staffing decisions and other major budget initiatives at the College and Department levels. And I believe this can be accomplished through a University policy, and I am proposing to draft, with your input and the input of anybody else on campus, I'm proposing to draft such a policy for our consideration. Any thoughts or suggestions in that regard? Are you comfortable with going ahead that way? Obviously, we could set up a committee to do this. My experience is we'd turn over this to a committee, and it'll be a year and a half. I can do it, and we can get it done this semester—I mean, this year. So, if you're comfortable letting me—and I will need a lot of input, so I encourage you to suggest any ways in which you think at the College and Department levels faculty can and should have input into, you know, what kind of person do we search for? How do initiatives—Budget initiatives—get generated? Do faculty have enough involvement there? How can it be improved? Send me your cards and letters, and I'll try and put that into a policy—into a draft, and then we'll come back and cycle through it and try and get something. All right?

Peters: I was going to ask you. I don't know if this is appropriate or not, but like does anyone—is there anyone at the table who's been on a College Senate? [nods] Is it routine for Deans to come to College Senates at the beginning of the year and say, "Here are the decisions I'm making in terms of hiring?" Is that something that has happened a lot on College Senates? "Here, this Department is going to get this number of lines. This Department is getting this number of lines. Here's why. Here's why I did not renew this Department's line. Here's why I transferred this one to that one." Is that done. [no's all around] No? Okay.

Female voice: Maybe that's where we need to start.

Peters: And then another, like—I know that Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] mentioned that one of the things I think that prompted him to start thinking about this was that in some Departments on campus that they may not even have a discussion to hire in a particular line. The Department Head may sort of just go to the Dean and request a line, and the Department has no say into it. Is that a common thing, too?

O’Kane: Not in Biology.

Nelson: Not in my experience. We definitely have no say in the Departmental

Peters: That’s maybe more mixed. [voices agreeing] Ok. So I just thought it might be helpful to at least get a baseline sense of

Smith: Yeah, my sense is—I mean, I heard from you [to someone present] saying that in your Department it’s standard. Jeffrey [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] as well in Music, you said that you—faculty would

Funderburk: I will say in Music there is a master plan of the ideal set up. “We would like to see these positions added at the first.” Now, at the time that you pick which one of those 5 you’re going for, we don’t always have input, but there was always input of saying what needs to be on that list. [some voices agreeing]

Smith: So, I mean, we would—what we would have in this policy is the faculty are going to have input. Now, there may be some resistance from this from Deans. I’m not sure. But I know President **Ruud** is very much on board with this. He’s been quite supportive of this, and so I think we’ve come up with a policy I think you can get it approved. And I think it will be beneficial, understanding it’s just input. They—where nobody’s saying we get to make the decisions, but, you know, if you consistently ignore our input, you know, we’ll get a little biting back on that, too. Ok.

Terlip: Jerry, just one more question.

Smith: Yes.

Terlip: Are you really just talking “faculty staffing,” or are you talking administrative positions and support personnel or what are we considering here?

Smith: I was mostly focused on faculty staffing in the belief that faculty best know the needs of the disciplines and, you know, where things should be going, so they can make an expertise argument. Now, if you want to make an argument for kinds of things, you know, maybe we can do that as well. We’d have to think about how we would constrain it and shape it and define it, but with faculty staffing decisions, I think you’ve got a very strong case to make.

Edginton: I think a good example is HPELS and how that wasn’t played effectively. We have a tremendous need for a person in Physical Education Pedagogy. And, in fact, positions have been vacated in that area. So, it’s not my area. My area is Leisure, but the decision was _____ at the meeting of the Chairs that the position was going to be Sport Management. We don’t even have a Sport Management Program. Now, it may be somewhat desirable. I doubt that the P.E. faculty would vote for a Sport Management Program, so the question about who controls this is really essential there in that particular case. So, I don’t know. I mean, to me that’s a great example of—Forrest [Senator **Dolgener**] wouldn’t bring it up, but it’s a great example [laughter around] of exactly what you’re talking about that just really basically ignored faculty input.

Smith: Uh huh. Thank you.

Terlip: I guess my question more than anything is I understand all of the concern about faculty lines, but I know faculty often question if they need technical support why those kinds of hires can’t be made? Or I always hear, “Well, why do we need a Vice President? Why can’t we do this another way when we start increasing administrative lines in other areas?” So that’s really what my question was about in terms of how much do we want to look at?

