

11-4-2013

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 04, 2013

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2013 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 04, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 101.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/101

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Special Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
11/04/13 (3:33 p.m. – 5:07 p.m.)
Mtg. #1743

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

No members of the press were present.

Provost **Gibson** was absent today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** mentioned there will be one last workshop held by the Library Feasibility Study group which faculty can participate in.

Chair **Smith** stated he had received a request from the new Director of University Relations, Scott **Ketelsen**, to come to the Faculty Senate for a consultative session. Early Spring semester, perhaps February, was agreeable to **Ketelsen** and also Senators, and Chair **Smith** will put that on the schedule. An extra meeting is not anticipated in order to work this request in.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

No minutes were up for approval today as the last meeting was only 1 week ago.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1212 Request for Emeritus Status, Merrie **Schroeder**
Motion to docket in regular order (Walter/Gould**). Passed.

1213 Consultative Session with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen**
Motion to docket in regular order (Strauss/Hakes**). Passed.

4. New Business--none

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1202 1098 Request for Emeritus Status, Cherin A. **Lee**
(**O’Kane/Abebe**)
Motion to endorse emeritus application (Walter/Cooley**). Passed.

1204 1100 Request for Emeritus Status, Donna **Raschke**
(**O’Kane/Abebe**)
Motion to endorse emeritus request (Heston/Terlip**). Passed.

1205 1101 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert H. **Decker**
(**O’Kane/Abebe**)
Motion to endorse emeritus request (Peters/Strauss**). Passed.

1207 1103 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert E. **Lee**
(**Peters/Degnin**)
Motion to endorse emeritus request (Breitbach/Ophus**). Passed.

1198 1094 Performance Review of Senate Budget Committee in quasi-
committee of the whole on 9/23/13, delayed (**Peters/Terlip**)
Motion to move into quasi-committee of the whole (Walters/Peters**).
Passed.
**Discussion completed.
**Motion to rise from quasi-committee of the whole. Passed.

1209 1105 Reauthorization of Administrator Review Procedures
(regular order) (**Nelson/Heston**)

**Discussion ensued.

Motion to extend for 5 minutes (MacLin/Breitbach**). Passed.

Motion to table (Dolgener/Ophus**). Passed.

1210 1106 Changes to Policy Process (regular order) (**Gould/Nelson**)

**Not considered at this meeting.

1211 1107 Proposed changes to Policy #3.06: Class Attendance and
Make-Up Work (regular order) (**Nelson/DeSoto**)

**Not considered at this meeting.

6. Adjournment

Time: 5:07 p.m.

Motion to adjourn (Walter/Hakes**). Assumed passed as all prepared to
leave.

Next meeting:

November 11, 2013

Center for Multicultural Education (CME) 109AB

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 52 pages, including 0 Addenda.

Special Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 4, 2013
Mtg. 1743**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk** (alternate for Melinda **Boyd**), Jennifer **Garrett** (alternate for Lauren **Nelson**), Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Kim **MacLin**, John **Ophus** (alternate for Steve **O’Kane**), Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter** (22 present)

Absent: Chris **Edginton**, Gloria **Gibson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan** (5 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:33 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: All right. After my silly technical difficulties, let’s get started. I’ll call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And first off press identification. [pause] None, which is fine.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Provost Gibson was not able to be here today, so she has no comments. [light laughter around]

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: And Faculty Chair **Funderburk** is here today.

Funderburk: I have only the briefest comment, just to let you know there's still a Library Building Feasibility Study going forward, and I think there'll be another workshop in a couple weeks? I forget. I just got a note this morning, and I missed the morning meeting to find out where it was, but if you haven't been participating, pay attention. There will be one more shot. What really is going on with that is a study to figure out how to redistribute the space within the existing library. So, that's what I have to offer.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: Ok, and I was going to have no comments, but then something came up [light laughter around], so I do have a comment. I got an email from Scott **Ketelsen**, our new Director of University Relations, and he's asking for time to speak with us to let us know about developments in his area. I suggested that we probably wouldn't be able to do anything until next semester probably, possibly in February. And he replied that that timing works just fine for him as he could then provide something of a progress report on what has been going on, talking about new initiatives, etcetera. So, assuming the Senate is willing, I'll plan to schedule a consultative session with Scott for sometime early next semester.

Strauss: Does that mean an extra meeting, Sir?

Smith: I would hope not. I wouldn't anticipate an extra meeting. Any discussion of that or objections to doing that? [pause] Ok.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Now, Minutes for approval. There are none because our last meeting was only a week ago, and the cycle takes a little bit longer to get the Minutes done, but we'll have some next time.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1212 for Docket #1108, Request for Emeritus Status, Merrie Schroeder

Smith: Then we've got Calendar Items for docketing, the first of which, Calendar Item 1212, would be docketed as #1108, Request for Emeritus Status for Merrie Schroeder from the Department of Teaching. Is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [pause] No discussion of that. Then I would entertain a motion to docket this item in regular order.

Walter: So moved.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Walter**, I believe. And that's seconded by?

Gould: Second.

Smith: Seconded by Senator **Gould**. Any discussion? Then a vote. All in favor of docketing this in regular order, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] It is approved and so docketed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1213 for Docket #1109, Consultative Session with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen**

Smith: The second item to be considered for docketing is Calendar Item 1213 which would be Docket #1109, this being a Consultative Session with

Athletic Director Troy **Dannen**. Any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item?

Strauss: I have a question.

Smith: Ok, we can do it now, or we can do it during the discussion of the docketing.

Strauss: You know, whenever you wish.

Smith: Ok, take it now. What ya got?

Strauss: Well, is there any way that we can apportion the time during this discussion so that we don't get wrapped up in immovable financial issues, and we can focus more on the concussions and injuries?

Smith: I can try and manage that to match the Senate's interest, and I'm sure there's going to be people interested in both of those, but I will try to ensure that both parties get a reasonable amount of time, if that's acceptable to you?

Strauss: I'll trust you on that.

Smith: Ok. Todd [Senator **Evans**]?

Evans: I mentioned earlier, I'm going to be speaking next week—alongside with Don **Bishop** and Troy **Dannen**. As the Athletic Training Division, we're the ones that provide the healthcare, so we're the ones that are going to answer the questions about injuries, so I'll send a message out to the listser—the email, and if anybody has a question that I can actually, you know, legitimately answer, you can send it to me, and I'll do my best. You know, some of the information is protected, you know, by HIPA rules and what we can and can't share. But, if it's about policy and the way we handle head injuries, concussions, or anything like that, I'll do our best. And if I can have the info ahead of time, I might be able to prepare for it.

Smith: So, if you have questions about the head injuries and those kinds of things, send them to Todd [Senator **Evans**], and that will help us facilitate this kind of thing to make sure we have a productive meeting with Director **Dannen**. Then, given that discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item, I would like a motion to docket it at the head of the order for our next meeting, which will be next Monday, a week from today. Any—does somebody want to make a motion to that effect?

Strauss: So move.

Smith: Senator **Strauss** moved. Seconded by Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Any discussion of this issue then of docketing this? [none heard] Then we've got this, got that, ready to vote on docketing on 1213/—this will be #1109, at the head of the order for our November 11th meeting. All in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay." [none heard] It is approved.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Then we have New Business, and is there any new business for the Senate to consider at this time? [pause] Hearing none, we're going to proceed to a consideration of the items on our docket.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Smith: And as I stated in the meeting preview email that I sent out on Friday, I would like to have your permission to deviate from the docket's prescribed order of business by first taking up the 4 emeritus requests. I believe that we can address these fairly quickly. Are there any objections to that? [none heard] Ok, thank you.

DOCKET 1098, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, CHERIN A. **LEE**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**O’Kane/Abebe**)

Smith: Then I’m going to go ahead with that starting with Calendar Item 1202, Docket #1098, Request for Emeritus Status, Cherin A. **Lee**, formerly of the Biology Department. I would like a motion to endorse Professor **Lee’s** request for Emeritus Status.

Walter: So move.

Smith: Moved by Michael **Walter**, Senator **Walter**. Seconded?

Cooley: Second.

Smith: Seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Any discussion of this? And I should say for the record, I requested but did not receive a testimonial or statement of support from Professor **Lee’s** Department Head nor, for that matter, from any of the other Department Heads for the faculty whose emeritus requests we’ll be considering today, which is one reason these are going to go fairly fast. That should not inhibit any Senator or any other member of our audience from making a statement on behalf of these requests. And so does anyone care to speak in regard to Professor Cherin **Lee’s** request for emeritus status? Senator **Heston**.

Heston: Well, I worked with Cherin for many, many, MANY, many years in Teacher Education, and she was extraordinarily diligent, extremely student-centered. She worked her heart out in many ways, and I very much appreciate her contributions over the years to Teacher Education and trying to make sure people understood it’s a University-wide program and not a College of Ed. program, and in stepping forward, even though she was nearing retirement, and taking over as Coordinator for the Secondary Programs when we had to make some governance changes. So I strongly support her request for emeritus status.

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Heston**. Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: I have a related question, one is out of ignorance and one is out of impertinence.

Smith: Let's do the impertinence first. [light laughter around]

Strauss: The ignorance one is "What does emeritus confer in terms of privileges?"

Smith: You're asking an equally ignorant person.

