

9-12-2011

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 12, 2011

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2011 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 12, 2011" (2011). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 54.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/54

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.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
09/12/11 (3:20 p.m. - 4:53 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

Three of four outgoing Senators were present to receive their plaques of recognition for their dedicated service: Megan **Balong**, Doug **Hotek**, and Julie **Lowell**.

1. Courtesy announcements included no press present.

Provost **Gibson** offered comments thanking the faculty for their attendance at the recent Faculty Awards Ceremony. She also noted that she received word that UNI has again moved into 2nd place in its category on the U.S. News and World Report rankings of colleges and universities after slipping slightly last year.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered no comments.

Faculty Senate Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included information on upcoming President's Breakfasts and a call for the submission of questions by tomorrow afternoon for the breakfast to be held this coming Friday. He also stated that he would make a formal petition to call for a committee to work on Faculty Senate By-laws in light of the passing of the amendment to the Constitution regarding University reorganization. Senators **Neuhaus** and **Breitbach** volunteered to serve on that committee. Lastly, he noted that he will add a new item to upcoming Agendas—an additional comment section for Vice-Chair **Breitbach** to report regularly on Senate committees.

Faculty Senate Vice-Chair **Breitbach** then took the floor to comment and asked Senators to consider two things: 1) To review the recently sent (via e-mail attachment to Senators) the Committee on Committees Recommendations dated 1/18/09 (sic, 2010) with handwritten comments by Chair **Funderburk**. The Senate considered and passed 2 of those in the past, and she proposes consideration now of the remaining 3. 2) To take a

look at the entire committee structure for possible disbanding of some long-standing but little-needed committees. Ad hoc committees might be able to do the little work needed. She will file a formal petition or petitions so these items can be docketed.

2. Minutes for August 22, 2011, had the following corrections requested:

1) The addition of attendance as present names of new Senators inadvertently omitted and 2) the addition of names for a motion and second omitted. The corrected Minutes were then approved by acclamation.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

- 1089 987 Request for Emeritus Status, Ron **Abraham**, Accounting, effective May 31, 2011. Docketed in regular order (**Wurtz/Smith**). Passed.
- 1090 988 Invitation to President Allen for 9/26/11 meeting. Docketed out of order at the head of the docket on that date (**Neuhaus/DeBerg**). Passed.
- 1091 989 Moratorium on LAC Category Reviews. Docketed in regular order (**Smith/DeBerg**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1083 981 Request for Emeritus Status, Michael R. **White**, Industrial Technology, regular order (**Neuhaus/Terlip**). Vote to endorse request, passed.
- 1084 982 Request for Emeritus Status, Diane **Thiessen**, Mathematics, regular order (**Kirmani/East**). Motion to endorse request (**DeBerg/Kirmani**), passed.
- 1085 983 Consultative Session with Associate Provosts Virginia **Arthur** and Michael **Licari** regarding new wording for policies on Academic Ethics and Student Academic Grievances, regular

order (**DeBerg/Bruess**). Discussion completed. Policy drafts to be forwarded to EPC as written along with Minutes showing discussion points.

- 1087 985 Motion to guarantee that program cuts, reorganization, and/or expansion be supported by the current University Strategic Plan, regular order (**DeBerg/Bruess**). Motion withdrawn.
- 1088 986 Motion to reserve West Gym for academic purposes, regular order (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Held until next meeting.

5. New Business

Appointee to Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee made:
Senator **Terlip**

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:53 p.m. (**East/DeBerg**). Vote. Passed.

Next meeting: September 26, 2011, will be in the Oak Room of Maucker Union, 3:15 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DATE
Mtg. 1698**

PRESENT: Robert **Boody**, Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. and declared the first order of business to be recognition of outgoing Senators who stood and received plaques for their dedicated service: Professor **Hotek**, Professor **Lowell**, and Professor **Balong**. These 3 individuals survived one term on the Faculty Senate (laughter and clapping), and **Funderburk** offered his thanks for their service.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost Gloria **Gibson** had two quick comments. First, she thanked all faculty for their attendance last week at the Faculty Awards Ceremony and where new faculty were introduced. Extra chairs were needed, and it went very, very well, so she thanked the faculty for attending and supporting their colleagues at that event.

Second, she has had word that tomorrow the U.S. News and World Report rankings will come out. Last year, UNI slipped a bit, but UNI is now back at #2, tied with a University of Wisconsin affiliate, in the regional Midwest public universities category. This is good news, and UNI is looking to raise that next year to #1.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Chair **Funderburk** reminded Senators of the e-mail he had sent announcing the President's Breakfasts and his call for questions. He has received already more than the 3 questions to be submitted, and later this evening or tomorrow morning he will send a compilation of all questions received at that time. From anyone with strong feelings about things that should be asked now or should not be asked, he invites replies. He needs to turn in by tomorrow afternoon to the President's Office the 3 questions chosen for the first breakfast

Also, because the amendment to the Constitution passed, he will be sending, in the form of a petition for Senators to review, the need to form a committee to work on the By-laws of the Senate and how to handle representation due to the College reorganization. This committee will also look at other things such as the election of a Faculty Senate Secretary, which has not occurred for perhaps 15 years, but the By-laws, as written, require it. This is a step in having the Senate operate more closely to their By-laws. So he would like everyone to be thinking about serving on this committee, and he would accept volunteers even now. Senator **Neuhaus** volunteered to serve on this committee as did Vice-Chair **Breitbach**, and both were accepted. The petition then may simply reflect the names already submitted.

In addition, along the lines of committee reorganization and restructuring, **Funderburk** has asked Vice-Chair **Breitbach** to head up that initiative for all Faculty Senate committees. In order to keep this moving this year, he has asked that she make comments, basically a status report, at each Faculty Senate meeting to show where things are moving so that this stays as a front burner item. This being a good time to begin that report, he turned the floor over to Vice-Chair **Breitbach**.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Breitbach would like the Faculty Senate to consider 2 things. First, she reported that she and Chair **Funderburk** decided to begin by bringing back the 5 recommendations from the Committee on Committees brought to a Faculty Senate meeting last year (092710). The Faculty Senate discussed 3 of the 5 recommendations at that time and passed 2. The Senate now needs to follow through and make the changes suggested in their operating procedures as a result of those recommendations. Nuss recently sent that Committee on Committees Recommendations report in an e-mail to all Senators. It included some handwritten comments by **Funderburk**.

Breitbach proposed beginning with the 3 recommendations not considered or passed. Discussion of those will be docketed for a future meeting, and she requests that Senators take a close look at any notes they may have from that earlier Senate meeting and the notes **Funderburk** has included on the recently received attachment.