Smith: Well, for the—with respect to the policy, we’d only be at College and Department levels. With something like a Vice President, that would be something that we’re—you know, what we’re talking about, faculty at the University level having input through the [Faculty] Senate.

Terlip: Ok, so the Budget Committee would look at those issues?

Smith: Yeah, and bring it to the Senate.

Terlip: I’m just trying to make it clear.

Smith: If for instance the Senate felt, “Gee, do we really want to spend half a million bucks a year on an Enrollment Management VP and infrastructure, etcetera?” and we had qualms about that, that would happen at the Senate. We would express our qualms through the mechanisms we’re talking about.

Now, a final initiative, not related to budget and finance, that was discussed in my preview e-mail: A writing improvement initiative. There was strong faculty support for this several years ago when a Committee that was developed—it was called the RSC, LAC-RSC—developed a kind of—proposed potential changes or improvements to the LAC. Surveyed faculty found a lot of dissatisfaction with the writing skills of our graduating students. The University Writing Committee itself expressed a willingness to do something in a report they submitted to the Senate a couple of years ago. And so I’d like us to take them up on their offer, but to charge them a bit more specifically, to develop a proposal, based in part on “best practice” research, for improving the writing skills of UNI undergraduates through a program that would, in some measure, be across-the-curriculum. And what I have in mind is what I saw at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. They had—you could be either a writing certified—your major certified as having writing courses, or if the student wasn’t in such a major, they’d have to take other writing intensive courses. But they’d have to be exposed to and have their writing evaluated in places other than the General Education course, the current College Reading and Writing. But that’s just one thought. But I think this is an issue that many faculty, myself, have been dissatisfied with, and it’s a skill certainly important for our students. So, are

you supportive of my proceeding with a charge to the University Writing Committee to try during the coming semester to produce a report for us? [heads nodding and yes's vocalized]. Yes, Lauren [Senator **Nelson**], you're our rep. on that.

Nelson: And I would support that. I was at the meeting they had this Fall, and they are looking for a charge. They feel like they've given us their report, and because of everything that went on last year and how busy the [Faculty] Senate was with other issues, they never really got feedback on it. But they would like a charge of where to go from here.

Smith: Ok. Good. And if any of you have suggestions on how we might, you know, specifically recommend to them, charge them, etcetera, let me know, but otherwise I will plan to meet with that Committee early in the Spring semester and try and get things going.

Ok, one final item that wasn't mentioned in my email—we're getting there—requests for consultative sessions are rolling in, and I'd like to be able to accommodate them, but I hope we don't have to lose as much of our time on consultative sessions next semester as we did this semester. Fortunately, many of the requests are for short sessions, maybe in some cases 15 minutes, so we can double or triple up in some cases. But, in addition to the meeting with LAC Director **Heistad** that we docketed earlier today, the following individuals have requested time to meet with the Senate:

Scott **Ketelson**, Director of University Relations, would like to talk about what's happening in his shop. They've had some things done he's just started. I suggested he could meet with us sometime in February.

Joe **Gorton**, President of United Faculty, has been interested in talking with us about relations between UF and the Senate, roles, etcetera. The timing on that is open.

Again, let me know if you don't think any of these are good ideas, but I'm going on the assumption that if you don't say otherwise, then at some point I will try and schedule something with these individuals.

I just was approached today by Bill **Calhoun** who met with us last year. He's the Director or the President of the UNI Foundation and would like to talk—he said, only about 15 minutes—to talk about alumni relations and development activities. I'm not sure if they've got another campaign or whatever, but it would be a fairly quick consult. I think he basically wants to maintain relationship with the [Faculty] Senate, and he found last year's meeting was very beneficial.

Chris **Cox**, Dean of Rod Library, had asked me some time in the early Fall to talk about various developments in the Library. I'm assuming that includes the feasibility study of a redesign. There were a couple of other things that he wanted to talk about, and I don't know that that would take a full meeting, but it would probably be more than 15 minutes.