Strauss: Well, we spend all this time doing this, and I was just curious.

Smith: The Library privileges. [voices offering ideas]

Licari: It confers certain privileges to have access to University resources some of which are guaranteed, some of which are not guaranteed. When they are not guaranteed, there is some preference towards emeritus faculty. For example, office space on campus. You can request an office. It's not guaranteed, but generally-speaking those accommodations are made. So there is some benefit tangible to the

MacLin: It's also a way to continue to more formally use the UNI affiliation

Licari: Correct.

MacLin: which can be important during retirement.

Licari: The other intangible benefit is it's something that is done to recognize contributions to academe that these people have made. ? [For details of benefits, go to: <http://www.uni.edu/emeritus/Rights.htm>]

Strauss: Now my impertinent question, this process has a huge footprint on what we do. We spend a lot of time doing this, and I was just wondering if there was a more efficient way, perhaps a subcommittee of Senators do this and then recommend in total the weeks' worth of emeriti status, because we have so much other important stuff to do. I'm just saying

Smith: Yeah, I understand that. I mean, I'm semi-sympathetic. On the other hand I kind of feel like if somebody's been here, you know, 20, 30 years, it isn't bad for the Senate to spend a few minutes talking and kind of thanking them in the way that Melissa [Senator **Heston**] just did, and saying, you know, approving their emeritus request. So I guess that's my take on it. I don't—I mean, if you look at—it takes a lot of time of the time that we've kind of had available when we're not doing consultative sessions, but on the total time, it's probably not that much. That, at least, is my view, and I don't know if the Senate felt we should find a more efficient way of doing it—I try to be efficient in docketing them by doing it en masse, but I think we have to do them, actually approve them or endorse them, one by one. I think that's just a respectful thing, at least that's my view. Anybody else on that? Then any other—anybody else care to speak in regard to Professor **Lee**'s request? Then we're ready to vote. All in favor of endorsing this request, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay." [none heard] It stands approved.

DOCKET 1100, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DONNA **RASCHKE**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**O'Kane/Abebe**)

Smith: Now we will consider Calendar Item #1204, Docket 1100, Request for Emeritus Status for Donna **Raschke**, formerly a member of the Department of Special Education. I would like a motion to endorse Professor **Raschke**'s request for emeritus status.

Heston: So moved.

Smith: By Senator **Heston**. Seconded?

Terlip: Second.

Smith: By Senator **Terlip**. Any discussion of this, and again I don't have a formal testimonial, but anyone care to speak on behalf of Professor **Raschke**'s request? Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I've also worked with Dr. **Raschke** for many, many, many years, and she is extremely well-respected by her students. They are passionate about how she's contributed. She's spent most of the past several years working with grad students rather than undergrads. And she has brought in loads—and I mean loads—of Federal dollars and other kinds of grant monies, millions and millions of dollars to this institution for teacher preparation grants and special ed. She's published a huge amount, and she's just really what—been a very, very, very hard worker, and so I've appreciated her contributions as a leader in special education and as a leader in terms of teacher preparation for special education teachers.

Smith: Very good. Thank you, Senator **Heston**. Anyone else wish to speak? Then I believe we're ready to vote on this request. All in favor of the Senate endorsing Professor **Raschke's** request for emeritus status, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay." [none heard] It is approved.

DOCKET 1101, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, ROBERT H. **DECKER**
(REGULAR ORDER) (**O'Kane/Abebe**)

Smith: On to the next one, Calendar Item 1205, Docket #1101, Request for Emeritus Status for Robert H. **Decker**, formerly a member of the Department of Educational Leadership and Post-Secondary Education. So I would look for a motion to endorse Professor **Decker's** request for emeritus status. Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. Second? Senator **Strauss** [who indicated]. Thank you. Discussion of this? Anyone care to speak on behalf of Professor **Decker**?

Strauss: Melissa [Senator **Heston**], did you want to? [light laughter around]

Heston: Actually, no. [more laughter]

Smith: Well, I'm sure he was a great guy [loud laughter all around] who made significant contributions. Any other discussion? Then

Strauss: So, how long did he work at UNI?

Smith: Oh, I can get you that. [voices addressing required years for emeritus rank]

Strauss: At the risk of delaying this. [laughter around]

Smith: Oh, August 1984 through December 2013, that's 29 years.

Strauss: That's a lot, then.

Smith: It's going to beat me maybe, so, yes. I believe we're ready to vote on this then. All in favor—oh, I—Todd [Senator **Evans**]?

Evans: I sure don't know the order of process, but in follow up to Jerry's question—or Mitchell's [Senator **Strauss**] question, does somebody self-nominate for this? Or does another Division or Department have to sort of move it forward and with support? [For details of requirements and application process, go to: <http://www.uni.edu/emeritus/Eligibility.htm>]

Smith: I believe faculty request, and there's a form that comes through. Faculty request emeritus status. It goes—it has to be signed by the Department Head, College Dean, the College Senate Chair, before it comes to us. And once we've signed it, it goes to the Provost and then to the President. And then—so that's the formal chain of approval. One issue's come up is whether we approve them or endorse them, and I—this form kind of says “approved” by us, but yet on our—some of the things it says “endorse.” I don't know that it's substantively difference, but that's kind of—Scott [Senator **Peters**].

Peters: I would just say there would be nothing that would stop us from having a subcommittee that would prepare a short report about each person to the Senate, and then the Senate would just, you know, approve that report. And there would be nothing that would stop us from doing a—almost like a consent docket or something like that. But those would—those would all be options. I know that it—just in terms of the testimonial thing, I did that last year. I don't know that the Senate had always done

that, but I did that last year in particular because many of the people who were requesting emeritus status last year were leaving the University under strained circumstances, and I felt it appropriate that the record of the Senate would reflect their contributions to the University.

Smith: I then perpetuated the practice by just kind of routinely when I get them I send out to the Department Head saying, “Do you want to make a statement?” And I typically do get something, and I think it is, again, as I said earlier, I think it’s a decent thing for the Senate to do. So, my personal thing was if it doesn’t become more burdensome than it is now, I think we should just do it the way we’ve been doing.

Funderburk: Jerry? [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**]

Smith: Yes.

Funderburk: Back like 4 or 5 years ago the Senate voted to do away with doing these, and it was actually reinstated by Scott [Senator **Peters**], and the idea then was when we’re asking for people to submit these that they were included in the Minutes but into—streamlined. And that was because we suddenly had a much larger number than we’d ever had because of the number of retirements that had started during those—just for historical perspective. I think it made a lot of sense for why it started last year, but there have been times where the Senate needed the time and just tried to streamline it. Sometimes we do them as blocks of 4, for example.

Smith: Well, I guess I’d like to get through these today. [laughter all around] And then down the road if we—if we feel a big—see a big logjam coming up again, then maybe we can reconsider the way we’ve done these. I think we’re ready to vote on Professor **Decker**’s request. All in favor of supporting his request for emeritus status, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Any opposed, “Nay.” [none heard] Then it is approved.

DOCKET 1103, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, ROBERT E. LEE (REGULAR ORDER) (O’Kane/Abebe)

Smith: We’ve got one more. Calendar Item 1207, Docket #1103, Request for Emeritus Status for Robert E. Lee, who served as an instructor in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services, otherwise affectionately known as HPELS. Motion to endorse Mr. Lee’s request for emeritus status? Moved by Senator **Breitbach** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **Ophus** [who indicated]—sorry Forrest [Senator **Dolgener**, who also wanted to second] [light laughter around]. But now any discussion of Senator [*sic*, instructor] Lee’s—I know we’ve got some people here from HPELS.

Dolgener: I’ll just very briefly say that—well, I knew him by “Bob.” He is actually Cherin’s husband, so they both retired at the same time.

Smith: Oh?

Dolgener: And so he originally was at the Lab School for many years and then moved up to HPELS maybe 15 years ago, I’m not sure. But an excellent teacher and a good colleague, and I would highly recommend him.

Smith: Ok. Anyone else?

Breitbach: And an awesome coach, track and cross country. None better.

Dolgener: Coach—many—several state titles at the Lab School for

Smith: The question I had was I had thought maybe emeritus request were only for faculty. An instructor, would that count as faculty? Perhaps it does. [voices commenting]

Dolgener: I think so, yeah, full-time faculty. [Again, see: <http://www.uni.edu/emeritus/Eligibility.htm>]

Smith: Shows what I know. Any more discussion? Then I believe we are ready to vote on this. All in favor of supporting Mr. **Lee**'s request for emeritus status, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay." [none heard] It is approved.

DOCKET 1094, PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE IN QUASI-COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON 9/23/13, DELAYED (**PETERS/TERLIP**)

Smith: Ok, now we are ready to take up Calendar Item 1198, Docket #1094, Performance Review of the Senate Budget Committee. As we agreed when we docketed this item however many weeks ago, before entertaining motions and votes on this item, we would like to discuss it less formally, as a quasi-committee of the whole. So I need a motion for the Senate to move into a quasi-committee of the whole for purposes of discussing this item. Do I have a motion to that effect?

Walter: So move.