Second, **Breitbach** would like the Senate to take a quick look at the entire committee structure that has been in place forever. She thinks there are one or two committees that might be disbanded or perhaps have them on an ad hoc basis. Some committees just do not need committee members filling slots every single year. An appointed ad hoc committee could do the little bit of work that needs to be done.

Senator **Terlip** asked if the Faculty Senate has asked the Committee on Committees for their report for this year yet? She feels they should have completed that and that elections should all be completed. **Breitbach**

replied, no, and that one of the things the Senate needs to find out is who is chairing that this year. There seems to be a breakdown in communications in reporting the results of those elections to the broader faculty in any organized way, much less to the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate. Chair **Funderburk** noted that he has a meeting with Provost **Gibson** on Thursday and one of the topics of that meeting will be that there is no uniform reporting policy for elections on this campus to anyone, including those who were a part of the election and were elected sometimes. He hopes that some structure will be set up to make this a little cleaner. He has yet to receive even the list of the faculty. **Terlip** said she asked because normally that committee is supposed to make that report very early. **Breitbach** noted that they did last year but have not yet this year.

Senator **DeBerg** suggested that the Senate consider making the Vice-Chair or the Secretary of the Faculty Senate the standing Chair of the Committee on Committees. The Chair of this Committee on Committees, she feels, should always be a member of this body. **Breitbach** agreed saying that was one of the recommendations she planned to bring forward, noting that that would take a change in the By-laws, and that the Vice-Chair has never had a lot of other responsibility. There was discussion last year to have the Vice-Chair work on the Report but not necessarily to serve as Chair of that Committee. **Breitbach** will make a formal petition to get these issues on the Calendar so that faculty campus-wide can be aware of their work on them. And **Funderburk** reminded everyone that this subject will be discussed at each Faculty Senate meeting during the Comments portion to keep it alive.

Funderburk also reminded everyone to speak loudly to assist with audio recording and transcription in this large room.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

No e-mail corrections were received from Senators on the Minutes submitted by Nuss for August 22, 2011. **Funderburk** called for any other corrections from the floor at this time.

Senator **Kirmani**, new to the Senate this Fall, noted that his name and that of Senator **Edginton** were omitted from the list of those present.

This reminded Chair **Funderburk** to thank two alternates who will be filling in for two Senators unable to attend meetings this Fall due to class schedule conflicts: Susan **Roberts-Dobie** for Senator **Edginton** and Robert **Boody** for Senator **Gallagher**. He noted the often difficult time Senators have in finding alternates when they have conflicts and expressed his sincere gratitude for the willingness of these two to serve.

Senator **Swan** asked that the Summary be corrected to show, as does the body of the transcript, that he made the motion to table 1076/974 rather than the person listed.

These corrections will be made prior to the posting of the Minutes for August 22, 2011, and these Minutes as corrected were approved by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1089 for Docket #987, an Emeritus Status Request from Ron **Abraham**, Accounting, to be effective May 31, 2011.

Senator **Wurtz** moved to docket in regular order. Second by Senator **Smith**. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1090 for Docket #988, an invitation to President Allen for 09/26/11. **Neuhaus** moved to docket this out of order

at the head of the docket for that date. Second by **DeBerg**. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1091 for Docket #989, a Moratorium on LAC Category Reviews. **Smith** moved to docket in regular order. Second by **DeBerg**. No discussion. Vote. Passed with 1 opposed.

Funderburk then summarized that the top of the order for the meeting on September 26, 2011, will be a visit from President **Allen** who can arrive at 3:15. Background information included that this invitation was made based on conversations the Chair has had with the President. Because he, President **Allen**, was unable to attend the recent Faculty Senate Retreat nor has he addressed the Faculty Senate recently, he agreed to come when a time could be worked out, if invited. **Funderburk** said that it was his own idea that it occur at a Faculty Senate meeting. He understands that President **Allen** will make some remarks and will also be willing to accept questions at that time. If there are any questions or concerns about this, then now is the time, the Chair stated.

Swan clarified that this is a consultative session with President Allen to take place at 3:15 on September 26. **Terlip** asked if he is requesting questions in advance? The Chair replied, no, but that he would likely accept them if they were to be submitted for a heads-up (laughter). Another vote was taken, which passed, to schedule this consultative session at 3:15 with President Allen on September 26.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #981, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, MICHAEL R. **WHITE**,
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

Chair **Funderburk** read this docket item and asked if anyone wished to speak to this request. Former Senator **HOTEK** from the audience commented as a member of the faculty in the Industrial Technology Department in support of Dr. **White** and his emeritus status. Dr. **White**, **HOTEK** stated, has been a mentor and advisor to all the junior faculty in the

Department, and all of Dr. **White**'s 31 years of service have been as a full professor. He has touched many undergraduate and graduate lives in all of the Industrial Tech. Undergrad., Master's, and Doctoral programs, as well as in the Liberal Arts Core Capstone courses. The Chair called for a vote to endorse this request. Passed.

DOCKET #982, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DIANE **THIESSEN**,
MATHEMATICS

DeBerg moved that the Faculty Senate award Professor Diane **Thiessen** emeritus status. **Kirmani** seconded. **Wurtz** noted that the Faculty Senate technically does not approve emeritus status requests but may simply endorse them. Agreement all around, including **DeBerg**. Vote on the amended motion to endorse this request passed.

DOCKET #983, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH ASSOCIATE PROVOSTS
VIRGINIA **ARTHUR** AND MICHAEL **LICARI** REGARDING NEW WORDING FOR
POLICIES ON ACADEMIC ETHICS AND STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCES
<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-regarding-new-wording-policies-academ>

Chair **Funderburk** asked the Associate Provosts to move to the table in front of the projected screen for nearness to and clarity of the recording equipment. He introduced the session, saying that the three of them had had a meeting today. These two topics, as well as one that the Faculty Senate worked on for a couple of years regarding Attendance Policy and Make-up Work, which also had a grievance component, have been in the works now for several years and running into each other with some conflicts among the various Grievance Policies. This is not asking for any official endorsement. This is simply a session so that **Arthur** and **Licari** can present what they are working on and what they are doing. The Faculty Senate is giving them the opportunity to provide any comments as well.

Associate Provost **Arthur** began by thanking those present for allowing the two of them to be on the docket today. She noted that she is in some way

one of the few people who are still left at UNI who was on an ad hoc task force that was working on it, so that is why she now has the task of bringing it forward to the Senate. She does think this is properly a matter of faculty governance, and although Chair **Funderburk** said that this would be a consultative session, she would still hope that maybe the EPC committee would take these drafts and then begin the work of moving it through the process of getting faculty approval of the policies.

