

8-23-2010

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, August 23, 2010

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2010 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, August 23, 2010" (2010). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 63.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/63

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.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

8/23/10

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/26/10 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson welcomed the Senate back, and initiated introductions of Senate members.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair Jurgenson welcomed the Senate to the new school year. He announced that the annual Fall Faculty meeting will be Monday, August 30, Lang Hall Auditorium at 3:30 P.M.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz thanked those senators that were able to be at the Faculty Senate Fall Planning Session Saturday. The senators that were there appeared delighted at what the Faculty Senate web page is going to be when it's up and running, which it should be within the next week.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Chair Wurtz commented that as the Senate has decided to not do the eulogistic comments for Emeritus Status requests she is asking for a motion on all of today's requests to have them docketed out of order at the head of the docket.

1044 Emeritus Status request, Orlando Schwartz, Department of Biology, effective 5/10

Motion by Senator Neuhaus to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #942; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

1045 Emeritus Status request, Nancy Simet, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 5/10

Motion by Senator Soneson to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #943; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

1046 Emeritus Status request, Leonard Upham, Department of Educational Psychology & Foundations, effective 6/10

Motion by Senator Breitbach to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as items #944; second by Funderburk. Motion passed.

1047 Emeritus Status request, Carol Anderson, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective fall 2010

Motion by Senate Neuhaus to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #945; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect Faculty Senator representative to the Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate has the obligation to elect a Faculty Senate representative to the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC), it is a three-year term and it must be a Faculty Senator.

Motion to self-nominate by Senator Smith. Senator Smith noted that he has one year left on his term as Faculty Senator and that he would be eligible for re-election for a second term. Second by Senator Breitbach. Motion passed.

Export Controls Policy Update

Anita Gordon, Director of Research Services, Sponsored Programs, distributed copies of Export Controls - Brief Overview to the Senate, and shared information about these regulations and the resulting policy to address those regulations.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

942 Emeritus Status request, Orlando Schwartz, Department of Biology, effective 5/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Smith; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

943 Emeritus Status request, Nancy Simet, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 5/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Soneson; second by East. Motion passed.

944 Emeritus Status request, Leonard Upham, Department of Educational Psychology & Foundations, effective 6/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Funderburk; Second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

945 Emeritus Status request, Carol Anderson, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective fall 2010

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz noted that the following two items were tabled from the 2009-2010 year. In order to discuss these there needs to be a motion to bring them off the table.

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities and Fine Arts Senate (*tabled from 3/22/10 meeting*)

Motion to bring off the table by Senator DeBerg; second by Senator Terlip.

Senator Terlip reviewed for the Senate the history of this motion. The impetus for this motion was when the College of Natural Sciences (CNS) and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) merged. There was great concern about the procedures and policies related to the merger.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Motion to call the question by Senator Hotek on the original motion.

The original motion did not pass.

933 Creation of a standing UNI Faculty Budget Committee -
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Motion to bring off the table by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Hotek.

Cyndi Dunn, Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) College Senate, was present to discuss this with the Senate.

Motion to table by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson.
Motion passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Discussion followed on procedures.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

8/23/10

1683

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah

Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, James Jurgenson, Mike Licari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:20 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/26/10 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed with one abstention.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson welcomed the Senate back, and initiated introductions of Senate members.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair Jurgenson welcomed the Senate to the new school year, noting that this new to him as he has not chaired the Faculty before. He also noted that as Chair of the Faculty he is on more committees than he wished to be on.

He announced that the annual Fall Faculty meeting will be Monday, August 30, Lang Hall Auditorium at 3:30 P.M.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz thanked those senators that were able to be at the Faculty Senate Fall Planning Session Saturday. The senators that were there appeared delighted at what the Faculty Senate web page is going to be when it's up and running, which it should be within the next week. UNI's IT Production House is

being pushed with the operational nature of our web page as they are more accustomed to putting up informational pages, and they have been delightful to work with.

Those senators that were at the meeting Saturday participated in the decision that the Senate will have a "shindig" this year, Sunday evening, September 12, 2010 at her home. More information will be coming on this. She felt it made a difference last year to have an evening to talk with each other in a relaxed setting.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Chair Wurtz commented that as the Senate has decided to not do the eulogistic comments for Emeritus Status requests she is asking to a motion on all of today's requests to have them docketed out of order at the head of the docket. At least one person is waiting for this action to take place so they can receive university Emeritus Status benefits.