Smith: Senator **Walter**. Seconded? By Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. Any discussion of the wisdom of doing that? [none heard] Then let's vote on moving to a quasi-committee of the whole. All in favor of doing so, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "Nay." [none heard] We are now functioning as a quasi-committee of the whole, which means that the rules of debate are more relaxed, in part because we're discussing, but not acting or voting on, the issue at hand. So there's—we aren't—we can't take votes formally as a Senate right now. We just do discussion. And so—you know, then kind of in essence report back to the Senate as if we were a committee. As I said in my meeting preview e-mail, this issue is one that could be discussed for hours, I would hope that we can manage today's consideration of the topic so that we'll have some time left today to address other items on our docket. But, of course, we'll see how that goes.

That said, I'd also like to frame the discussion as follows: As per the petition at hand—there is a petition that this relates to—we have to review the performance of the Senate Budget Committee, a Committee that we established just over a year ago, possibly with the intent of revising its

charge, potentially even of disbanding this Committee. If we decide to continue the Senate Budget Committee, we will also need to re-staff it since the terms of two committee members have expired. Arguably, and I think one of the intents in having this discussion was so that our deliberations on these matters would be conducted in light of a more general understanding and agreement as to the role UNI faculty should play, and how they can best discharge their responsibilities, in the setting of Budget priorities, in the generation and evaluation of Budget proposals, and in the monitoring of financial performance against budgets, both at the University and Academic Affairs levels, and in some cases, at the level of individual Colleges and Departments. So, I'd like this to be a broader kind of thing. We ultimately have to come back and decide about this Committee and potentially staffing it, but before we do that—I mean, making that decision, I think we should do that in the context of a broader kind of understanding of what our role is. What the faculty's role is or should be vis-à-vis budgeting and financial management in the University and how we can best perform that role. So, while we may not reach agreement on all these latter, larger issues, we might nonetheless reach an agreement on what to do with the existing Senate Budget Committee, and if so, we'll want to "report that back" to the Senate for its action.

And at this time, I'm going to open the floor for discussion. I'll just take out my pad so I can keep track. We'll start with Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I have a question. As I recall when this was discussed at the beginning of the semester that [Senator] Chris **Edginton** had had some input that he was going to try to pass along to you as to what some things were not functioning correctly. Could you give us a synopsis of what he offered?

Smith: I wouldn't say that I got detailed input. I just got a general sense of dissatisfaction. [voices commenting]

MacLin: Yeah, that's precisely what I was going to ask because I thought this meeting was set to make sure he could be present because he indicated he had a wealth of information to give us that would help us to make our decision. [voices saying "yes"]

Smith: It's turned out to be very difficult to schedule a meeting where he could be present, and it is unfortunate that, you know, maybe he could have sent an email to everybody expressing things, although I don't know that he wanted to be on record in that regard. But he did express a feeling of dissatisfaction that the Committee didn't function all that well. I wouldn't say that he had recommendation that "Now, you should bag it," "That it should be recharged" or whatever. He just—what I got was a sense that

MacLin: Yeah, I got the sense that it was personality clashes? Is that true, in which case then the Committee itself may be perfectly fine, but that iteration of it wasn't contentious?

Smith: There may have been some of that. I don't know. He never expressed to me that, you know, that way. I think there may have been issues in terms of what the Committee was asked to do. And if you remember, our one interaction with it, they reported back to us on criteria to use in evaluating academic programs, as I recall. And I don't know that—I personally wasn't knocked out by what they gave us; in fact, I had some serious quarrels with it. And so I—I mean, I'm not sure that the way they—if you look at how that Committee's charged, it didn't—it wasn't even set up to provide input into the Budget process. It was more set up as an evaluation on the back end, which I think is an important role, but not one that this—if you look at the charge, to me it wasn't really set up to do. It wasn't doing, for instance, the kinds of things that Senator **Peters** has talked about of providing—having a vehicle for faculty of input in terms of, you know, Budget proposals and stuff like that. It really wasn't set up to do that.

MacLin: [pointing across room] Melissa [Senator **Heston**].

Heston: Well, I just was not clear exactly what this Committee had actually done or what data we have to evaluate it, other than we're evaluating their performance, but I don't know what performance data is that we're supposed to be looking at to make a judgment call, other than that they reported to us on something, and I wasn't on the Senate then, I don't

believe, at that particular point. So I'm kind of at a loss about how I would evaluate their performance without data.

Smith: Yeah, let me try and position this a little bit. Scott [Senator **Peters**].

Peters: Well, I guess I can give you my perspective as Chair last year. The [Faculty Senate] Budget Committee was revamped the previous year, so any—the purpose of revamping it was to try to tie it more closely to the [Faculty] Senate to allow it to do what the Senate wanted of it, basically. Early in the year last year I asked it to convene and to issue a report to us about what it would—what it was interested in looking at for the year. What I was told was that there was a lot of disagreement among the members of the Committee about what people should focus on and what the Committee should focus on. So, I went at it from a different direction, and I asked the Committee—I tried to give the Committee two concrete tasks to carry out on behalf of the Senate. One was to report back to us with a recommendation for some guidelines for Budget Consultation Process, a systematic Budget Consultation Process. And the second was to report back to us for criteria that could be used within Academic Affairs for allocating resources within the Division. We got reports on both of those things, but I'm not sure how much those reports actually reflected a real debate within the Committee. My s—I think it was also the case that there was some serious trouble actually finding meeting times for members of the Committee. So I'm not sure—my recollection anyway is that there may not have been any meetings where all the members of the Committee were actually there. And so there just seemed to be—I was copied on a number of emails where it just seemed to me that different members of the Committee had different—had significantly different interests and significantly different approaches to fulfilling the tasks. And, you know, I asked Adam who was chairing—Adam **Butler**, who was chairing the Committee, to give me reports, and I don't know to what extent those reports—and this is not in any way a criticism of Adam; I think he was doing the best he could to try to get the Committee all on the same page—but I don't know to what extent those reports reflected true Committee deliberation versus, you know, maybe a couple members kind of getting together and brainstorming some ideas.

Smith: Other discussion? Yes, visitor Joe [**Gorton**, President of United Faculty], do you want to contribute here?

Gorton: And I think when this Committee was first started, I think Scott [Senator **Peters**] asked me to be a member of it. My sense of it, if I remember correctly, Scott, it sort of emerged out of the, you know, the problems of 2012 and concerns about fiscal priorities and that sort of thing. When Scott asked if I was—for me to be a member, I ultimately deferred because what I understood about the mission of the Committee, it wo—this seemed for me a bit broad if not kind of not well-focused.

But I do want you to know what United Faculty is doing. We have established a Financial Sustainability Committee that is doing a very, I think, intense Budget analysis. And three members of that Committee are in the room right now—Tim **Kidd**, your Vice-Chair; Frank Thompson; and I. Adam **Butler** is on the Committee, and so is John **Deisz**. And it is a Herculean task. It really is. I mean, we've already put together a data set from Fiscal '12—Fiscal '3 to Fiscal '12 of about 50 different organizational level items in the Budget, and—but our purpose is pretty—I don't know if it would match your purpose or not—that our purpose is really to support the collective bargaining process and to support United Faculty and collective bargaining, especially in the area of contrasting revenues and expenditures at a University-wide data. So I just want you, as part of your discussion, to know it. And I don't know, I really don't know, Jerry [Chair **Smith**], if United Faculty will be able to share that data with the Committee? We're going to have to have some discussions about that on the United Faculty side, but—I mean, to share it with the Senate, rather. That may be some information that we pass along to you, and it might support some of your earlier ideas about what you wanted in their report.

Smith: Thanks, Joe. That's helpful information. Other comments here?

Walter: Just a question.

Smith: Sorry, back there. Frank **Thompson**, [Professor, Finance Department]?

Thompson: Just another bit of historical information was that we had this Committee in the Senate. It was a sitting Budget Committee, but we didn't have any particular charge to the Committee. This is about 3 ½ or 4 years ago. So I requested a charge to the Committee, and we then started looking at the Budget. We formed a Committee. The Committee met regularly. And the first thing that we did was we asked for the Budget Process, because we couldn't find a Budget Process on the web. So I wrote a letter to then Vice-President **Schellhardt**, and I asked for a Budget Process. What I received was a one-page description of a Process that basically said that the University created a Budget within the Administrative Staff. They submitted it to the Board of Regents. It was approved. But nothing in terms of a Budget Process that included faculty. So we then made some additional requests for information. We gathered information. We found that, for instance, at the University of Maryland there was an article written that actually clearly defined a Budgetary Process that the faculty had direct input. The AAUP principles clearly state that the faculty should have a strong influence on Budget Processes, that is pre—before a Budget is proposed—and then afterward to determine that the actual expenditures are in keeping with whatever is decided. I think we're still at a very early stage in terms of actually getting a Budget Process, because we still don't have anything that would look like a Budget Process that faculty are aware of.

Smith: Ok, thank you, Frank. Michael [Senator **Walter**] did you want to

Walter: Just want to be clear. The Committee actually started in 2010 or thereabouts?

Thompson: Well, they were—actually, it was prior to 2010. It was actually on the Committee of Committees, there was a Budget Committee, but it was never—it never met.

Heston: The way back history, actually

Male voice: That's what we need.

Heston: when the—under Aaron **Podolefsky**, I believe, is when we first created that original Senate Budget Committee under similar times of budget cuts, I think, oh, in 2001, etcetera.

Terlip: Actually, it was before this.

Heston: Was it before that?