And finally, Steve **Carignan**, who is the Associate Dean for Special Programs and Director of Gallagher Bluedorn, has asked to meeting with us to talk about the Center for the Study of Undergraduate Education, which is something that him and some other, mostly staff members who I think have completed PhD's at Iowa State—they tried to—they've got actually some funding from the Provost, I believe, to do this Center, and they were encouraged by the Provost to get out and talk with various Bodies on campus, including the faculty, which suggests talking to us. So he's asked for some time to talk as well. I don't think that he would take too much time, maybe we're thinking a half an hour on there. [joking around about times and light laughter] We could double up on some of these. But again, I'd like for the Senate to be able to meet with all of these individuals, but I want to make sure we have the time to do our own work, and very important work this coming semester, so if, you know, you've got ideas one way or the other.....Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Since there's nothing else on the docket for that first meeting, are there any of these people you could put there on the January 13th meeting?

Smith: That's prob—that's a good idea. Thanks, Scott. I haven't docketed it [*sic*, put it on the Calendar] yet, but if you're comfortable with it, we could—I'll—I'll talk to people and ask them, and then I'll email you around,

and then we could docket it and hold it at the same time, if they're on board. So I could—I'll check with a couple to do that. Good point. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: First, I have a question. So we're absolutely sure there's no curriculum for the 13th? Are we? [voices saying it would have to be docketed first] Ok, so, yes, so I think it would be great to get at least a couple of those people in. And another strategy might not to be—to rush them all in together but to spread them out. And if there's somebody we think needs 15 minutes, and we want to make sure it doesn't go on too long, maybe we can ask them to come at a meeting at 4:30? So that might be a strategy to use in certain cases.

Smith: I'll email Bill **Calhoun**, Chris **Cox**, and Steve **Carignan**. I know Scott [**Ketelson**] I think might. I'm not sure. I can email a bunch of them and try and get a time estimate and would they be available for our first meeting, and then from there I can put something together. And then we can hold them to a—I'll have to ask Deedee [**Heistad**, Director of the LAC] how long she'll take, but we've got more things to talk about with that. Ok, any....yes.

Funderburk: In follow-up on that, it might be helpful if we just say right up—we can't do it for the first meeting, but we just docket it for 15 minutes, so they know they've got 15 minutes, and at the end of 15 minutes, their time's up unless somebody votes to extend, so that we can keep moving, because I'm afraid if we leave it open-ended some of these could go much longer than we actually needed to get it done. So, if they understand they've got 15 minutes, then maybe they'll be a little more concise.

Smith: Ok.

Funderburk: Or 20 minutes or whatever, you know, in advance.

Smith: Are there any other things anyone thinks we should be talking about now as part of planning for the Spring semester or for other reasons? Complaints? Criticisms?

Cutter: You know, based on that, I just did want to follow up and say, I'm not suggesting that everybody has to be limited to 15 minutes, but if they think they only need 15 minutes....

Smith: What I will do is ask them how much time, and I'll make clear that, yeah, "Our time is kind of a scarce resource. How much time you going to need? And then I will slot—if I can slot you on that day, I'll slot you for that time."

Funderburk: But I think if they understand this is slotted for this amount of time and they'll be cut off, and so be realistic.

Smith: Yeah, I think we can do that. So, last call for other kinds of things you want to talk about? Because we're getting close....

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

None

ADJOURNMENT (4:52 p.m.)

Smith: Then I think we're then ready. Anybody care to move to adjourn?

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Senator **Edginton**. Seconded? By Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Sorry [to others who also seconded]. And passed by acclamation. Thank you all, and we'll see you next time.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: Monday, January 13, 2014
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 2 addenda to these Minutes.

Slide 1

FACULTY SENATE UPDATE

Jerry Smith
Chair, UNI Faculty Senate
December 9th, 2013

Slide 2

QUESTIONS

1. What has the UNI Faculty Senate been doing this academic year?
2. What does the Senate hope to accomplish during the remainder of the year?

Slide 3

CONSULTATIVE SESSIONS

- During the Fall '13 semester, the Senate held consultative sessions with the following individuals:
 - Provost Gibson and Associate Provost Licari
 - President Ruud
 - Board of Regents President Rastetter
 - Iowa Legislators Danielson, Kressig, and Rogers
 - Athletic Director Dannen

Slide 4

POLICY APPROVALS

- This semester, the Senate has approved the following policy proposals for consideration by the Policy Review Committee, the Cabinet, and the President:
 - International Travel Policy for Faculty and Staff
 - Policy #0.00: Policy
 - Policy #3.06: Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

CURRICULUM

- **Curriculum Packages:** The Senate expects to be reviewing and approving curriculum proposals during January and February of 2014.
- **Curriculum Management:** During the spring semester, the Senate expects to receive and act on a committee report that will recommend:
 - Establishment of a university-wide faculty committee responsible for monitoring and evaluating the performance of all academic programs.
 - A review of the curriculum process to increase its speed and efficiency.
 - Changes to Policy #2.04, Curricular Changes.