She will provide a little background and perhaps Associate Provost **Licari** will be able to fill in a bit more. When she joined UNI, there was a committee already in process. It was chaired by the then Associate Provost Bev **Kopper**. Other members of the committee included the Interim Dean of the Graduate College, Sue **Joseph**; Donna **Wood**, who was Chair of the Student Grievance Appeals Committee; Kent **Sandstrom**, who was also a member of the Grievance Appeals Committee; students, including the Vice-President of NISG at that time--she thinks the Committee originally began work in 2008; a graduate student and an undergraduate student who had been on their Grievance Appeals Committees; Linda **Walsh** from Psychology; Jon **Buse** from Student Affairs; and a couple of other faculty members involved whose names are not in her records nor in her memory.

When **Arthur** came to UNI, Associate Provost **Kopper** asked her if she would join the Committee because one of her upcoming duties was to help with policy drafting due to her training as a lawyer. One of the reasons why this Committee began to review these policies was due to concerns about how procedure works and the appropriate procedure to use. So they were concerned they may have some legal questions that would arise.

The Committee began by looking at Policy 12.01, which is the Student Academic Grievance Policy. A major change made by the Committee included combining the undergraduate and graduate policies, because they seemed parallel, and having one policy would simplify things with just references as to graduate and undergraduate as appropriate. Most of the rules of procedure and the kinds of issues were exactly the same.

Also, another concern to the Committee which they tried to address included clarifying the jurisdiction between the academic process for

grievance hearings and the intersection with the Office of Compliance and Equity Management. Perhaps some present have experienced that it is not unusual for a student, when they come forward and are upset about a grade or some action that has been taken, in some cases they may say that they have been discriminated against. Oftentimes, she understands, investigations were going on through the Office of Compliance and Equity while the Student Academic Grievance process was also underway, and sometimes there were conflicts about how to resolve it. So the Committee wanted to make clear that they wanted the academic process to occur first, keeping Compliance and Equity fully informed, and then if there seems to be some issue of discrimination, then they could take over afterward. This would prevent conflicting messages.

Another issue was to clean up the structure of the policy. In one sense, they reformatted it and put it into clear steps, trying to make the language a little more transparent to everyone. The Committee did not really tinker much with the time lines. They did shorten them a little bit. This is still a fairly long process. It could perhaps take a whole semester if everyone takes the maximum amount of time at each step to do their consideration.

Then there were a number of things that the people who have served on the Grievance Appeal Board were concerned about, such as questions about what do we properly consider as evidence in these hearings? Can students bring their parents? Can they bring attorneys? Can a faculty member bring an attorney? And what happens if there are conflicts of interest? Those kinds of things have apparently occurred in a variety of cases as they have come up over a period of time. So that is the essence of what this Committee tried to do to make those much clearer.

As part of this process, this then began to bring in a discussion of 3.01, which is the Academic Ethics Policy. Originally, the members thought that again they should try to clear up that policy and make it more understandable for everyone. Associate Provost **Kopper** had mentioned many problems where faculty members might informally report that they were having issues about academic ethics, but then the policy was so unclear and the process so intimidating to them that then they would not

want to make formal reports, and yet the University has an interest in having that done.

At some point in time in this Committee she knows that a discussion came up with previous Senate consideration of an honor code and that the committee members at that time said that the honor code had not gotten any traction. So they wanted to look at something different.

At that time she was still fairly new at UNI, so having less to do she agreed to undertake a research project to find out what is the best practice in academic ethics. She looked at a number of UNI's peer institutions, a number of other comprehensive institutions, and also an organization called the Center for Academic Integrity which had a nice compilation of about 120 different kinds of policies and some that they pointed to as real models. She gathered all this information together, summarized it for the Committee, showed them a variety of approaches, and they wanted to take the path of proposed revision that Senators have in front of themselves today. Essentially, the idea is to fulfill an educational purpose through the policy both for faculty and for students, but most especially for students who everyone seems to agree have a less clear view every year about what are good academic ethics.

So this policy revision tries to lay out examples of different kinds of violations of academic ethics. It gives a definition and then examples. It then has a system of various levels of academic sanctions and again gives examples since this is one of the areas that showed a real lack of clarity in the existing policy. So that is the background on these two policies she had to offer, and she turned the floor over to **Licari**, who simply thanked her for her overview. They then asked if anyone had a question.

DeBerg asked if the draft Senators received redoes 3.01 Academic Ethics, or is **Arthur** saying that that needs to be done? **Arthur** replied that they received two documents. **Licari** explained that one would replace the 3.01 Academic Ethics Policy. The Student Academic Grievance Policy would replace 12.01. **Arthur** further clarified that 3.01 right now basically describes academic ethics violations and prohibits them. **DeBerg** noted that this revision is badly needed, and others agreed.

Roberts-Dobie (alternate for Senator **Edginton**) asked to add 3 things. First, she thanked the guests on behalf of all who have struggled with this in classes. This format showing the varying levels of punishment which follow the level of transgression is greatly appreciated. She also wanted to ask two things. First, she struggles as far as their curriculum with the “hours.” She is having trouble finding a place to really mark it underneath when misrepresented. They have clinical hours, such as they have to do 10 hours or 440 hours or 25 hours, and the only place she has found to put that underneath is “representation” or “misrepresentation.” She wondered if under that perhaps a specific example saying “You have completed clinical hours” could be added there? **Licari** suggested that maybe they could broaden that to say that “Claims about completion of academic activities that are deemed to have been falsely made would be misrepresentation.” That would broaden that beyond that particular case. Secondly, **Robert-Dobie** wondered if this information could be included in the Cornerstone course, because, if it is not presented to students somewhere systematically, they will never have the information. **Arthur** replied that they considered doing that even just as “Here is an example.” But they decided that they should wait until it is officially passed by the Faculty Senate. If it gets completed this semester, then the Cornerstone faculty will address it next semester, and she said she did agree with that thinking.

Terlip noted that in the old policy it gave steps that the instructor needed to follow in order to file, and she felt that that needed to be included in this policy because she sees definitions but specifically what needs to be done is not as clear. **Licari** asked if she meant a specific work process or work flow? And **Terlip** agreed. **DeBerg** felt this had a student audience in mind and that the faculty audience needs to be included, too. What is it that a faculty member needs to do? **Licari** stated that they could work this into the section Responsibilities of Faculty Member, just a short step-by-step guideline. **DeBerg** also suggested that faculty may need to do different things at the various levels so perhaps a 1, 2, 3.