Senator Funderburk asked if, by docketing and acting on these requests all today, there was an issue of faculty not having an opportunity to oppose such a request, how would that be handled?

Chair Wurtz replied that if it happens the Senate will re-visit that request and deal with it. If department heads and deans have done their jobs it doesn't get to us until everything is valid.

Senator Neuhaus remarked that while working on minutes in the archives this summer there was one instance where an Emeritus Status request was approved and several meetings later it was discovered that that person shouldn't have received that status and the Senate was able to undo it after the fact. If the Senate needs to, a precedence has been established.

1044 Emeritus Status request, Orlando Schwartz, Department of Biology, effective 5/10

Motion by Senator Neuhaus to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #942; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

1045 Emeritus Status request, Nancy Simet, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 5/10

Motion by Senator Soneson to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #943; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

1046 Emeritus Status request, Leonard Upham, Department of Educational Psychology & Foundations, effective 6/10

Motion by Senator Breitbach to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #944; second by Funderburk. Motion passed.

1047 Emeritus Status request, Carol Anderson, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective fall 2010

Motion by Senate Neuhaus to docket out of regular order and move to the head of the docket as item #945; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect Faculty Senator representative to the Liberal Arts Core Committee

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate has the obligation to elect a Faculty Senate representative to the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC), it is a three-year term and it must be a Faculty Senator.

Motion to self-nominate by Senator Smith. Senator Smith noted that he has one year left on his term as Faculty Senator and that he would be eligible for re-election for a second term. Second by Senator Breitbach. Motion passed.

Export Controls Policy Update

Anita Gordon, Director of Research Services, Sponsored Programs, distributed copies of Export Controls - Brief Overview to the Senate. She had asked for a few minutes at today's meeting to share information about another set of Federal Regulations and the resulting policy to address those regulations. The policy basically says that UNI will follow the regulations. A draft to the policy was sent to senators prior to today's meeting.

Ms. Gordon stated that basically export control laws have to do with the shipment and transfer of day-to-day information, materials, equipment, and technology to foreign persons or countries. The Overview hand out was one attempt of many that several people are making to try to outline export control regulations in as simple and straightforward manner as possible. There are three major federal agencies that oversee these regulations, and they are complicated and overlap. This is a difficult process and she hopes to gain more training as the process goes on. Her goal is to have faculty have to deal with this as little as possible. Faculty do need to know when they should call someone, which she hopes addresses this in the handout. A lot of people on campus are involved in this; Office of Business Operations, Office of Sponsored Programs, International Programs, Human Relations, and others. Included is traveling, conducting research involving foreign students or colleagues, communicating with them about the work you do, which can come up in a lot of areas. The activities most likely to involve export controls are listed on the handout, and a web site has been developed, www.uni.edu/osp/research-compliance/sport-controls.

Chair Wurtz asked what the plans are for informing the faculty at large?

Ms. Gordon responded that the process involved naming people to serve as leads for this, as well as establishing the web site. They have tried to set up a screening process in other units for people with some knowledge about export controls. They are now moving into the informational stage beginning with the Faculty Senate. They plan to get out and talk with as many groups, departments, and colleges as possible to inform them that this exists.

The next step will be to identify key groups of individuals that they believe might be most likely to have to deal with export controls, which has to do with sensitive topics, high risk topics that you would expect the government to care about. Computer sciences, biology, chemistry, physics, and industrial technology are all areas that they will be talking to one-on-one with. She needs to understand what it is that they do that might fit the regulations. They plan to offer forums on export controls.

Ms. Gordon also noted that a license may be required to talk with a colleague in another country. In that case, Tim McKenna, University Counsel, would become involved.

Chair Wurtz thanked Ms. Gordon for updating the Senate on Export Controls.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

942 Emeritus Status request, Orlando Schwartz, Department of Biology, effective 5/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Smith; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

943 Emeritus Status request, Nancy Simet, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective 5/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Soneson; second by East. Motion passed.

944 Emeritus Status request, Leonard Upham, Department of Educational Psychology & Foundations, effective 6/10

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Funderburk; Second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

945 Emeritus Status request, Carol Anderson, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, effective fall 2010

Motion to recommend Emeritus Status by Senator Neuhaus; second By Senator East. Motion passed.

Chair Wurtz noted that the following two items were tabled from the 2009-2010 year. In order to discuss these there needs to be a motion to bring them off the table. She is asking the Senate to be prepared to put them both back on the table as she would like to see if people from the Committee on Committees can be here for the next meeting as we will begin the process of looking at the committees, making sure the Senate understands the charge of each committee, what constitutes each committee,

and that they are in order. It has been discovered that many things have "slipped through the cracks."