Terlip: When we had extra money, because I was on it, and it was for faculty input on which initiatives to pursue when we had money.

Heston: It was not a very viable Committee, as I recall. [voices and joking a bit and then questioning date again] See, I'm thinking—I thought it was 2001, but if it was when we had money, it might have been the late '90s.

Funderburk: Not disagreeing. I mean, this is all right. And actually that Committee was officially disbanded in the Fall while I was [Faculty] Senate Chair, to reconstitute, because it was vague, and there was a lot of discussion of where it came from, what its charge was. So, it was reformed, recharged, and I don't remember if we voted on it in the Spring or if it was in the Fall when you [to Senator **Peters**] took over that the final dispersion [*sic*] of the Committee was reconstituted.

Smith: So, you've got a long history of frustration in this area. Scott [Senator **Peters**], did you want to say something?

Peters: Well, per Frank's [audience member **Thompson**] comments, I—at—when he was—well, I guess—I'm sorry, I'm—let me get my thoughts for a second. [pause] Last Spring the [Faculty] Senate passed a resolution calling for the creation of a Budget Process like Frank laid out that involved significant faculty participation. President **Ruud** relied on a process very similar to that at Shippensburg, and so right now I have a draft proposal for such a Process that's circulated to Senators. I'm happy to send you a copy for feedback, too. And I've sent it to Michael **Hager** [Vice President for Administration and Financial Services], and I assume he's probably sent it on to people in his Division and the Executive Management Team and what have you. It's a first draft. It's an early proposal, but I certainly believe that

we should move toward that kind of Process, that it could benefit all kinds of things on campus. I think it could make for more strategic decision-making all around and give Academic Affairs a somewhat stronger voice in the Budgeting Process, significantly, possibly, a stronger voice. So—and so far everything I’ve heard from President **Ruud** about it—I haven’t heard anything about the draft, but everything I’ve heard about the idea is that he’s supportive of it. He used it at Shippensburg. He wants to do something like this here. So I think it’s just a matter of ironing out details, and then, more significant than that, getting it up and running is going to take some work. But I think it can be done.

Smith: Yes, Senator—Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I think if we’re going to make some headway on this, we also have to realize there’s two different things going on. There’s two different committee structures.

Peters: Yeah.

Funderburk: There’s one that’s this thing, but that’s actually not the charge of the Senate Committee at all that we’re seeing here, and I think that’s—probably the real question is, “Do we want to have this Senate Committee doing this charge? Or do we want to abandon that entirely and start working on this other Process? Or do we think we need both of them?” If we’re having both, it makes it pretty clear to go back to this charge, and it’s a much more limited scope of what that Committee was asked to do.

Smith: If I may, I’ll throw my own confusions into this. I look at it as three ways in which faculty should be involved in the financial management of this university:

One is the kind of thing that we have been talking about, at least Scott’s proposal. There’s setting budget priorities, generating and evaluating Budget Proposals, which the current Committee really hasn’t been asked to do. What we’d be talking about is special projects, funding of academic programs and faculty lines. Some of you may remember our first meeting of the semester, in August, the 26th, Professor [*sic* Provost] **Gibson** outlined

her Fiscal Year 2015 goals, a set of things that we really—that were new to us. Few of us had any kind of awareness of these or any involvement. That shouldn't be the case. Faculty should have some input into that and know about it when it actually goes through the Budget Process, but that requires establishing a clear Budget Process with certain timelines and points at which faculty, through a Committee or in some other way, can get input.

And the other—another kind of important issue, and the one that I think this, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, at least the existing one, was primarily intended to address, was the matter of monitoring the University's financial performance and condition. And that's the issue that really became important a couple of years ago during the troubles. It was that we as a faculty and as the [Faculty] Senate and the faculty in general didn't really know how the University was doing financially, and all of a sudden it's kind of sprung on us we got big troubles, and we've got to do all these things. We should have had input. We should have had knowledge from the start, been at the table, known about what was happening and been in a position to say, "Hold it. You don't—you know, you don't fire or let go tenured faculty unless it's a doomsday scenario." We should have been in a position to do that. I'm not sure if this Committee could do it, but potentially that's what it was set up for. Maybe it could be handled through the [Faculty] Senate's representation at Cabinet meetings, assuming the Administration will use these meetings, among other things, to keep everyone informed as to the University's financial condition. But that's—those are kind of—it's the front-end Budget input; it's the back-end financial management and monitoring. Those are two potentially separate kind of responsibilities.

And then I'll add a third, and this reflects my own personal experience here, which may not resemble yours. Faculty should be involved in setting budget priorities and generating and evaluating budget proposals, not only at the level of the University and Academic Affairs Division, but also at the College and Departmental levels. And I know some of you have that right now, but I don't think it's uniform across the University, because I know it isn't the case in my Department, and I don't believe it's generally the case in my College. I've spoken to President **Ruud** about this. He is strongly supportive: Faculty should be consulted and have an influential say in

decisions about how to allocate faculty lines within Colleges, and how to fill lines within Departments. And I'm not talking about being on a hiring committee. "Who do you hire?" I'm talking about "What do you search for? Do you search for a specialist in Twentieth Century American History or should—do we need somebody more in Medieval History? Which do we need in this Department to maintain the programs?" Because if you want to get faculty committed to programs, they have to have input into the staffing of, you know, the faculty that are going to offer these programs. By doing that, I think—getting faculty involved in those decisions is a necessary condition for faculty to take ownership of their academic programs. If Deans and Heads decide, without substantive faculty input, what kinds of faculty we will search for, then faculty are not in a position to offer the kinds of programs their students need, nor are they likely to be committed to the success of those programs. And, again, some of you may have this input, but I think we need to make it University-wide. We don't need new committees for that. You can use departmental faculty. You can use College Senates. What I think we need is a policy, and I think that we—I would hope that the [Faculty] Senate, if we think about it, will endorse the issue of developing a Policy that I believe—I'm quite convinced—the President will support. There'll probably be some kick-back from Deans and Department Heads, but I think this is something that really is a way of engaging faculty in management of the University. So that's the third thing. And it's kind of separate from the other two things that we've been talking about. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Ok, have I got a Budget Process for you. [laughter all around] It slices. It dices.....no, look, I have—I think if we use the right kind of Process, I think a lot of that thing can happen during the course of the Budget Process, so what President **Ruud** did at Shippensburg, and I've just—in the proposal I put out, I just literally copied and pasted part of it from that document, because I figured, hey, if he supported it there, he's likely to support it here. The Budget Process starts each year with the President with consultation with the Cabinet and other key people—the President issuing a statement saying, "This is what we're going to do this year. This is the University's goals. This is how we're making advances toward the University's Strategic Plan this year. This is what we're going to emphasize." Then down to the individual units, that filters down, individual

units make their Budget Proposals. Maybe it's, you know, "Hey, we're good. We don't need extra resources." Maybe it's "This one, maybe extra lab space would really, in this one program, would really help the University's overall Strategic Plan." Maybe it's hiring an additional faculty member or whatever it is. You obviously have non-academic units as well. They make their proposals, and that filters up. And so, I mean, you could certainly build into the Process that we expect that when Departments set such goals that they would consult with the faculty, that when Deans take those proposals from the different Departments, that they would consult with their College Senate and maybe this is the role for a University Faculty Senate Budget Committee. Maybe we would say that when the Provost makes those decisions about proposals coming from the different Colleges, that the University Faculty Senate should have some input into the decisions. And maybe that would be the role for a Budget Committee. And if that was the role, I guess I would argue that probably it would be most appropriate to change the Budget Committee again and to make it a committee of Senators. But I think that there would be ways within the process that is sort of floating around right now, the proposal that's floating around right now, to build in that kind of consultation from the ground up.

Smith: Yeah, and I—you know, I can agree with that. I think it still may be necessary to have a Policy that requires Heads and Deans to do the consultation, to do the involvement. And, again, I don't know what your experiences in any of your Departments. Mine has been there isn't always consultation, and in some cases, it felt like, "What's going on here?"

Terlip: Jerry [Chair **Smith**]?

Smith: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: And this is kind of consistent with what you're saying about differences across Departments on campus. We're in the process of doing our self-study for Academic Program Review, and one of the things we're asked to respond to are budgetary items, like "Is the Budget sufficient?" It's not very transparent, for example, what the—even in our Department—what the Budget is and how it's allocated. And so I think

getting more transparency throughout would make everybody a little happier, not just for lines and those kinds of things.

Smith: Ok. Professor **Thompson**.

Thompson: You know, in regards to your comments, I think it's good to look at all areas of the Budget, and certainly the College and Departments would be important, but the one thing that I think has been missed and that was, I think, something we can learn from the previous experience with respect to budgeting and budget cuts, is that there's about 70% of this Budget that doesn't represent instruction at all—70%. And faculty, when you're talking about Budget, we can concentrate on the academics, but if that 70% continues to increase to 75, there's less and less money that will be available for academic programming. We can talk all we want about having additional positions, but if we continue to increase the non-instructional budget, there'll be less and less resources in the future for instruction and improvement. So, my feeling is is that when we look at this Budget Process, all of the Budget has to be on the table, and the faculty need to be able to look at "What is the cost of recruitment, for example? What is the cost of ITS on this campus? Have those Budgets grown? And to what extent has that impeded our ability to add additional faculty positions?" When you look at the number of Administrative positions that have been added, there has been significant growth in comparison to reduction of instruction and faculty positions. And it would appear that that—that's one area in the Budgeting Process we need to redeploy some of our assets.