Senator **Peters** stated that he has 2 comments. He said that he has availed himself several times of the current process, and he believes that a strength

of that process is the amount of discretion it leaves to faculty members. He understands that that can be a detriment because faculty members may do wildly different things across campus. On the other hand, every case genuinely is different, and not every student stumbles into these problems in the same way. Some stumble in; some dive in headlong into them. There has to be a way the policy allows some faculty discretion about making those recommendations. He is afraid right now, in the draft as it is, that the levels are kind of rigid. There is nothing, for example, that says similarly to the current policy that some of this can just be taken care of through the grading process. Even with the Level I violation, it states something like even if the student were to just accidentally leave out a single citation. He, **Peters**, would not be writing a letter to the Provost's Office for someone who left out a single citation on a paper. Judged depending on the circumstances, that might just be a typo. If the rest of the paper is very good and everything else is well done, for one citation missing, he would not make a big deal out of that. There has to be, he feels, somewhere in this whole process where it is still within the realm of appropriate faculty response to dock the grade without resorting to any disciplinary action. His other comment concerned his wondering if the different levels could focus, instead of trying to envision the content of the violation, rather on giving faculty members and administrators the different factors that should be considered. He worries that each case will be so different that it will be hard to fit every case into just 4 categories. So instead of focusing on the content of each violation maybe including something along the lines of "In recommending a particular action, faculty members should consider certain things. Consider the extent of the violation, the amount the assignment was worth in the grade, the apparent intent of the student, etc." Have more of a sliding scale.

Licari responded that one way to interpret the different levels of violations would be along that line in terms of how you perceive the level of the problem. The policy as written provides essentially recommendations or ideas. For example, in Level I a professor could give no credit and presumably they could also dock the grade or choose to file something with the Provost's Office. **Licari** noted that as a scholar of public policy he appreciated **Peters** point of trying to balance guidance with discretion.

That is always a difficult trade off to achieve effectively. **Peters'** ideas suggest a bit of a different approach and maybe that can be reworked through the EPC.

Arthur wanted to explain why the Committee went the way they did. One of the problems is that if the violations do not get reported into the Provost's Office then the larger picture may not be seen. For Level I, it may be judged as the student not being very aware and making some mistakes and not knowing the citation system. But if that happens 10 times, then there is another issue going on. The Grievance Board has sometimes dealt with issues where things came out during the process of a hearing that there had been other kinds of violations of the same type. Because there was no central reporting function that was hard to track. A person making repeated violations is a factor to be considered rather than looking at the incidents in isolation from each other. So that was the reasoning of the committee as to why faculty should report each incident.

Chair **Funderburk** stated that his intention is that whenever this Committee reports that they have this document ready, then the Faculty Senate will forward it to the EPC to come back with recommendations, and he will call the EPC's attention to the minutes of this discussion as well to help inform their deliberations. He thinks it will also go back to NISG leadership to reaffirm and support it.

East stated that he has almost the opposite reaction to Senator **Peters**. He read the Policies, and in the Academic Ethics Policy he was struck by the lack of a requirement for a faculty member do almost anything. He said he interpreted the recommended action as “you can do anything you want, but here are some suggestions, and you don't have to do anything until it got to the point of a minimum response or minimum action.” He thinks that it is important that faculty be expected to report things that they consider breeches of academic integrity. He does not think that by accident leaving out a citation rises to that level, but he does think that one can omit a citation on purpose and that would rise to that level. If, in the judgment of the faculty member, academic integrity has been violated, they should be required to report. Otherwise, having this central reporting

facility does almost nothing, if faculty are not expected to report it. This means, in addition to students being aware of the policy and being told about it every year, that associate faculty members be informed also. It would seem to him that if a faculty member takes any kind of action that they deem to be in response to an academic integrity issue, then they should be reporting it. If they do not think it rises to that occasion, then they should not report it, should not penalize the student in any way. He thinks grading the work differently is appropriate in some cases without the need necessarily for reporting.

East continued with a couple of comments on the Student Academic Grievance Procedure draft. First of all, under item C in the second paragraph where it talks about two faculty representatives from each college, he assumes that is actually one so the numbers would be correct according to paragraph one. **Arthur** admitted that the idea was to have a pool of faculty available when needed and that they need to make that more clear between the two paragraphs. **East** also cited part A, paragraph two, where it was unclear just what the faculty member response must be in 10 days. A response of “Yes, I received your complaint” might not be sufficient, whereas a reasonable response might be a proposed or suggested resolution within the 10 days.

Wurtz stated that she finds the policies very attractive and that they clarify a lot. She asked if it would be possible to have a boilerplate report where faculty insert the specifics? She is looking at the recommendation that the student is required to do an assignment involving the practice of proper citation. That is not what she teaches, and she would prefer not to have to create special assignments and do extra work when it is the student who did not bother to do the work. But to have a set of such assignments available to assist the faculty members would probably make them a lot more happy and willing to jump into the quagmire. This includes any of these that would involve the faculty doing extra work based on the student's violation. The more faculty can have that is standardized would sure be nice.

DeBerg had comments about student ethics and then a question about the academic grievance. She agreed with Senator **East**. She thinks that violations of academic ethics need to be written up. That paper trail needs to be kept. A form letter would be really helpful. She also thinks this points to how important it is to have a centralized and/or college orientation for temporary, term, and part-time instructors. How can there be expectations for any of this to work unless the 90% of the sessions in the courses Oral Communications and College Reading and Writing that are taught by adjuncts are trained adjuncts?

DeBerg's next question involves the Student Academic Grievance Policy. If a grade is changed outside of this procedure, what redress do the guests think is appropriate for faculty? She noted that this procedure is the sole means of changing a student's grade. What do the guests think the proper redress a faculty member would have if a Department Head or Dean has changed a grade? As part of the policy, she thinks this is a legitimate question since they are considering redrafts of the policy. **Licari** responded that that was not something they considered here in this policy.

Neuhaus wanted to follow-up on Alternate **Dobie's** and Senator **DeBerg's** comments. Concerning the idea that the Cornerstone folks should look at it, keep in mind, he advised, that those students are just a fraction of the study body—just 250 students. He thinks, so that not every faculty member is burdened with having to go through all this, it best to be rather intentional about where and when share this. Perhaps online in an ethics tutorial coupled with it would be the way to go. There are two populations to watch for. One is the traditional first-year students, and then that rather large group of transfer students now coming in from different systems who will need to be clued in.