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions
Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities
and Fine Arts Senate (*tabled from 3/22/10 meeting*)

Motion to bring off the table by Senator DeBerg; second by Senator Terlip.

Senator Terlip reviewed for the Senate the previous history of this motion. The impetus for this motion was when the College of Natural Sciences (CNS) and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) merged. There was great concern about the procedures and policies related to the merger. CHFA also had support from other college senates on this. They thought the Faculty Senate should create some form or group to take a look at what happened and set policies for actions. They're not trying to control administrators but to develop policies that could be moved up the line and would be consistent with and for faculty governance.

Senator Smith asked what plausible recommendations or outcomes the group was looking for?

Senator Terlip responded that one of the things people were concerned about was communication; that certain people would be notified so it wouldn't all be happening at once.

Senator Smith continued that a recommendation might be the Faculty Senate recommending that under these circumstances when this kind of action is contemplated, that there be notification, consultation. Specifics on the consultation might be going through college senates or something like that.

Senator DeBerg suggested the deans and department heads involved.

Senator Smith noted that the word "consultation" is so open that you need to include specifics. He also noted that he is kind of sympathetic but would like to have a sense of what this could end up with because he doesn't want to launch a task force without any plausible sense of what could result from it.

Senator Terlip commented that it wasn't just faculty, that a number of students also weren't clear about why things were happening and it would have been easier had there been some

consultation, and there may have been with student government. There were many students that were confused as well.

Senator Gallagher reiterated that this merger is administrative, that is the administration does this, and it is within their right to do.

Chair Wurtz stated that it is her understanding from reading on the Board of Regents (BOR) and how their responsibilities were determined, that yes, the determination of what programs are on which campuses resides with the BOR and the administrators of the three Regents Universities.

Virginia Arthur, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, noted that, yes, this is the kind of action that is administrative in nature and that power is allocated to the administration.

Senator Gallagher noted that she felt that was important to establish. This motion expresses the wish for greater communication.

Senator Terlip replied that that is correct.

Senator DeBerg remarked that she would appreciate a task force to be in touch with the AAUP about whatever kinds of guidelines and policies it has in regard to this kind of thing. She's not familiar with AAUP documents but that would be another task she feels such a group could perform. The AAUP is mentioned in the original motion.

Senator East stated that he assumes that if the Senate takes some action today that they would create such a task force or fail to create a task force.

Chair Wurtz commented that those two options are outcomes.

Senator East continued, noting that the motion asks us to create a task force so we would have to name a task force or person, or identify a process whereby the task force got created. And we would want to come up with a charge for the task force that's relatively specific. That's the kind of action the Senate would be taking.

Senator Neuhaus noted that that in part would depend on how specific we'd want to make this document. He suspects some administrators or members of the BOR may have felt there was a time constraint. There could be moments or times where a

decision for financial reasons had to be made quickly, and this would also need to be taken into account. From an administrative standpoint it would be doubtful that they would "tie their hands behind their backs" and say they will always have a period of consultation. Ideally they'd like to have a nice long discussion about anything that we do here but he could imagine that that might be a point to talk about; was this something that had to happen quickly? And if so, why did it happen quickly? Was it merely a financial necessity?

Senator DeBerg commented that she doesn't see this as the meeting in which to discuss the wisdom of this administrative action. It's really to decide whether or not we want some group to look into it, to study AAUP standards and to develop guidelines and principles for these kinds of things on our campus.

Senator Smith stated that he's kind of split on this. He doesn't really like to see issues like this turned into mandates, rules and procedures. Organizations work better when there's a sense of trust between the relevant parties and they rely on each other to do the appropriate things. If there were a pattern at this university where consistently faculty weren't consulted on things like this then he would say that we should step in and say something about it. If what happened in this case is a one of a kind thing that possibly resulted because the administrator in question is relatively new, then maybe we just kind of say, hey, it happened and it wasn't done the way we would have preferred, but that's the learning curve, and it probably wouldn't happen that way again, and you let it go. You don't make a big deal out of it, figuring this isn't the way we normally do things around here. Under that circumstance he believes a task force is almost counter productive; making a big thing about it and creating potential conflict between faculty and administrators that we don't want to have. He's inclined to say to just ease this down.