Smith: Ok, thank you. Other discussion of this? Have we tapped this out for now, and if so, should we rise back to our

Cutter: Well, I do have one question about that, that the docketed item is a performance review, and I would have to echo Melissa's [Senator **Heston**] comments about having no idea, you know, not having been here last year what the performance review would be based on.

Smith: What—Sen—Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: And I was also—that’s kind of what I was getting at as well is we’ve got two different things. I mean, an additional Budget Process seems like something we ought to be dealing with. If we are going deal with that Committee, the Committee’s charge is one paragraph, and it doesn’t relate to anything much of what was just said.

Heston: Could you read that paragraph for us?

Funderburk: According to the new Committee on Committees, and I’ll assume they got it correct, it says, “The Faculty Senate Budget Committee shall inform the Senate about UNI’s budget and finances and assess how UNI’s budget priorities affect academic programs. In doing so, it shall consider as appropriate internal and external events that affect the University’s resources and priorities. It shall develop and maintain budgetary expertise among its members.” Everything else up there is mechanics of how it goes and when they report.

[<http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/2013-2014-university-committee-memberships.pdf> pg. 3]But it’s really—it’s more or less a post-mortem type of thing of what happens, where are we, and based on what has happened, what is our impact?

Smith: Let me say, too, when we talked about it—I mean, I wrote it up as a performance review, but it was kind of when we talked about it and originally docketed this, it was kind of “Should we reconsider the charge of this group? Should we redesign it, reorient it, etcetera?” And that’s the kind of thing that I think we should decide on, but only in the context of figuring out—having a general understanding of what, you know, what we want to achieve vis-à-vis Budget, financial planning, financial management on the University and how we might be able to do that? Senator **Peters.**

Peters: I just—so, I guess the way I think of the [Faculty] Senate in all of this is that the Senate would still be the faculty’s main voice for its priorities. So let’s say—let’s take the, you know, percent of the Budget spent on Auxiliary Enterprises, right? So, from my perspective, and keep in mind that I’m a political scientist, so maybe that—this explains why I think of it this way, but that the [Faculty] Senate passes a resolution however many years ago that was now—5 years ago?—that says, “We shouldn’t

spend more than X per cent of our Budget on Auxiliary Enterprises.” And then sort of every year the Senate sort of revisited it—revisits it and says, “You’re still not spending as little on Auxiliary Enterprises as we say you should be, right?” And from my perspective it’s sort of like, “Well, what did you expect? Where’s the enforcement mechanism?” Why would you expect that when you’ve got a Budget that is—consists of—when a Budget Process consists largely of the President and what President **Ruud** is now calling the Executive Management Team. Under President **Allen** key decisions were made by the President and the Vice-Presidents. And so when they are trying to make final decisions, are they going to go back of their own initiative and look at Faculty Senate Resolutions to guide them in their decisions? No.

So what do we need to do? We need to figure out a way to allow faculty to enforce the Senate’s resolutions, ok? So, the faculty members—the way I kind of see this is the faculty members who would be sitting on a University Planning and Budgeting Committee, the Senate could say to them, “Hey, do you remember, by the way, that this is a stated goal of the faculty to try to keep Auxiliary Enterprises below X per cent?” And now the faculty have a mechanism to enforce Faculty Policy. So the Senate is still doing the planning. The Senate is still—has the opportunity to set basic policy for the faculty and indicate the faculty’s preferences, and then the planning—this faculty representation on the University-wide Planning and Budget Committee gives the faculty the actual opportunity to enforce that in the form of a formal recommendation to the President, which is there in front of him when he and the Executive Management Team makes those final decisions. So, the Senate may still need information in order to make decisions like that in order to say, “Hey, we think the University is spending too much money on this, that, or the other thing and not enough on instruction.” The Senate may still need a source of information to make those kinds of decisions, so I just want to stress that even though I do think a proposal like this—a proposal like the University-wide Planning and Budget Committee—will be a positive, it doesn’t necessarily mean that the Senate doesn’t still have a need to be informed about Budget matters.

MacLin: Plus their own Committee.

Peters: Possibly by their own Committee, yes.

Smith: Professor **Thompson**.

Thompson: I think it's good to start looking about how you might go about enforcing some things. That would make sense. But you know one way of doing this would be a market solution where you say, ok, the entire Budget of the University—we take the entire Budget of the University, and we decide that, you know, given that it's 70% not instructional, we start from a premise that it should at least be 50/50, so that next year 50% of all the money that's spent at the University will go for instruction. The other 50% will be not. And by having a set percentage and looking at the Budget, you would actually have an enforcement on those units that are not instructional. The academic units have had no problem living within their Budget. There is not an academic unit on this campus that can finish the year with a deficit. On the other hand, there are Administrative units that finish every year, and have done so for the last 20 years, finishing with a deficit that they've carried over into a future year. So one way of using—I mean, as the University grows, then there would be more money available if we had a set percentage of the entire Budget that went for instruction and it was a reasonable percentage, not 30% but 50%.

Smith: Any other discussion? Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: So, I mean, it sounds like the current charge is actually something of importance to review the overall Budget of the University. I mean, maybe we could fine-tune it a little bit, but it sounds like we need this kind of information to make decisions, so just my input, I guess.

Smith: I'll throw in mine. I think it's an important responsibility for financial management, but I wonder whether the [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee as currently constituted is a good way to do it. Maybe it's better to have a [Faculty] Senate Committee do that, rather than faculty that kind of volunteer and do it. That would be my one concern.

Heston: I'm a little troubled by the possibility of redundancy. I think it would be fascinating to me to see the numbers that my colleague Frank

[Thompson] is talking about, actually see them kind of in a line-by-line budget sort of format and how things break down and actually see some comparative data—comparison data from other institutions, but I also am concerned that we'll have multiple groups kind of gathering the same data. Is there not some way to streamline this so that we all see the same stuff? I mean, my frustration actually with the previous—when we went through the troubles, if you will, was that I could not get a sense of whose numbers were more accurate than whose? I saw all kinds of numbers thrown around by all kinds of entities on all sides, so it's not—I'm not finger-pointing exactly, but knowing which numbers were more truthful or more accurate in how you interpret those is, to me, very problematic given that most of us don't have much familiarity with how university budgeting works or doesn't work and what the restrictions are on how the universities can and can't spend their money, whether they can move it from this account to that account, whether they can do this with it or that with it. I mean, I think there's a lot.

Maybe the [Faculty] Senate needs to be better educated about all of this as a whole before we can really make good decisions about what kind of committee we really need, because I feel like we're kind of responding. We're still in a response mode to the problems of 2012 rather than—with the exception of, you know, looking at a possible Budget Consultation Process, I really would rather we start looking forward to how do we do things better than how do we create some mechanism that will prevent what happened before as if we have control over that. I just don't—and enforcement is also an issue for me. I don't know how faculty enforce their Budget priorities. That makes no sense to me. We don't have any power from any group to enforce our Budget. All we can do is complain. And we can complain publically, and that's fine. That's as close as we can get to enforcement. It's a gentleman's, if you will, agreement between us and the Administration about how things will work, in terms of budgeting.

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk.**

Funderburk: And part of that about looking at the same numbers, they are—and again they kind of aren't in one sense. I mean, if already if you noticed by the time we started classes, we were talking about next year's

Budget requests and working on that, so there's a group of people that need to be watching out that. It strikes me that what this charge is really talking about is trying to tell the [Faculty] Senate by October 1st "Where are we today with what we are doing?" So, whether you choose to have the same people try to do both of those or that their job is really to look at it because you're—this one's calling for an October 1 report of "Where are we?". By October 1, of course, everybody was already worried about Fiscal '15, not worried about Fiscal '14.

I think that's maybe the first question that the Senate needs to answer, is "Do we want to have one that that's just their job to bring us up to speed in the Fall?" because that seems to be what this says. All the other stuff, which seems to be very important, it doesn't—we're not handling that at all through this Committee, nor do I think probably this is the best committee to do that. Whether or not we can get 5 Senators to do it is the real question that I have. I think that was the reason that this first, if you don't have it in front of you, has "4 members elected by the Senate after campus-wide solicitations"

[see <http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/2013-2014-university-committee-memberships.pdf> pg. 3]. So it doesn't mean that it couldn't all be Senators, and then "one appointed by the Senate Chair." And I'm not arguing for or against it, just trying to help get us someplace where we can get something done on something.

Smith: Senator **Peters.** Do you want

Peters: Very briefly. I don't want to belabor it too much, but when I say *enforcement*, I don't—obviously you can't make the President make a particular budgetary choice. But what I mean is make sure the faculty are part of the formal decision-making process in some way, so that they have an opportunity, rather than just complain, to actually, as part of the Budget Process, make a formal recommendation that is part of the process and the President must respond to it. The President would, when the President chooses to spend this money over the faculty money, everybody on campus knows the faculty suggested this, and the President would have to respond to it and justify it. And so I would—I'd consider that in making it part of the formal process, the opportunity for the faculty to, in a more coherent way,

to make their—try to realize the goals that, say, the Senate has set out via a resolution.

Smith: Any other comments?