As a librarian, **Neuhaus** wanted to share his thinking on impeding fair and equal access to the educational and research process which he certainly supports. Perhaps those days of damaging materials and hiding them in the rafters is gone, but maybe something should be mentioned under the faculty members section, perhaps called “unintentional impeding of materials.” There seem to be an awful lot of assignments generated

without looking to see whether the material is actually there or whether there is just one copy and it is not placed in a position where there is access for all. It is inadvertent and accidental, but it is a looming, major problem because he finds an awful lot of students looking for something that the Library cannot seem to get for them. This in some cases results in students going to a Plan B that is less desirable.

Kirmani noted that sometimes faculty members do not put information about their policy on their syllabus and then condemn their students. He thinks faculty should make the rules of the game clear as to what constitutes plagiarism, for example. Unless those things are written on one's syllabus, it is very difficult to argue with the students.

Arthur pointed out that under Responsibilities of Faculty Members it does say to make reference to the Academic Ethics Policy on each course syllabus. She thinks it could mean that the student needs to be directed to read it on the web, but, yes, this is a faculty member responsibility.

Terlip said that she thinks that whenever this is completed it needs to be cross referenced with the Office of Sponsored Programs, and while she recognizes that the 3.01 Academic Ethics Policy was written towards students, the definitions of application falsification there are different. They are not the same as they are in reporting research misconduct. So all those things need to be cleaned up and cross referenced. **Arthur** said that she would share this with Anita as she is certainly overseeing the implementation of that policy. **Terlip** stated that if there were something like this for academic misconduct like there is for research misconduct it would be very helpful.

Swan, referencing the Academic Ethics Policy, said that he could see that for bureaucratic purposes it is fine, but for certain creative, pedagogical, academic purposes, it can be stifling. For instance, under Fabrication looking at 5. it sounds very clear and simple and plain. "Oh, well, if you altered and resubmit an assignment or test or quiz or exam for additional credit, that's terrible!" But that is the pedagogy of the vast majority of the best writing instructors in the nation. That is what the 4 C's promotes. It is what gets people to write better. When they have the opportunity to redo

something for real credit that changes things; it brings it to life for them; it is vibrant. Other graduate programs recommend, "Well, of course, you have to think about things for a long time and redo them, and then you do them in a dissertation because you have redone them." This says that that is a horrible, academic ethical violation. And, of course, we can say, "Well, yes, when you say it like that we understand that that is not what we meant." But that is what is said, and it is very clear and very plain and very authoritative. And then we are now saying that faculty must report an incidence of resubmitting an assignment that has been redone for credit. With a brilliant Master's thesis, "I know you did this part in this graduate seminar before. I must report this. And not only are you not going to be getting an A from UNI where you would someplace else, you are going to be academically unethical." This is really serious. People will have trouble with this, especially when they are told, "I have to report it. I can't just not. I can't just say 'I'm not going to report it here because it's not really what's going on.'" Someone else could come along and say, "Dr. **Swan**, you did not report this plain, clear violation." There are lots of instances like that. He does know that there are lots of situations where, yes, faculty just do this. It produces reproduction and assignment of individuality. He understands doing that, but for other mechanisms it may not be as beneficial.

Arthur responded with thanks and noted that that was not at all the intention of the committee and that maybe it just needs to be rewritten a little bit. A couple of Committee members brought up examples where they had turned back exams and students had changed answers on multiple choice and then took it to the professor and said, "You misgraded my exam." (**Licari** stated this also at the same time.) **Licari** went on to say that this was not in the editing process, not the revision process of writing; this was just where an exam was returned, the student learned the correct answer, changed the answer, and turned it in again. **DeBerg** called this misrepresentation not turning something in a second time. The Associate Provosts agreed. **Licari** suggested that perhaps this needs to be moved to a different place in the document. **Arthur** noted that they see **Swan's** point and that it was not meant to be when the student is just revising and resubmitting. **Swan** advised that they take several situations like this and

think of it from lots of disciplinary perspectives, whatever the document is going to say, especially if the faculty member cannot just set it aside. That is where he feels it gets really alarming, when it reads “Faculty must do this in every instance,” because then you must engage with someone who misinterprets the rule. So that is part of the balancing he thinks they need to be careful about. He realizes that all of this is in the administration of it, the execution of it; that is key and essential. But everyone does like to tend to believe that documents speak plainly and do not need to be interpreted and will not give rise to some of these problems. He then thanked the guests.

Peters began a question then realized he had been misreading the section in question and withdrew from the floor.

Chair **Funderburk** called for any further speakers or any further information from the guests. **Licari** said that they just hoped that the Faculty Senate will refer these draft policies to the EPC for further work and that the Senate will eventually consider whatever the EPC comes up with. His and **Arthur's** job was simply to present this to the Faculty Senate, and they are not wedded to it in any way. Their feelings will not be hurt if things are changed.

Arthur would like to be clear about the next steps. Would the Faculty Senate like for her and **Licari** to work on incorporating the comments made today, or do they just turn this draft over to the Senate and they take it from here? **Funderburk** replied that he would prefer the Senate send the language as it is now to the EPC along with these comments for them to incorporate. He would point them to the Minutes for this discussion.

East recommended that the Senate refer these documents directly to the EPC. Today's comments should also somehow be communicated to them either through a summary or in reference to the Minutes or both. **Licari** noted that he does sit ex officio on the EPC, so he can serve as a link.

Terlip stated that this has been in the hopper for a while, so should the Senate put a reasonable time limit for the EPC to respond to the Senate? Perhaps that should be included in the motion, when they should report

back to this body. **Funderburk** agreed and noted that there is a third policy to be taken into consideration at the same time, so there are some complicating factors, but it is reasonable to set a time limit. He would certainly be communicating that to the Chair of the EPC as he has done with a time line for other items.

Neuhaus wondered if, when this is finally approved, there would be a certain amount of lead time that would allow faculty to prepare for some of it? It may encourage a little more instruction, at least within certain realms of the Colleges so that the first year can be transferred. **Funderburk** asked if he was to interpret this as the time line at the implementation? Yes, **Neuhaus**, replied and asked what would be the difference between approval and when it is this way? **Licari** asked what is meant by “finally approved”? Once the policy has gone all the way through the processing, it will become part of the catalog language. At that time, he can send out an announcement to campus about the new policy and direct faculty to the portion of the catalog that includes both policies. **Arthur** also said they would be willing to hold open forums so that if faculty wanted to have discussion and questions about it before they implement it that that would be a good faculty development thing. **Funderburk** in answering the direct question from **Neuhaus** stated that, barring something unforeseen happening, his intention is to get this completed before he leaves as Chair, which is one reason he asked the Associate Provosts to come early in the year to get this process started. Also, by having this in the Minutes, those faculty who read the Minutes will already be aware and hopefully will start funneling any concerns they have directly to the EPC once this body has stated that that is where it is.