Senator Terlip replied that she doesn't believe we should be evaluating the past mergers. This was intended to take a look to see what faculty would like in the future. She agrees with Senator Smith that we don't set up unnecessary conflicts. We do want to set up conditions where we can trust each other. The faculty should be able to say ahead of time how they'd like it to be done. The administrators can choose to go along with that, or they may not have the time to do that but if the faculty tell people what we want we're likely to get it. If we

don't, they don't know what we want. She really sees this as the faculty coming forward.

The other thing, Senator Terlip, continued, is that the conversation up to this point in time has been about the two colleges but there have also been departments that have merged. Given the budget constraints that we've been hearing about those kinds of things are going to happen in the future so how do we want that information communicated to us?

Chair Wurtz asked of those that have been working with this and are more familiar with it than she is, was there consultation to our faculty constitution about these processes? If it's already in the constitution do we need to do more than simply emphasize and point to it?

Senator Terlip responded that there was nothing specific about mergers or programs that they could find in the constitution or the Master Agreement.

Chair Wurtz clarified, not about the merger but about the jurisdiction and the expectation of consultation?

Senator Terlip replied that she doesn't know but wondered if this would fall under the rubric of the Education Policies Commission, which deals with policies and procedures?

Chair Wurtz continued with an illustration of what Senator Terlip had asked about earlier, when an exchange is natural it just happens. That would fit in with the fact that we want to get our Committee on Committees in line, revisiting their charge before referring anything to them.

Senator Terlip asked why, as this fits in with their charge?

Chair Wurtz responded that just because it's online doesn't mean it's right.

Senator DeBerg stated that she just wanted to reiterate Senator Terlip's point that senators were told by Provost Gibson at Saturday's planning session that there is another large shortfall coming in academic affairs, and she can't believe that we're at the end of mergers. It's a good idea for the faculty to come forward and say they expect some kind of consultation, if not with all faculty groups then at least with the deans and department heads. This motion is a good idea because she doesn't believe that this going to be a one time shot.

Senator Smith commented that his feel is that administrators do know that what happened was kind of a one time shot, and that administrators do know the culture here is one of consultation.

Senator Balong remarked that how Senator Terlip had framed the motion earlier doesn't say the same thing to her as when she reads the official motion about a review of the actions. She was talking not just about the culture but defining what faculty want. The official motion looks as if it could be perceived as a review, which is what we're hoping for.

Senator Terlip noted that the timing has passed for everyone and this motion was a group-edited document.

Senator East stated that the original document that came to us included a short paragraph "The UNI University Faculty Senate develop policies and procedures for any future mergers of academic units and/or change in the structure of academic units that are consistent with AAUP standards and that insure that UNI adhere to principles of shared governance" which does have the quality of moving forward.

Senator Soneson suggested that it would be nice to have a real sharp motion before us. What Senator East just read makes him wonder whether or not this is overstepping the bounds of the Faculty Senate? Can we formulate policies and procedures that are binding on the administration? Or, is the intent that the task force come up with a set of recommendations about how they would like to see procedures in the future? Which is quite different than coming up with policies and procedures, it's recommendations that really say what we want without saying "if you don't, you're violating our policies and procedures."

Senator East noted that the constitution appears to say "The faculty may formulate and recommend policies to the president of the university on all subjects of university concern" which is what we would be doing if we did this.

Chair Wurtz stated that if the Senate finds itself in the position of doing that, coming up with a policy that we'd like to recommend we would really need to not specify AAUP specifically, or if we want to mention it specifically, we don't want to mention it solely. There are other sources comparing the sister institutions here in Iowa. The problem that we're going to run into as a senate is if we tie ourselves to "saying AAUP, gotta go with it." She has nothing against AAUP but our

union is affiliated with AAUP and we need to keep that separation of union and Senate separate.

Senator Terlip added that the union is United Faculty. AAUP is separate.

Chair Wurtz responded that the last time she checked, the UNI Faculty Union is an affiliate member of AAUP.

It was noted that faculty members can be members of AAUP and not be members of United Faculty, and likewise, they can be members of United Faculty and choose not to be members of AAUP.

Chair Wurtz asked, is our union an affiliate member of AAUP?

It was noted that the union is an affiliate members of AAUP.

Chair Wurtz continued, suggesting to specify not just AAUP but to also look at best practice in a broad base. Specify other good practices as well.

Senator DeBerg commented that the motion did specify "...consistent with AAUP standards and that insure that UNI adhere to principles of shared governance." Principles of shared governance opens it up to how the other universities do it, common expectations that we have as professionals, and things like that. She doesn't have a problem with AAUP being mentioned because whether we're members or not sets national standards for shared governance across the country.