Gorton: Well, I just want to

Smith: Professor **Gorton**

Gorton: mirror Senator **Heston**'s comments about the, you know—I mean, once you get into this, it can be like an Alice in Wonderland experience. It really can. So you, you know, you're going down a path analysis—through a budget analysis and you think you're really tracking _____ . Then you sit down over here with Bruce [**Rieks**, Budget Systems Development and Reporting Director and Vice President for Administration and Financial Services] or Gary [Senator **Shontz**, Controller/Secretary/Treasurer and Instructor, Financial Administration and Reporting Services] or, you know, or you go to IPEDS [Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems] Day or something and you find out, whoops, you know? So, I just—the only thing that I would say is this—this has just been my experience for the past several months working on Budget data is that you might consider a multi-tiered process. The boilerplate data that come, for instance, from the supplemental financial reports, not too complicated. Something that the [Faculty] Senate could easily handle, I think, where you kind of do boilerplate examination of the Budget, and Scott's [Senator **Peters**] idea sounds to me—his proposal sounds to be much more in depth, part of a broader picture. So you might consider it something along that line. And then the people who join it must—if you do this, go in the direction of Scott, then they have to be really committed, you know, because this thing will just beat you down. Working on the Budget will just beat you down. The boilerplate stuff, not so hard, but the project that Scott has in mind, you really have to have committed people for it. So that's just my admonishment to you, if you will. Thank you.

Smith: Other discussion? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: One thing that strikes me is, as Melissa [Senator **Heston**] says, we're still kind of in a reactive mode. And, to me, all this stems from either a perceived lack of transparency or we need a better policy about transparency. That if everyone could get access to the numbers and could trust the numbers, we might not even need to have to Committee. So I don't know if in—somewhere along the line we need to address the transparency process, because as long as we don't do that, it's going to—we're going to continue to struggle to figure it out.

Smith: Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: The numbers are publically available. It's just how to interpret them which is the challenge. I've been looking into this for quite some time, and so that's what I think a Committee would do for it, is to kind of get some kind of head start interpreting these things and then relay them to us.

Terlip: Uh huh. But... Yeah, I don't disagree. But my experiences a couple of years ago were that there were 3 sets of numbers often depending on who you were listening to, so...we have to agree on the numbers.

Smith: Are we—do we have anything close to broad agreement or even a consensus as to what to do with regard to the existing Faculty Senate Budget Committee that we should tell them, "Yeah, keep doing what you've been doing," We should recharge it? We should disband it? Do we have consensus on any of those kinds of things that would lead us when we come out of our quasi-committee of the whole to enable us to take and pass a motion to whatever effect? Or are things pretty much up in the air and we have to kind of accept that they are up in the air and they're not going to be resolved today? Anyone want to propose something that they would regard as

Funderburk: I'm going to make a statement, I guess, on that. With the current Budget Committee, it's not in opposition to anything of what's being said. So, for example, if this whole processed developed, there could still be a use for this Committee. What I was trying to get in before, you've got people that are worried about 2015 already now on the—that most of the decisions, because of the way the Legislature has been doing things,

halfway after the Senate's already gone, and so that all happens during the Summer. So, this [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee first and foremost must bring us up to speed of where we are at the moment. That would then allow the [Faculty] Senate to understand enough to make suggestions, either for redistribution on the campus that would be for the following year or perhaps have better input into ideas for how to propose the next Budget cycle, which—so if we were talking about this year, we would already be trying to draft what we'd be suggesting they ask for in 2016, FY '16. So, I think the point is that this Committee could potentially have a good function if it's totally separate from this Budget Process that's going forward. It needs to be working forward all the time, if we want somebody to inform us. If we think this new Process is going to give us all the information we need, ok. But it also is going to take this Committee so long that they're two members short, and if I understood Dr. **Gorton** correctly, he thinks he's not on the Committee, but according to this he is [loud laughter all around]

Gorton: Get me off! [as laughter continues]

Funderburk: We probably need to make a decision of whether or not we're running the Committee this year or not, because the charge actually expires in the Spring of '15 regardless of whether or not we do anything. So I think we ought to at least decide if we want to keep this running at the moment, pending doing something, or if we're just going to bag it and say, "We need to start everything over again." My only worry about that is we've already done that a couple of cycles on this Committee and formed a Task Force, and maybe we need to do it again, but...so ponder that.

Cutter: Yeah, I'd be most comfortable keeping this Committee at this point in time for exactly those reasons, to inform us to get us all up to speed, and that's, I think, especially important for new Senate members, but probably for everyone and also because we've got this other process that's just getting started. And then we could reevaluate if we still had a continued need for it after we see how the new, you know, Budget Process involving faculty works.

Smith: So, your idea then would be to continue the Committee, to re-staff it with the—to fill in the vacancies, and then to let the members of the Committee know that, yeah, we value what we—what their charge is, and we would like them to provide the information that they were charged to provide us with?

Cutter: Yeah, I think.

Smith: Yes, Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: One thing is, you know, for this new Process, you know, having Budget input into the next fiscal year. That seems to be almost like a separate committee.

Smith: Yeah.

Kidd: Might have some of the same members overlap perhaps, I don't know, but that would be a separate charge, so I think this one is, again, yes, very important.

Smith: Is there

Funderburk: One more down here.

Smith: Ok, I'm sorry. Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I think the other thing that we want to consider is we seem to be talking about this in black and white, like there's a Budget proposed, and then it's sent exactly that way. And so I think we need both groups to try to figure that out, because the Budget things happen. The Budget is living and breathing, and as the Legislature makes changes or things shift on campus, sometimes we're not aware of that until we find out much later. So, it would be nice to have this Committee sort of let us know what happened, the existing Committee.

Smith: Yeah. I would point out as Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] noted that this Committee's charge does expire at the close of the Spring 2015, so

we do have built in this kind of sunset thing where we will revisit. So, given that, we could continue it as we initially planned and would kind of sharpen the charge, re-staff it, and maybe they'll demonstrate that they've got a really important function. It doesn't—you know, if once address some of the other things, that it still stands there as a valuable function. So, I don't know, there—is there some kind of general support for that kind of approach to it?

Heston: I would just like to have a really clear sense before we leave today of exactly of what we want them to bring us for their report. They obviously didn't report the first of October. I want to know exactly what we're asking them to do and to bring us at some point in the rest of—the rest of this year or are we going to just wait until next Spring, next Fall, October '14 since it's so far already into this year and we haven't filled the Committee yet?

Funderburk: And that's one area that may be worth discussing, because the second point on this says, "The committee shall issue a report to the Senate no later than October 1 of each academic year, and may, at any other time as it deems appropriate, report to the Senate regarding any matter within its charge. The committee shall provide other reports or information to the Senate at the Senate's request." [<http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/2013-2014-university-committee-memberships.pdf> pg.3] But it doesn't actually say exactly what it is they're supposed to report on ever. It says they can decide to report on whatever they want. That may be something would need to be tied down—it might help.

Smith: Senator **Evans**.

Evans: Did I hear the word *sharpen* the charge? Is that the words you used? Or bind the charge or something like that?

Smith: I think so, yeah. Or adjust the charge. [light laughter around]

Evans: Something like that. That seemed to make a lot of sense, to give them clarity in what we're asking them to do.

Smith: I'm not sure if we're going to be able to do that today, but let's kind of get our heads together and so that at an upcoming meeting we can do that, recharge the committee hopefully sometime in this semester and get them to work and then see how that turns out. Are you comfortable with that kind of approach?

Kidd: Couldn't we just do something now?

Smith: Well, if you've got something now that you feel would satisfy our needs. I don't want to do something quick for the sake of being quick and then it's not right, because we've kind of—you know, we've had all sorts of trouble. But I want to feel sure that we're going to give this Committee a good charge, give them the best shot to really do something valuable and demonstrate that this is something that we want to have on an ongoing basis.

Kidd: Well, I mean, it's going to be change in the Spring perhaps anyway. The first line of the charge is: "The Faculty Senate Budget Committee shall inform the Senate about UNI's budget and finances and assess how UNI's budget priorities affect academic programs." [<http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/2013-2014-university-committee-memberships.pdf> pg. 3] That seems like a reasonable thing for them to give us a report on. So, what we could do is put out a call for re-staffing the Committee and ask them to write such a report by, say, February 1st. I'm making an arbitrary date here, but something before the end of next year because it would be nice for us to get some kind of report on the finances of the University. It seems like reasonable information that we should have, especially if we're going to need to try and make informed decisions or informed input on how the Budget Process should go forward in the Spring for the next year.

Smith: Uh huh. Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: I really like that because I'm concerned that we've been sitting on this for, you know, basically all semester, knowing that they wanted new people since the beginning.

Kidd: So, let's do it.

Smith: Ok, let me just go through that again. "Faculty Senate Budget Committee shall inform the Senate about UNI's budget and finances and assess how UNI's budget priorities affect academic programs." Is that a clear, crisp enough charge to get what we want?

Heston: I think it will be interesting to see what we get with that charge.
[voices commenting on it]

Dolgener: It's pretty generic and broad.

Breitbach: Is there a reason why we can't ask individuals from the Administration to come and report to us about changes in the priorities in the Budget?

Smith: We can do that at any time.

Breitbach: Instead of having a middleman.