Funderburk asked the guests if, for clarity, they would prefer any change in wording in it further or should the document that the Senate currently has be the wording that is forwarded to the EPC? **Arthur** stated that she would like to leave that to the members of the Senate. If they would like her to carry through by her just drafting some more and incorporating these suggestions and then turning it over, that is fine. She does not care either way. **Funderburk** noted, after pausing, that because there seem to be no strong opinions expressed that the Senate can forward the language as it

sits to keep it moving. The EPC will have the Minutes, once they are approved, to consult what the Senate asked for changes. Hopefully the one technical issue of clarifying the actual college representation will be fairly obvious when it gets there, especially since **Licari** is there. **Licari** agreed.

Hearing no further requests to speak, the Chair thanked the guests for a ton of work and lots of information with which to work. Some quiet conversation occurred as to whether a motion was needed and determined not.

DOCKET #985, MOTION TO GUARANTEE THAT PROGRAM CUTS, REORGANIZATION, AND/OR EXPANSION BE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Funderburk called for a motion to approve. **DeBerg** so moved. Second by **Terlip**. Some discussion occurred as to whether this motion was necessary, and **Funderburk** ruled that it was necessary in order to open the floor for discussion.

DeBerg began by stating that this may seem to be an overly simplistic motion, but she wanted to call the Senate's attention to a couple of things. One, when the Academic Program Assessment process that Jim **Lubker** initiated as Provost got started with a Phase 1 and a Phase 2, everyone across campus worked very hard on this, either to prepare material for them or else to read through the material and make recommendations. The APA was asked to rule on centrality but without the current Strategic Plan in place, for example. So a new Strategic Plan means to her that there are new arguments about centrality to make. She does not want arguments about centrality if they are going to be made by the Provost and the President to be based on the old APA process that had a different Strategic Plan guiding its sense of what is central to the University now.

Secondly, **DeBerg** wants not just cuts to be justified pretty explicitly on the new Strategic Plan, but she wants where that money is to go to be justified, according to the new Strategic Plan. That is, if they are going to cut one program because it is not central or is floundering, they had better give it to

another program that is central. She wants this to be both in regard to any program cuts that might be down the pike but also to the shifts in money to certain programs. She does not want money going to a program that is not justified very clearly by the Strategic Plan. Then she asked if that made sense that it is a motion that asks both of those? Assent given around. So that was her thinking when she sent this motion forward.

Provost **Gibson** said that she has two concerns. On one level she understands what is being said and agrees, but she also has a problem with using the word “guarantee.” The other issue is that clearly the Strategic Plan will be central to decisions that are made, but there will be other criteria. She can envision where a program may be justified in the Strategic Plan, but there are other factors that would say that this program should be reasonably eliminated. She does feel that the Strategic Plan should be a document that they consult and that it would be a component of the decision, but to say that it has to be justified in a detailed way based on the Strategic Plan could be problematic.

DeBerg said that she would expect that any justification about program closing and expansion would be detailed and that it would be justified in a detailed way. The Provost agreed. **DeBerg** said that that is a legitimate expectation. That part of the detailed way was in reference to it on the basis of the Strategic Plan seems to her to be 101. That is about as basic as you can get. Why have a Strategic Plan? She notes that the word “guarantee” is not in her motion. It is in the title of the motion given to it when the petition was accepted and placed on the calendar. The Provost agreed. **DeBerg** read the motion as: “Be it resolved that any academic program cuts, reorganization, and expansion now and in the future be justified in a detailed way to the Senate and the larger university community on the basis of, and in reference to, specific outcomes and goals contained in the current university strategic plan” That is all that it asks for, she stated. Provost **Gibson** replied that as long as it is understood that it would not solely be Strategic Plan. **DeBerg** reiterated that that is not in the motion. Provost **Gibson** noted this and said that is fine.

East had two comments. One is about the APA first of all. The APA did not think about the Strategic Plan, at least he did not, when they would talk about centrality. Second, his view of the Strategic Plan is that it is very specific for a short period of time and really relates to specific goals that may or may not relate to a whole host of programs on the campus, some of which might be cut and some of which might be given money from the programs that were cut. Neither of them had anything to do directly with the Strategic Plan other than they are part of the general mission of UNI. While he is in sympathy with the idea, it is very difficult to make detailed reports about rationale for cuts and changes in funding on the Strategic Plan. He thinks it can go the other way and say that basically we did these things in reference to the Strategic Plan, but he does not think they can make all goals about programs based on the Strategic Plan because they just do not fit for many of the programs. Somehow he likes the whole idea of explaining outcomes where decisions were made, but the Strategic Plan does not seem to do it.

Smith wanted to echo **East's** comments and agreed with them. More generally he is concerned because it seems from the perspective of business school organization, you have Management, and they have some responsibilities, and they draft a Strategic Plan. Here at the University, there is faculty involvement, co-management governance. It seems to him that this motion goes too far. It is the prerogative of Management to make the decisions. Last year the Senate spent a lot of time talking about making sure that they are consulted about things. He is comfortable that they are consulted and that they will be consulted. They are given opportunities to have input on these decisions. He just does not, quite frankly, see where this is beneficial. In fact, he thinks it is harmful. If he were an administrator, he would be very upset about it. He thinks it is reaching too far. He thinks it is an inappropriate kind of intrusion of faculty on administrative prerogatives, and what **East** said about the Strategic Plan is exactly correct. It will not give specific guidance on specific programs. It cannot do that. It is strategic.

Kirmani pointed out first of all that the University Strategic Plan itself is flawed, that that process was not great. He served on the Strategic Planning

Committee in 2000 and thought it was one of the biggest jokes on campus. If you have to follow the University Strategic Plan very closely, then the process should be improved. He does not see it as important as some people would make it out to be. The spirit of the University Strategic Plan is ok, and we can follow that to some extent, but he would not like the Administration to just follow it blindly. He thinks the whole process should be improved.

Wurtz said she was quite comfortable with what she thinks is the intent of this proposal, but in looking at the Faculty Senate Constitution, which goes back to the process of consultation that is expected, it is the word “justified” that tips for her. That is not in fitting with the constitutional provision of consultation. She wondered if this body would be better off, rather than putting a policy like this in place, to clarify the intent of the constitution or to do what has been discussed and that is to make some revisions in the Constitution, describe them a little bit in that piece of it.