Senator Funderburk stated he takes it to mean AAUP principles of standards of publication as well. If we decide one way or the other, if there is also a block of faculty that seem to feel strongly that they were going to have a place to come to to have a voice and talk about what was going on with this, this would be a good place for that to take place. He doesn't know if the fervor is at the height it was last spring, maybe it is. Another component is that faculty is asking us to see if there are any things to be learned.

Wurtz noted that the motion on the table is that yes we will develop policies and procedures, or that we form a task force, with the intent to develop policies and procedures for any future mergers or academic units and/or change...

Senator Soneson asked if the question of whether or not the motion as it stands is beyond our authority as a senate can be

settled? Is that a legitimate motion for the Faculty Senate, as he's not clear about that.

Senator Breitbach commented that that can be handled if we add language saying "recommendation" because we can't set policy and procedure that tell the administrators what they can and can't do; that's done by the legislature. But we can "recommend" policies and procedures that address the consultation and discussions.

Senator Neuhaus remarked that between Senator Breitbach and Senator East we're pretty nearly there. Senator East quoted that faculty may formulate and recommend. Could we simply say "develop and recommend"? It certainly would be congruent with our approved constitution.

Senator DeBerg suggested another amendment to create a task force or refer to a committee. "The Senate should create a task force (or refer to a committee)..."

Senator Terlip commented that that's very consistent with what the CFHA Senate was trying to do at the time. They were under no illusions that the Faculty Senate could set policy; they didn't even know if the motion would be accepted. It would be getting a task force to come up with some things and then the Senate could decide what to do with them. However, they did think it should be looked into more and the faculty should make their voices heard if they want to discuss it or have input for the future.

Senator East stated that he agrees, the original motion said to bring a policy and procedures statement to the Senate for consideration, which they would then recommend to the administration. He doesn't see how the Senate needs to do any kind of wordsmithing on the motion. However, he believes Senator DeBerg's suggestion is an and/or; you either figure out a committee to do it or you name a task force, but you don't have a motion that says do one or the other because we want to actually do one or the other. Either give it to the Educational Policies Commission (EPC) if that's appropriate, for example, or we find another committee that's appropriate, or we set up a task force.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate needs to know who made the original motion and second if it is going to be amended or put it to a vote, vote it down and start over.

Discussion followed as to how to proceed.

Senator Roth asked for clarification as to when recommendations are made from the Senate? What's the path they take, where do they go?

Chair Wurtz replied that it would depend on what the recommendation is.

Senator DeBerg suggested "...develop and recommend to the President and his Cabinet...".

Senator East stated that that's pointless. A task force would recommend policy statements. We would then do with it whatever we pleased. We don't want the task force to make recommendations to the President. A task force would bring their report back to the Senate, that's what a task force will do. A task force of the Senate will bring a recommendation back to us, we will consider it and do whatever we please with it. We don't need to say "recommend to the President" in the motion; that's what we will do when we receive their report. What we're doing right now is pointless to the motion to establish a task force.

Senator Soneson asked that the Senate look at the first paragraph, "The UNI University Faculty Senate develop policies..." not a task force. The next paragraph says specifically "Specifically, the Senate should create a task force..." which will formulate policies and procedures, and bring them back to the Senate for whatever we want to do with them. It does suggest that our task, the UNI Faculty Senate, should develop or have the task force develop or whatever, but it does say "develop." He's suggesting that to make this a legitimate motion we need to add "...and recommend."

Senator Neuhaus noted that the constitution says "...the faculty may formulate and recommend policies to the president of the university on all subjects of university concern." Putting that in there adds some clarity.

Senator Terlip commented that the Senate has to have the right to say if they don't like the work of the task force and not do what they recommended. If that motion means that the Senate is automatically going rubber stamp whatever the task force does then she doesn't think we should put it in.

Senator Breitbach recommended that the Senate switch the order of the two paragraphs so that the task force is created first, they do their work, they bring it back to the Senate, the Senate considers it and then recommends to the administration that they take the Senate's recommendations under consideration. It's just a matter of order.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that the Senate is debating the merits of voting yes or no on the motion that the Senate should create a task force to review recent UNI actions, develop clear policy and procedures statements, and bring these to the Senate for consideration. The task force should be faculty driven but should include representatives from the administration and the student body, with the intent based on the task force's report, the Senate would develop policies and procedures to recommend to the President and the UNI Cabinet for any future mergers of academic units and/or change in the structure of academic units.