Smith: Yeah, we could do that at any time.

Breitbach: Because the middleman has got an enormous task, whereas there are people that are—have intimate knowledge about our Budget and where priorities are shifting within the Budget, and if they could come and report to us about shifts in priorities: "We're going to spend more here and less here and....."

Heston: We could have a report from every VP about line-by-line interpretation of where they're spending their money.

Breitbach: No. No. [light laughter]

Smith: Senator **Peters**

Peters: I mean, I think the answer to Karen's [Senator **Breitbach**] question is just a matter of the Senate's time. It's just—I can tell you that I sat down last—early last Spring, late last Fall, something like that with Michael **Hagar** to try to arrange a series of Budget consultations with the full Senate, and I gave it up because it would—became clear that it was—that we had so much other stuff to do and it was just not going to—it was going to take so much time to get the full Senate up to speed on those issues that it was going to be very difficult to do, and so I sort of gave it up. And so, yeah, if you have a really specific thing you want someone to come—like if you want Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] to talk in more detail about her FY '15 requests, you know, yeah, yeah, we can do that. That's a consultative session. That's probably the bulk of the whole meeting. But maybe it's worth it. It very well might be. But to try to sort of do that and get the overall feel of the whole University Budget, using formal parliamentary procedure with the whole Senate, that's tough to figure out how to do, which is why a Committee could be very helpful.

Smith: Yeah, I get the sense that there is considerable support for Tim's [Vice-Chair **Kidd**] suggestion that we do ask this Committee simply to carry out the charge that they were initially provided and as part of that that we will try to re-staff it by soliciting nominations—self-nominations for the vacant positions, and that while doing that we will go ahead with the other kinds of things, such as Senator **Peters** has proposed, the issue of perhaps a Policy regarding budgetary involvement, a Policy that would require Department Heads and Deans to involve the faculty in decisions at those levels. That's my sense of where we stand on this. Are we then prepared—is that a generally accepted sense of where we stand on this? And, if so, are we then prepared to come out of our quasi-committee of the whole? [voices saying "yes"] Yes. So, let's do that. I need a motion to rise up—oh, sorry

Funderburk: Does that mean you're going to then immediately solicit the campus for nominees as this calls for?

Smith: Yes.

Funderburk: Ok, and there—we need then to clarify also if we’re looking for—you—there’s an appointed position that’s open. There is at least one and then apparently Joe [**Gorton**—so we apparently need 3 positions filled, two of which would be elected by this Body?

Smith: One. Bill **Callahan** has agreed to serve another term. We need to replace the Senate—the appointment from the Senate Chair, Chris [Senator **Edginton**], and then apparently we need to replace Professor **Gorton**.

Gorton: Yes, you do. [joking voices] I’m trying to get out of it. I thought I send Scott [then Faculty Chair **Peters**] an email, but apparently he didn’t get it.

Smith: So we need to get one person from the faculty-at-large and then one appointment by me, which would ideally be from the Senate.

Funderburk: One person, or two people? I mean, if Joe’s staying, we need one. If not, we need two.

Smith: If Joe’s staying and Bill **Callahan** is staying

Funderburk: [looking at **Gorton**] That looks like a pretty solid “no.”

Gorton: No, Joe’s not staying. [laughter all around and joking]

Smith: So, we don’t need to replace Bill. We need to replace Joe and then we need to replace Chris [Senator **Edginton**] which is our internal appointment.

Funderburk: Well, I think that based on what this says, it’s elected from the Senate, so while he may be willing to, we still need to solicit, and the Senate needs to vote. I don’t know, but I think that’s right.

Smith: Right. I think that’s true, but we need to get—so we need to—we need to solicit nominees from the faculty, and then I’ve got appointed by the Senate Chair to replace Chris.

Funderburk: One appointed, yeah, right. So we have to elect two and then appoint a third one. [more discussion between **Smith** and **Funderburk** until they agreed on terminology of “electing” and “appointing” and “open slots”]

Smith: Ok, yeah, ok. I was assuming that we would reappoint Bill, but you’re right. That’s ok. Then let’s vote on rising from our quasi-committee of the whole, all in favor of so doing, say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “Nay.” [none heard] Then we are back in business so to speak. And I’m not sure if we need a motion specifically with regard to that petition at this point. [pause] Yeah, we really have—I mean, we can—to me it’s kind of like we’re back to what we normally do with committees which is we kind of solicit people and get and then we agree on them and do it, so I don’t think we need to do anything else at this point with that particular docket item.

DOCKET 1105, REAUTHORIZATION OF ADMINISTRATOR REVIEW PROCEDURES (REGULAR ORDER) (**NELSON/HESTON**)

Smith: So then we are prepared to take on the next item on our docket which is #1209/1105 Reauthorization of Administrator Review Procedures and that actually was initiated by Faculty Chair **Funderburk**, so I’m going to kind of turn that over to him.

Funderburk: Just quickly, I figured that every 37 years or so we should review our process procedures . [loud laughter all around]

Strauss: Whether we need to or not.

Funderburk: Exactly. So, I’m not suggesting anything in it be changed. There were some suggestions in the Senate last year that it should be looked at again. As we have a review process that should be starting, this seemed like a time to throw it out there on the table and see if anyone feels it needs to be changed. If we continue doing it as it’s been done, what I—I think everyone got an email from me today showing where you could find the questionnaire. I think you have the 1976 documents that we

looked at before, but that's as much as there is. There was some talk last year that we should either abandon or change the process. I don't know if you need a primer on how it works or not?

MacLin: What was the basis for wanting to change it?

Funderburk: I couldn't tell you fully. I just know that it was a discussion at a retreat. Maybe....

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Last January before the Spring semester started we had a retreat that some of you were able to attend. Some other faculty members were able to attend. It was actually—one of the purposes was to get some broad data, so to speak, for sparking the Budget Committee's deliberation over the 2 things we gave it to do. And then we opened it up to other things that faculty were interested in, and one of the things that I heard back from was on annual evaluations of administrators, and I know that Senator **Strauss** was part of the group, the break-out group at that retreat that discussed this, and he might be able to talk a little bit more about it. But I would just say that one thing I think we learned on the Presidential Search Committee last year, at one point I think the consult—the consultants, the search firm people, told us that the average term for a university president these days is—was it 5 years or was it even less than that?

Funderburk: I think they said 3-5.

Peters: So, if we are only evaluating them every 5 years, you know, maybe [quiet voice interrupting and light laughter]—yeah, so I think one option would be to do something like an annual or every other year or something like that kind of review. It would probably be—I would assume it would be less all encompassing. Maybe we would still have procedures in place for a big, full review every 5 years, but, you know, surveys every year or something like that, I don't know. But it's worth—I—it—I think it is worth discussing.

Smith: Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: There was a lot of enthusiasm on the part of faculty that were in that subgroup, including Vice-Chair **Kidd**, and the semester got away, and one of the reasons I relented on it is because the Union addressed this, and there was a wonderful letter, as I recollected, that said that these Administrator Reviews that we were all invited to participate in would be released to all the faculty; however, that review seems to have gone into a black hole. So it does suggest that maybe the—does suggest that maybe the [Faculty] Senate ought to have a more transparent and public evaluation of Administrators. I remember that

Thompson: Let me do some follow-up on that. We did a Survey of Administrators. We used the University of Michigan survey form. We had given the results to President **Ruud**. Those are under review right now, but our intention is that we will do another survey next Spring, and before the Spring survey is out, the previous survey that was done last Spring will be released with a white paper.

Strauss: Well, I think that's encouraging to hear, because I don't know if I would participate in another survey if I knew that it was going to be used for, you know, for whatever purposes you guys are using it for. I'm sure it's for constructive purposes, but it—and I can understand—I saw that letter you wrote saying, "This is why we're sitting on it," and I have every reason to believe that that's a judicious decision for at least one position on campus, but not for all the others, and so—well, anyway, I'll restate my position that I relented because I felt we were going to have a routine and publically-available set of evaluations coming from the Union. Now, either we are or the [Faculty] Senate's going to have address it themselves, because the approach that you used, the vehicle for doing it I thought was fantastic.

Gorton: And we're going to keep doing that. We are going to continue to do that in the future.

Strauss: Not with my participation, unless it becomes public.

Gorton: It will become public.

Thompson: It will become public.

Smith: Well, let's—yeah.

Gorton: As you say, there are, you know—we're in a—I think that the reason the Central Committee and the Executive Board and everyone else has sort of agreed that we're not "sitting on it right now"; we're allowing it to be used for purposes that we think will be helpful for the University as a whole, and we're just doing that at this time. So that's—I mean, that's the best I can say about that.

Strauss: Is that going to be nature then of any type of evaluation, or it has to be done quietly?

Gorton: No.