BUDGETING AND FINANCE

- The following Senate activities are intended to increase faculty involvement in generating budget initiatives and setting budget priorities, and to improve faculty understanding of the University's financial condition:
 - Generating initiatives/setting priorities:
 - Defining a process whereby the faculty, through the Senate, have a role in budget development at the University and Academic Affairs levels.
 - Proposing a policy that would insure faculty input in staffing and other budgetary initiatives at the college and department levels.
 - Monitoring the University's financial condition: The Senate has restaffed its Budget Committee and will ask it to devise a process by which the Senate can, on an ongoing basis, be kept informed of the University's financial condition and reserves.

Slide 7

OTHER INITIATIVES

- **Improving Student Writing:** The Senate may ask the University Writing Committee to develop a proposal for improving the writing skills of UNI undergraduate students.
- **Motivating and Evaluating Faculty Performance:** UNI needs to better align faculty performance evaluation criteria with the needs of the university. More specifically, it needs to insure that faculty service activities, including the development of academic programs, receive the rewards and recognitions needed to motivate tenured faculty to spend time on these efforts.

Slide 8

QUESTIONS

- **Now it's your turn:**
What else do you want to know?

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
FY 2015 Budget Planning Steps - Summary

9-

Month	Step	Planning Steps
AUGUST	1	Divisional Budget Planning Processes begin
	2	Preliminary enrollment projections and tuition rate increase estimated
	3	Planning scenarios are developed
	4	Next FY <i>Appropriation Request</i> finalized for submission to Board
	5	Next FY <i>Capital Appropriation Request</i> for submission to Board
SEPTEMBER	6	Vet new <i>Tuition Rate Proposal</i>
	7	Vet new and revised <i>Mandatory Fee Proposals</i>
	8	Academic Units initiate Program review
OCTOBER	9	Academic Units complete Program review with recommendations
	10	Submit Tuition and Mandatory Fee requests to Board
	11	Legislative Fiscal Committee presentation
	12	Update planning scenarios based on resource and expenditure assumptions
NOVEMBER	13	<i>Budget Request & Prioritization Process</i> initiated with form and instructions forwarded to Divisions/Departments with completion date of Jan. 31, 2014 (normally in August)
DECEMBER	14	Governor conducts budget hearings (Dec 13th)
	15	Board approves tuition and fees/resource scenarios updated as needed
JANUARY	16	Governor's Office completes budget hearings and formulates recommendations/scenarios updated with Governor's budget
	17	Legislature convenes/reply to legislative requests and comment on legislation
	18	Governor delivers State of the State message including Regents budget recommendations/scenarios updated with Governor's budget
	19	Prepare comprehensive report of FY 2015 Budget Requests w initial prioritization

FEBRUARY	20	Executive Management Team reviews/revises FY 2015 planning for alignment with institutional priorities (normally in September)
	21	Begin FY 2015 budget topic discussions with Cabinet, Faculty Senate, and P&S Council (normally in September)
	22	Executive Management Team approves which Budget Requests will be included for FY 2015 budget planning
MARCH		
	23	Share 'near final' draft of budget decisions made by President and Executive Management Team
	24	Apply results of bargaining agreements to budget scenarios
	25	Request final feedback from Cabinet, Faculty Senate, and P&S Council on FY 2015 budget plan
APRIL		
	26	Distribute <i>Self-Support Funds Budget Worksheets</i> to all divisions/departments
	27	<i>Budget Issues</i> documented and submitted to Board
	28	Distribute <i>Salary Increase Worksheets</i>
	29	Allocate new resources and reallocate existing resources per approved plan
MAY		
	30	Salary policy for all employee groups presented to the Board
	31	Self-Support Fund Worksheet budgets due
	32	Final budget determined based on Legislative appropriations and Governor's action
JUNE		
	33	Communicate final approved budget to University community

* These are basic planning steps. Full process is available in the timeline version of the budget planning process.