Senator Breitbach added that we're being somewhat redundant by saying the Faculty Senate is going to develop; it's already been developed. So from this body of work the University Faculty Senate will recommend policies and procedures for any future mergers.

Chair Wurtz asked the Senate to now consider logistics and practicalities if we're going to vote that we're going to form a task force. How do we want to form it? How do we want them to report?

Senator DeBerg stated that she didn't believe the Senate can do it until the Senate has reviewed their committee structure.

Senator Roth noted that he appreciates Senator Smith's earlier comment about working relationships and trust. He's seen situations at other universities where that trust has gotten ruined, and anything we do in terms of committee composition or thoughts we should keep his comments in mind about the good working relationship and trust because that's so important.

Senator Van Wormer suggested forgetting about establishing a task force and come up with motion about greater communication in the future.

Senator Gallagher commented that the mark of an effective administrator is good communication. Therefore, when they don't communicate well she's not sure that a task force and recommendations are going to make a difference.

Senator Smith asked Provost Gibson if she had to do the merger between CHFA and CNS over again, what would she do differently?

Provost Gibson replied that she can't answer that right off the top of her head, she would need time to think about it before responding. She stated that the idea for the merger did not just come off the top of her head. There was a task force before she arrived at UNI, several task forces, that made recommendations. And there were faculty members on those task forces.

Senator DeBerg remarked that none were from the colleges involved.

Senator East commented that they didn't recommend merging colleges.

Provost Gibson continued that she's not here to argue, and she doesn't know who was on those task forces. All she knows is that there were recommendations for looking at various areas and there was a category with big ticket items and that's where mergers was listed, which did not say those two particular colleges. Yes, she would do things differently but she's not prepared to specify exactly what it is she would do differently.

Senator DeBerg noted that she doesn't like policies and procedures to be personnel based. Because we have the word of one provost that this might never happen again doesn't really satisfy her. With budgets the way they are and with other things happening she would like some kind of recommendations from the faculty that these kinds of big decisions which effect a huge proportion of our faculty and departments have some kind of faculty consideration and a set of recommendations for consultation and those kinds of things. She is speaking for this motion however it ends up being worded because she doesn't like how this university gives its reasons for doing things based on whoever happens to be holding a job at the time. Reasons need to be principled and institutionalized in such a way that it doesn't matter who's holding the positions. She believes that's the way institutions need to run

Provost Gibson added that she doesn't believe that there will be any future mergers; she doesn't believe that she's ever said definitively that there would be. She doesn't see any in the future but she just wants to clarify that she doesn't think she said that.

Senator Smith responded to Senator DeBerg's point, and agrees that we want to have rules and procedures as part of an organization's structure but with the Senate's role here, we're not able to implement rules and procedures; we can just make recommendations. The ultimate does come down to whoever is in the administrative position, whether they're aware of the recommendations or not, and if so, do they want to pay attention to them. In his department faculty get involved and are aware of what's going on. In general he would assume that the culture at UNI is one where faculty felt that they had consultation, and this was maybe an isolated incident, and if so, he'd prefer to not make a big deal about it.

Senator Roth commented that maybe this was less than ideal at the time it happened but he believes that UNI is a very functional university. This happened early in the provost's tenure and she may have thought mechanisms were in place that really weren't. He also feels that this is an isolated incident and over all we have functional communication here.

Provost Gibson remarked that it would be helpful for her to understand what the Senate wants to come out of this. What she's hearing is that the Senate wants better communication.

Senator DeBerg noted that communication isn't the same as consultation where you actually give people a chance to make appeals one way or the other with proposals. Appeals against this merger could have been made but there wasn't a chance. She would like, at least, certain pockets of the university community to be able to have a say or to be able to make a case against or for them. These are important things.

Senator Hotek clarified that what is wanted is communication at the planning level as opposed to the implementation level.

Senator DeBerg replied that yes, consultation before the fact.

Senator Van Wormer commented that she doesn't see why we can't make that as a motion without the task force, a motion to have greater communication and possibly consultation.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate will need to deal with the motion in front of them on it's own as she doesn't think we'd want to try to amend it.