DeBerg noted that the Senate can make a recommendation on anything that it wants. That was cleared out of the Constitution last year. She thinks it is legitimate to ask that justification for program cuts or expansions be detailed and that one of the things that they look at when they make a detailed argument for a program or against a program is whether the Strategic Plan guides in any way. If UNI has a Strategic Plan that does not guide in terms of academic cuts and expansion, then this University is in sadder shape than whether or not there need to be academic cuts or program expansions. The Provost has been saying all along that the Strategic Plan is important, that we need to guide budgeting decisions by it, so **DeBerg** would like it to be explicit. Where in these budget decisions has the Strategic Plan been a factor in Administration thinking? That is what she is asking for. She wants to know where the Strategic Plan is being used and where is it not? And she expects it to be used after all the work colleagues have put into creating it, which all had input in in one form or another. She is not defending the Strategic Plan necessarily. She is not defending the process. She is saying that UNI has it, and it should be one of the things talked about to the Senate when Administration, she hopes, justifies in a detailed way plans for any cuts or expansions that come down

the pike. She actually sees this as kind of a minor deal, but the Strategic Plan got left off some of the other work done in terms of academic reorganization. She offered an example: The new Strategic Plan talks about global global global international international international in the way that no strategic plan has ever talked about it, in a way that the APA process did not have in front of it. Well, global global global in the Strategic Plan means that you pay attention to that criteria when you look at programs and programs on campus. And that was a new criteria that the APA did not have, because global global global was not in any prior Strategic Plan. That is one example, she stated.

Smith replied that if it means that global global global says UNI should continue offering Portuguese to 2 students, in the big picture here that does not makes sense even though UNI wants to go global. That is the trouble with this. If you say you have to look at the Strategic Plan and then you get down to applying it, you are using the Strategic Plan to justify courses of action that are not really justified in a big picture sense. That is why you trust your Administrators to do that in consultation with Academic Deans and Heads, etc.

Terlip mentioned that the examples so far have tended to be negative. She thinks it would be very helpful when programs are expanded for the Administration to be clear about that so all know where it is going. It is not only cuts; it is also expansion. What part of the Strategic Plan are they putting the money behind? That would be very helpful to know.

DeBerg agreed with that point and wanted to clarify that she is not saying that the Strategic Plan should be the only criteria. She is saying that in its argument in the detailed brief to the Senate references be made to the Strategic Plan. She would like to have some detailed argument that has the Strategic Plan in it for any of these considerations. Not that they have to be the only considerations. She would not argue that. Her motion does not argue that. The motion does not talk about how decisions are made. It says that when they justify decisions, she would like to have the Strategic Plan reference in a detailed way. That is all it says.

Swan stated that the discussion today has helped him a lot to understand the motivation on **DeBerg's** writing of the proposal for the Senate and the words chosen to communicate it, and that it was, for instance, meant for the Administration. He and many in his College with whom he spoke thought that she was going to advocate arguments in relationship to the Strategic Plan when they contemplate changes in the curriculum across the country that, of course, they want to bring to UNI, and that just seems to be an unnecessary curriculum concern and even inappropriate perhaps, especially with cuts. Most of the College that he represents would be very happy to say to Administration, "You must justify the cut, especially with relationship to some Strategic Plan." The subtext of that coming through sounds good, but he is not sure that it is clearly expressed broadly. He thinks people read this and rightly interpret it not to mean Administration only. He thinks some further consideration, maybe some alteration to it, would be helpful. He thinks this conversation right now having to do with the facts that people supporting this want is good, and it is communicating with Administration. The Provost is here. The Associate Provost is here. They are interested in thinking of it, yet he thinks that people want this body that is representing this faculty to say something for it, for the faculty, because then they feel like the Senate never does anything, never says anything. Some people have some problems with some things that have gone on and feel that they could be fixed by some rationale, some explanation, or something like that. He is not sure this motion does it. He is not sure where he is in having to vote up or down on it, especially learning the spirit of it, what underwrites it. He had no sense of these things before the beginning of the discussion. So he is just taking this time on the floor to just communicate to his fellow Senators where he is about that in his thinking and feeling.

Provost **Gibson** stated again that she thinks she understands the intent. She would like to suggest some type of rewording. To her, if something has to be justified, then that justification can be accepted or rejected, and then what? She thinks the tone of this petition is not one of "pay attention to"--that is how you might phrase it, that you want the Strategic Plan to be paid attention to. Certainly, she has no issue with that, but to be justified is another thing and is that justification meant to be rejected by this body?

What sometimes some can feel as a simple statement others can take in a much different way. If there is some way to rephrase this so that it is not, well, to her it seems, for lack of a better word, harsh.

Breitbach understands the Provost's wanting to reword it, and she thinks that the way she interpreted it is that the Senate wants justification from the Administration to be communicated to faculty and that the Strategic Plan is not the only guiding document or guiding principle here. Again, she likes the intent of it. Perhaps it just does take a couple of subtle changes in the language, such as: "Be it resolved that any academic program cuts, reorganization, and expansion now and in the future **that the justification for be communicated** to the Senate and the larger university community on the basis of, and in reference to, specific outcomes and goals contained in the current university strategic plan"

Smith stated that it seemed to him that the language is strong--the justification, that it should be justified--is too strong, and he thinks that is offensive. Bringing out its one factor, to him that goes without saying. Of course the Provost and other Administrators are going to take that into account. It is the Strategic Plan they put a whole year into developing. If anyone assumes they would not, then it is an assumption that they are incompetent, which is not good. Here, last Spring at a session, the Provost's Office presented possible scenarios. There is consultation all over the place. It seems to him the Senate is getting plenty of consultation. To him it is almost insulting to say that we need to put a motion out saying we need consultation. He says this motion just seems inappropriate to him. Yes, we have the right to make motions, he feels, but we need to use that sparingly. He thinks this is too far.

DeBerg stated that first of all there has been a lack of consultation on this campus. The visiting team for the HLC noticed this as a matter of fact. There is a lack of shared governance. People from the HLC team who met with the Senate said, "Oh, my god, I can't believe how lack of shared governance there is on this campus." So she does not think UNI is at a time where faculty can give the Administration the benefit of the doubt that faculty will be consulted and in detail, rather than in general way, in which

the Administration actually has to marshal some good arguments for what they want to do. Having said that, she has decided to withdraw the motion. She thinks her point has been made. She asked if the seconder is willing to agree to this? **Terlip** agreed.