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I mean, for part of that, of course, the President's Review that was done here was fully public and was presented to the [Faculty] Senate. It's a document, and it was distributed. But the thing without getting into that, I think the only issue is that if the frequency changes very much, the Review is going to have to change. This Review is much more extensive. An annual review of this sort, you won't get people to do. We might be able to do it every 3 years instead of 5 years. That might be realistic. For those that weren't here to know this—besides the questionnaire which went all across campus, there were also interviews of all of the direct reports to the President that were done, so there's a huge amount of data to compile and try to get trendings. And one of the things that was also actually interesting about it was that you were able to track a lot of the information based on faculty and faculty who are Administrators, so that you're actually seeing if there is any divergence. And in this case, you noticed that actually everybody had the same opinion with only a slight change of the numbers. And that's something that's kind of different. But I would say that that Committee spent just—actual face-to-face Committee-time of about 20 hours on it? So it's a lot of time.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I would put forward a different view on how public it should be, if we were going—especially if it was going to be something that we wanted decision-makers to rely upon as part of evaluation. If you think of something like the every-5-years-review of Department Heads, one of the things that allows faculty to be frank and open in that is the notion that their views will be considered, that they will be passed along, and the Committee, having done one of those reviews one time, the Committee can be very frank with the Dean, and say, “Here’s the problem areas. Here’s what’s going on.” And we don’t have to worry that—about that, of it getting out, getting back to the person being reviewed. Responses are confidential. But then also the Department Head can get a full review of his or her performance because the Department Head is not worried about that information getting out either, and so they—the Department Head could say, “Please give me all the bad news, you know, and I will be able to use it.”

Now, if you think of this as the faculty having a voice in sort of personnel decisions, then it strikes me that the faculty should be professional in the way we handle—we should handle it, similar to personnel records, and we should handle it with the confidentiality that it deserves as what would essentially be a personnel record. That’s my own view on it. And I think we’d be more likely to have—I think we’d be more likely to have a survey like that respected by, you know, the President in evaluating Vice Presidents, or the Board of Regents in evaluating the President, if we treated it that way. That’s my own view.

Smith: Vice-Chair **Kidd**.

Kidd: I was part of that Committee [retreat sub-group], and one thing that came up a lot was that they wished that at the Department Head level especially for what they call the “temporary Department Heads” [voices offering *interim*]. Yeah, interim, because they’re not evaluated at all by faculty, and there have been, I guess, some interim Department Heads who have been around 5 or 10 years as interim. So this was a real source of concern for a few members of that Committee. So while the Union survey

might do a fine job of upper Administration, it seems like even we could go down some levels, and I did agree that that survey was a fine tool, short and sweet, I like that. And I also agree with Scott [Senator **Peters**] that privacy is a real concern. If you start—I mean, how would you like if individual comments from students were selected out and publically broadcast. I've had some students write some interesting things about me at least. [light laughter around] So, you know, and I think these are confidential, and we need to consider carefully who gets to see all results, either aggregate or individually.

Smith: Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: Well, first of all, it seems like I've heard discussion that there were some Administrators who wanted to make those teacher evaluations all public. [voices agreeing] And so, I agree that probably not having what some of the students say about you—I mean, what they would say would be embarrassing, but I, you know, I have great respect for Senator **Peters**, but I disagree categorically with him. I think that if we do these evaluations at a public institution of people who have stepped up to do public leadership, then their performance ought to be reviewable by all of us. That's just my feeling about it.

Smith: Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: Just a quickly to echo what Scott [Senator **Peters**] said. I think that short, annual survey, survey only, would be nice and then keep the same system for the big 5-year review.

Smith: Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: I think that I agree that the stature of importance of the President is slightly above, a couple of notches above, a professor in their classroom performance. A President is really the public face of this institution, so any sort of evaluation that we do of that sort of a figure, I think the public might truly want access to that. I mean, I think we're kind of comparing apples and oranges here. You know, what happens in my classroom in my class on

Tuesday versus what, you know, the public face of the University is doing and how we receive his performance I think are quite different.

Smith: Senator **Terlip**. Yes.

Terlip: Yeah. I agree that it should be a short sort of survey kind of thing, and I also agree it should be kept confidential. But I still think that we need—because the faculty is only one part of the President’s job. There are a lot of other things, and that could get misconstrued. I think that faculty being able to share that with the Board of Regents or whomever in confidence is another issue, but in terms of public release, I don’t think that’s probably the way to go. But I think if the trend that the group talked about where Presidents are changing every 3-5 years might be too long to wait to keep our existing procedures to 5 years. We may need to have sort of a mid-term review at 3 years or something like that where more information is gathered.

Smith: Professor **Gorton**.

Gorton: So I just want to clarify. My sense of it is that this will be up to the Central Committee and the Executive Board that our future surveys will probably be released, but that will have to be up to the Central Committee. And I actually think there’s a good reason for that. I think you can discipline management of Administrations to understand that, you know, “You are being watched. You will have—you will be held accountable, publically accountable, for your decisions on an annual basis.” This particular survey results—firstly, this is our first time down this path, and I agree 100%, and I supported it and recommended it, that this particular survey results not be public at this time, in the interest of quiet diplomacy; I will just say that. And that’s not to say that those results will not be released at another time, but on the whole, I would say, generally, my personal view is more in line with Senator **Strauss** on this. I think publicizing these results can help to empower the faculty, and I’m all about that.

Smith: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I think we have to consider if we're going to make public this information how it will be interpreted by the public, and it will not be interpreted favorably towards us. The public was—by and large the State of Iowa was highly favorably disposed towards Ben **Allen** and his actions. We disagreed heartily with that, but I encountered people in various meetings across the State who made it very clear that they were horrified—horrified at what we had done, horrified.

So I think we have to think about the, you know—the other piece is, what's the purpose of this evaluation? Is it to basically do what we do with student evals, which we all mostly hate and say they're kind of popularity contests? This person is popular with the faculty right now versus this person is not popular. Is it to provide constructive feedback so they can course correct in a meaningful way? And I don't see any reason to do an evaluation that's really meant to kind of take a public opinion poll or a faculty opinion poll about whether or not you like what the Administrator has done given the pieces of what you understand about the context they're working in.

I do think there is value in providing course correction information on a very consistent basis, which I would assume our faculty are—our Administrators have not gotten. Just like we get course correction information every semester we do faculty evals, but that's private. That's confidential. That's for me and my Department Head to deal with. It's not for me and you and the students who may take me and the parents who may know me to weigh in on it at that point. And I really think we will have a very hard time finding any Administrator who will come under a situation—a good Administrator who will come under a situation and be faced with tough decisions if they know every semester—every year they're going to get a faculty opinion, public faculty opinion poll taken of them and made public. I just [voice noting time]

Smith: Let me point out—right, let me point out we have passed 5:00 o'clock. If we want to extend this, we can. Is there a motion to extend for, say, 10 minutes?

Dolgener: Is there someone waiting for the room?

Smith: No, they got moved. [light laughter around] Do you want to extend for 10 minutes, or do we want to—we could table this, I believe, and come back to

MacLin: I move to extend for 5 minutes, because I think there's a couple more people that have their hands immediately raised and have something on their mind right now.

Smith: Ok, we got a motion to extend for 5 minutes. Second by Senator **Breitbach** [who indicated]. All in favor of extending—is that how that works?—"Aye?" [ayes heard all around] Ok, so we're extended for 5 minutes. And I'll go with Professor **Gorton**.

Gorton: I just want to say, largely in response to Senator **Heston's** comments that, you know—and you'll see when you get—when you see these results back—I mean, not all—some of the results were positive. I mean, faculty evaluate, I think, on a rational basis. We've been through an unusual period in the last year, but I think that what happens is that faculty respond positively to the Administrators who are behaving in a way that they support. So it's—and I don't think this is necessarily a deal that's going to be very negative necessarily.

Smith: Ok. Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I think we're, for the purposes of what I brought this forward to, we're kind of mixing two different things, unless we're deciding to dump this and go in some—obviously I wasn't bringing anything to talk about what the last survey was.

But there was at least one issue of whether or not we want to continue, which is very big, acting very professional, well-done. But the question that's very vague is what defines "upper Administration"? On a practical basis, it's been the President and the Provost. But the structure has changed somewhat since 1976, so one clarification that would be helpful is how far this goes down? Should it be dealing with the Associate Provosts, for example? Do we have somebody else? Or should we be specifying that

here are the two categories that this particular thing deals with, and that's not defined.

Smith: Any other discussion of this issue? Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: I want to comment in response to Senator **Heston**. First of all, I've heard the sentiment before many times that faculty need to be cautious about how they publically respond to circumstances on campus, and we've allowed it to tie our hands, and I think we need to move forward. Secondly, surveys have a formative and summative purpose—formative to improve and summative for the faculty to say, "We just don't think this person is up to that position." And so you have to decide which faculty survey you're going to do or if you're going to do both.

Heston: Would you do summative every year?

Terlip: Just very quickly, I mean, I think one of the things we want

Smith: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: is some influence coming out of this Policy, and information is power. I think saying we're going to always publicize it is crazy. I think we're going to always do it is what we need to be saying, and maybe there are times when we don't need to release it; maybe there are times when we do. I think we just need to have the information.

Smith: So I think we've used up our comments here, and I think what we need is a motion to table this. Do I have a motion to table? Second? Thank you. Moved by Senator **Dolgener**. Seconded by Senator **Ophus** [both who indicated] to table. All in favor of tabling, "Aye." [ayes heard all around].

ADJOURNMENT (5:07 p.m.)

Smith: Motion to adjourn? Motion by Senator **Walter**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes** [both who indicated amidst much commotion of preparations to leave by Senators]. Thank you all. Next week back in CME. Thank you.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 11/11/2013

Center for Multicultural Education (CME) 109AB

3:30 p.m.

Follows are 0 addenda to these Minutes.