Provost Gibson stated that at UNI, and UNI is not the only university, there are financial issues and Academic Affairs is currently in a deficit mode. It would be very helpful for her to understand what the Senate needs from her. She suspects that there will be other decision that will need to be made in the future because of the financial situation that we find ourselves in. She's willing to communicate more effectively with the Senate and others across campus. She's willing to participate in whatever is meant by consultation, having discussions. But at the end of the day, if she's looking at a deficit and she's being told that she has to do something about that deficit, it's her job to do something about that deficit. That's part of her job. She is certainly willing to consult, to communicate however the Senate feels she should, but at the end of the day sometimes she has to make tough decisions, and they have to be made.

Chair Wurtz added that it was very apparent this summer that we as faculty choose for the most part to not be involved in policy type activities over the summer months. But the organization has no option to say we're not going to operate over the summer months. We need to understand that if we don't make ourselves available that the administration can't wait for us.

Senator DeBerg responded to Senate Van Wormer's suggestion stating that she would like the task force to come up with alternative, more general wording rather than the Senate. She would like to take the last sentence "The task force should be faculty driven but should include representatives from the administration and the student body" off so that task force doesn't have to be some big deal. She's leaning now toward having it maybe a small group of senators or one of the senate committees to simply come up with a set of recommendations for these kinds of actions in the future. It would be up to them to draft even just general language about consultation and communication. She says this because she doesn't mind most of what's in the motion, we just don't want to have a big huge task force that includes so many constituents when it's faculty recommendations.

Senator Neuhaus commented that if a group of people would sit down and spend sufficient time on this and come up with something that we'd deemed to be both very reasonable and possibly eloquent, and practical, then we'd all be happy about that. If it sits here in this group right now trying to do it he thinks one and possibly all of those are jeopardized.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that what the Senate is debating now is, do we want, as a Senate, to say we're going to form a task force.

Senator DeBerg replied that she thinks the Senate needs to vote amendments up or down and then have a final motion. She suggested taking the amendments as they come.

Discussion followed on the editing to the motion that has been suggested up to this point in the meeting.

Chair Wurtz noted that none of the suggestions have been put forward as motions to amend. She would like to handle this as one clearly stated motion to amend the original, and then vote on that. She ask for a senator to make a motion on what she hopes it the final version.

Provost Gibson stated that she would personally prefer a committee within the Faculty Senate. She believes that on this campus "task force" has taken on a very almost negative connotation.

Chair Wurtz remarked that she likes this because we're not wrapping this into the Senate's committees, it's independent of it. This would be a task force that's within the Senate body and would be able to move forward on the other committee issues without this being part of it.

Senator Soneson suggested an ad hoc committee, which is really what it is.

Chair Wurtz noted that the motion is that the Senate will create an ad hoc committee made up of senate members who will prepare a recommendation for the Senate to consider recommending to the President and the council for consultation when it come to changes in academic unit structures.

Senator DeBerg stated that she liked the original wording better. She doesn't know why Chair Wurtz changed it so much; it was okay as it was. Adding "ad hoc committee" instead of task force would have worked.

Senator East commented that it doesn't matter what the wording says anymore if we're going to name an ad hoc committee of the Senate. Whoever's here today pretty much knows what the expectation is, they're welcome to do their job and let's get this over and done with. And, please, in the future, when there

are motions on the floor let's make amendments to them and consider those amendments specifically rather than discussing for an hour amendments that aren't actually voted upon. The Senate really does need to follow order.

Chair Wurtz interjected, so noted, and this is where the Senate is now. We've discussed the elements that we're focusing on. We understand what we're doing and it's an ad hoc committee.

Senator Funderburk suggested voting the first motion down and vote on the second motion.

Motion to call the question by Senator Hotek on the original motion.

The original motion did not pass.

A brief discussion followed on procedures, noting that a new motion will need to be brought to the Senate.

Provost Gibson suggested having two or three senators getting together to craft a new motion so the Senate doesn't have to sit for another hour while discussion on wording takes place.

933 Creation of a standing UNI Faculty Budget Committee -
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Motion to bring off the table by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Hotek.

Cyndi Dunn, Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) College Senate, was present to discuss this with the Senate.

Senator Funderburk asked for clarification, noting that the Senate had a standing budget committee that has been inactive.

Chair Wurtz verified that that was correct.

Senator Funderburk continued, asking if this motion was to create a new committee.