Senator **Van Wormer** wondered if the word “rationale” instead of “justified” might be something that would achieve the same thought?

DeBerg restated that she has withdrawn the motion which takes it off the table. Someone called a point of order which resulted in discussion with multiple voices about how to proceed...vote to withdraw? vote it down to accomplish withdrawal? call the question? **Wurtz** offered that she thinks that once a motion has been made and seconded that it belongs to the body. **Funderburk** thinks that is correct because it could be that a majority of the body is actually supporting the motion even if the motion-maker no longer supports it. **DeBerg** said she supports it but just wanted to withdraw it.

Terlip asked to give her perspective on this motion because others have. Her perspective is that when they did the APA a lot of people put a lot of work into it. People were doing it under the old Strategic Plan. Her thought was that now that there is a new Strategic Plan, they do not want others to assume that arguments of centrality made under those statements may apply because there is a new Plan.

East does not view this as a consulting motion. He views it as an after-the-fact kind of motion, and he is very much in favor that the rationale of decisions be reported to anybody who is concerned with the decision. So anytime anyone makes a cut or a deliberate expansion in an academic program at the University, faculty ought to be apprised of the rationale for those decisions. He thinks that is a reasonable thing to do. He thinks that it has not been the case in his 27 years at UNI that this has happened. Faculty hear about budget cuts happening and/or minute money, new lines being created, and that is not a matter of programs being expanded. Those things are not a matter of public record in his experience. So he is very much in favor of a rationale or the thinking being communicated as to why certain kinds of decisions were made. He believes that a good

administration will do that automatically and a not-so-good administration will not do it regardless of what the Faculty Senate says. He does think the wording here is going to be interpreted as being harsh in any case. But he would like the idea of communicating rationales for decisions. When applicable, the Strategic Plan ought to be included, but many academic decisions have nothing to do with the Strategic Plan, and this motion suggests that every one does. He thinks that is inaccurate.

Funderburk received down the table from alternate **Boody** information which came from the ISU Simplified Parliamentary Procedure booklet concerning how to handle a withdrawn motion. Under Incidental Motions and Withdrawing a Motion, he reads: "The person who makes a motion can withdraw it (before any amendment is made) with the consent of the person who seconded it. No vote of the membership is required to withdraw a motion unless someone objects; then it takes a majority vote to withdraw the motion." **Funderburk** then stated that the motion has been withdrawn and asked if anyone objected.

Swan asked to speak, saying that this is why the faculty made a calendaring and docketing system, because once it is in the docket it is supposed to belong to the body. This is distinct from other kinds of parliamentary procedure. So once it is in the docket, the body is to take it and vote yes or reject it. He stated that they should not be changing things. He is understanding that now the Senate is saying that calendaring is just pro forma where the Senate does nothing until docketing and then do whatever it wants at the docketing stage, including withdrawing.

Funderburk said that that was a reasonable question being posed. His take on this is as follows: when something is docketed, it is docketed. After the faculty has had 2 weeks to see it, it could be that the person who made the motion could be convinced that he/she did not want to make it after all. So he believes that when a person makes a motion to docket, then when the body meets it needs a motion on how to proceed after 2 weeks' notice that it will be considered. That's the calendar purpose. It says on the calendar that the Senate received a motion. This one has been withdrawn. So at the moment the floor is open for another motion.

Swan offered that what **Funderburk** seemed to be saying was that this has just been removed and that the Senate will move on to other business. You are the Chair. **Funderburk** agreed and stated that currently there is no motion before the body with regards to Docket #985, should no one wish to make one. **DeBerg** asked whether a vote was need to withdraw, and the Chair responded, “No.” Several called out to just move on. **Funderburk** asked again for any motions.

Swan asked what then happens to this docket number? Does it just stay out there forever? Several replied that it was “withdrawn.” That that is the action. **Funderburk** stated that there has been no motion or action on #985. So **Swan** asked if the motion that the Chair asked for for action was withdrawn? Nods around.

DeBerg thanked the group for a good discussion. **Funderburk** agreed that often some of these things are more important for the discussion here as it goes on than the specific activity. And as long as the body keeps such discussions civil and respectful, the Senate can get a great deal done without the actual passage of a motion, and he thanked everyone.

In addition, **Funderburk** reminded everyone that if anyone feels that this petition is important and should be reworded, it would be appropriate to make a follow-up petition with respect to that.

Funderburk noted that 10 minutes remained with one motion (Docket #986) to be considered, that of reserving West Gym for academic purposes, and also some New Business. He recommended postponing discussion of #986 until the next meeting in regular order.

NEW BUSINESS

The Faculty Senate has been asked for a representative to the Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee. The floor was opened for nominations, and self-nominations were encouraged. Senator **Dolgener** asked what the IAF Committee does. **Funderburk** stated that the request did not come with that information but that it does meet regularly.

Associate Provost **Arthur** from the audience offered that the IAFC considers applications from students both for travel to conferences to make presentations and also for research requests from students. It consists of 3 representatives, she chairs the Committee, and it calls for someone appointed by the Senate. Steve **O'Kane** has been the faculty representative but has not been on the Senate for some time. He would continue, if the Senate wants, but he actually prefers to step down. **Funderburk** also stated that that Committee receives funds through the Student Service Fee, and that is one of the only funds that students can regularly go to seeking assistance for travel and research. It is very important, and the members see some very interesting things, he stated. He has been involved for quite a few years indirectly; he has seen that rules and guidelines for funding shift regularly based on the membership of that committee. **Terlip** nominated herself with a second not required. **Funderburk** asked if there were any other nominations because he did not want to steal anyone's opportunity for service (laughter). **East** proposed an alternative candidate, himself, so that Senators can vote for **Terlip**. Both agreed to a public vote. All voted for **Terlip** by show of hands, except that she voted for **East** amid laughter. **Funderburk** thanked **Terlip** for her volunteering and will forward her name to the Committee.

Breitbart reiterated that she will file a petition to get it on the docket for the action that she would like the Senate to take on committee reorganization, and she will also ask Nuss to send out any relevant documents to preview before meeting again to keep the discussion from running too long.

ADJOURNMENT

East moved to adjourn at 4:53 p.m. **DeBerg** seconded. Vote. Passed.

The next meeting will be in the Oak Room of Maucker Union on September 26, 2011, at 3:15 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Following drafts are found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-regarding-new-wording-policies-academ>

Academic Ethics Policy Draft
12.01 Student Academic Grievance (Draft 5/1/10)