Dr. Dunn stated that the SBS Senate were the ones to first bring this to the Faculty Senate last spring. She noted that as she understands it from Chair Wurtz, this will be discussed later when the Senate looks at the university's committee structure, and SBS Senate is fine with that. There is currently a Faculty

Senate Budget Committee, which has been inactive for many years, it does not appear to have a charge, they're not sure when it last met, and it doesn't have a chair. Last spring there was talk within the SBS Senate and someone that had been on the Committee on Committees had told them that because this committee wasn't doing anything they were considering getting rid of it or possibly rolling it into some other existing committee. Their feeling as a college senate was that now, of all times, we really need a Faculty Senate Budget Committee. It's important that there be some faculty committee that is looking at and assessing the budget, analyzing it, bringing that information to the Faculty Senate, so that we as faculty can look at whether and how the budget is reflecting our academic concerns, if more cuts are to be made, and to try to have a voice so that cuts can be made in ways that cause as little as harm as possible to the academic mission of the university. At that time they weren't sure whether they were going to get rid of the Budget Committee or what so they phrased it as creating a new motion.

Dr. Dunn noted that SBS doesn't care if it's a new committee or an old committee. Basically they want to do two things that were in the original motion. The first was to give the committee an actual charge so they would have a task to accomplish, that they would meet, that they would review and analyze the budget, they would provide an annual report to the Senate, which the Senate could either accept or if there were recommendations those could be made to the president and cabinet. This would hopefully give faculty a more active and constructive voice in dealing with the budget.

The second major change, Dr. Dunn continued, was the current Budget Committee has a term of two years. They believed that there was probably a high learning curve involved in getting your head around the UNI budget and they didn't feel that two years would give people enough time to figure out what it's all about. They recommended changing that term to three years. There is supposed to be a liaison with the Faculty Senate and that probably should be kept. Their intention was whether it was a new committee or an old committee, extending the term to three years, give them an actual charge so that they will meet and provide the Senate with the information to make intelligent recommendations to the president and the cabinet.

Senator Soneson asked Dr. Dunn if they considered a formulation of the charge?

Dr. Dunn replied that in the original motion there was a charge. The Senate is welcomed to amend it however they wish.

Faculty Chair Jurgenson noted that he was on the Faculty Senate when the Faculty Senate Budget Committee was created. The purpose of that committee was to make recommendations for spending the _____ made by the provost at the time, \$100,000. This fund was created with the expressed need for mediation of infrastructure for the university, that is equipment and other facilities. That committee was formed to decide whose proposals would be funded. That went on for about three years until the reversions of the budget began.

Motion to table by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson.
Motion passed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Senator Balong stated that she can send senators the revised wording on Docket Item #932.

Senator Terlip noted that she may be confused but she thought that they could bring forward subsequent motions without having them docketed every time. She recalls that once an item is opened up they can make whatever motions they want.

Senator East responded that they can but they have to follow the procedures. The Senate follows the agenda and the Senate had moved out of New Business and into Consideration of Docketed Items and in order to consider anything at that point it would need to be docketed.

A brief discussion followed on procedures.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Dolgener to adjourn; second by Senator Roth.
Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

932 - Motion for the University Faculty Senate

The UNI University Faculty Senate develop policies and procedures for any future mergers of academic unites and /or change in the structure of academic units that are consistent with AAUP standards and that insure that UNI adhere to principles of shared governance.

Specifically, the Senate should create a task force (committee) to review recent UNI actions, develop clear policy and procedures statements, and bring these to the Senate for consideration before the end of the Spring 2010 semester. The task force should be faculty driven but should include representatives from the administration and the student body.

933 - Motion for the University Faculty Senate

The CSBS Senate voted to approve the following motion to be brought to the University Faculty Senate:

"Whereas, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee has not met for many years and it has been proposed that its functions be merged with those of the Faculty Senate Strategic Planning Committee, and

Whereas we feel that it is essential to have a strong and active faculty budget committee in the current fiscal environment,

The Faculty Senate of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences proposes to the UNI Faculty Senate that:

(1) A new, standing UNI Faculty Budget committee be created by the UNI Faculty Senate to review all pro-forma, operating and continuing budgets including quarterly income statements and balance sheets of all segments of the university.

(2) The budget committee will consist of an elected representative from each UNI college with staggered terms of three years.

(3) This budget committee will review the budgets and make

recommendations to the UNI Faculty Senate no later than March 15th of each academic year on the transparency, sustainability and adequacy of the UNI budgets and the current budget process.

(4) This report together with any recommendations approved by the University Faculty Senate will be forwarded to the UNI provost, president, and cabinet.

(5) The UNI president will be requested to provide the University Faculty Senate with a response to the report and recommendations no later than the end of UNI's fiscal year to allow the budget committee the opportunity to incorporate suggestions and responses for those UNI components in the next academic year's deliberations."