

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
10/11/10 (3:16 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.)

Summary of the main points of the meeting is presented first, followed by the full transcription of the minutes

Summary of main points

1. By unanimous consent, the senate adopted an elaborated, re-arranged agenda
2. Courtesy announcements only from Chair **Wurtz** (no press being present and Provost **Gibson** and Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** being absent)
3. No minutes ready for approval
4. The following items were docketed from the calendar:

953 Consultative session, Associate Provost **Arthur**, et al., on the UNI Diversity Initiative, 11/29/10 at 3:45 p.m. (**Terlip / DeBerg**)

954 Consultative session, Chair of the Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council, Professor Eugene **Wallingford**, and UNI NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, and Chair of UNI Compliance Council, Anne **Woodrick**, on faculty oversight of the UNI athletics program, 12/13/10, 4:00 p.m. (**Soneson / DeBerg**)

955 Emeritus status request, Kathleen A. **Kerr**, School of HPELS, regular order (**DeBerg / Terlip**)

956 Emeritus status request, Janey L. **Montgomery**, Department of Teaching, regular order (**DeBerg / Terlip**)

957 Consultative session, Provost **Gibson**, on budget cuts for fall 2011, 10/25/10 at 3:45 p.m. (**Terlip / Marshall** [for Neuhaus])

958 Receive annual report from the Committee on Committees (committee elections and appointments for 2010-2011), regular order (**East / Marshall** [for Neuhaus])

5. Docketed items

951 Motion from Senators **DeBerg** and **Terlip** on forming a committee to work with the administration on protocols for future administrative changes that affect the integrity of the educational enterprise at UNI. **Passed.**

Adjournment

**TRANSCRIPTION OF THE FULL MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
10/11/10
1686**

PRESENT: Karen Breitbach, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Deborah Gallagher, Michael Lacari, Julie Lowell, Jerilyn Marshall (sitting in for Chris Neuhaus), Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Megan Balong, Gregory Bruess, Jeffrey Funderburk, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, James Jurgenson, Chris Neuhaus, Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:16 P.M.

Parliamentarian and Agenda

Wurtz announced that the minutes for several prior meetings are pending. Sherry Nuss has been hired to assist with administrative duties and was welcomed by the Senate. She will begin transcription of the tapes from the prior meetings as well as today's soon.

Parliamentarian **Swan** reminded Chair **Wurtz** that he brought a more formal Robert's Rules of Order agenda outline for adoption. **Wurtz**, **Lowell**, and **Swan** have met to rework this agenda format. **Wurtz** noted that although parliamentarians are typically mostly silent that **Swan** will initially offer many comments as to the constitution, bylaws, and Robert's Rules, as the group learns to work within the procedures, and that first of all will be a change in the agenda format, to conform to the requirements of the bylaws.

Swan passed out a hardcopy, 2-page sample of today's reworked agenda and explained the major points. **Swan** noted that this reworked agenda follows first the Faculty Constitution, then the Faculty Senate Bylaws, then Robert's Rules. **Swan** pointed out that the discussion of how to adopt this form of the agenda is printed at the end of page 2 of the handout and that the Senate members could adopt it by unanimous consent, which is typical for much normal business. He further elaborated about the procedure if there were to be an objection.

The new agenda format arranges the business in the order prescribed by the Senate Bylaws. It also describes what to do with the Minutes according to the Bylaws and Robert's Rules. It then goes through the calendar items for docketing and gives each item the proper designation. By way of an example, a request submitted to the Senate may not arrive in the form of a "consultative session" (Bylaws 7.13), but the Senate can supply that proper designation. He added further that the Bylaws provide for certain sessions with rules within the type of session and that in a consultative session no action or business can occur. The Senate can stipulate the amount of time for the consultative session, or anything, always a wise thing according to Robert's; an amount of time would be perhaps 25 minutes or 75 minutes, etc.

Parliamentarian **Swan** gave another example where the request may further stipulate the actual time, say 3:30 to 4:30, which is very typical in meetings such as these. That's how calls for the Orders of the Day happen. When the time occurs and someone calls for the Orders of the Day, the

group must move to that Order. Without stipulations as to the time, Orders of the Day cannot be profitably called.

Swan then discussed docketed times and what it means when something comes up as docketed. It is assumed that it is ready for action, for disposition. Example 951 shows the presumption that Senators **DeBerg** and **Terlip** are sponsoring this and that when the Chair comes to this and announces it, then the primary sponsor has the right to speak first, and then discussion occurs until it is voted on.

The example just prior, 999/958 near the top of page 2 of the handout, talks of scheduling for docketing the Committee on Committee's report. It refers the reader to the Senate Constitution 3.10 that states what was decided a long time ago about committee work. Committees dispose of actions, and the Senate simply receives their reports. And if the Senate receives the committee's report, then the committee actions stand. For instance, if the Committee on Committees has held elections, those members to those committees are elected, and the Senate simply receives the report, and those actions stand, unless a senator says, "I move to reverse/overturn X action." So, in summary, the actions of committees stand; the Senate receives it; it goes through; it's systematic; it's supposed to be smooth. The Senate delegates their authority to the committees. The Senate reviews them. The Senate gets their reports. Senators read their reports. If a problem is seen, then a Senator would notify the Chair ahead of time asking to challenge and reverse one of those decisions. Otherwise, the Senate just sets the schedule for docketing these reports. They go in order. The docketing is very important, because that is how the Senate tells the Faculty at large what is happening and when it is happening, so they know when to come. It's really good to stipulate a time, say 4:45 to be disposing of Docket #958. Sometimes it is not possible, but they can certainly have them in order.

The new format is really an elaborated and slightly rearranged agenda because **Swan** was asked, as the parliamentarian, to facilitate these matters beginning with this meeting and then going forward. Of course, the Chair controls the floor.

Wurtz stated that, if there is no objection, then the proposed agenda, an elaboration of the original agenda, will be the agenda for this meeting.

Wurtz recognized Senator **East** who said it is his understanding that the Senate docketed the Clifford **Highnam** request for emeritus status last meeting. **Wurtz** stated she cannot find where it was actually docketed, although it did appear on the agenda, so she wished to perhaps docket it twice rather than not at all. **Wurtz** asked if this served as an objection to the new agenda. **East** replied no.

Again, the Chair asked if any objections were to be heard about going to the proposed agenda. None were heard, so she declared that the meeting would continue with the new agenda format, an adoption by unanimous consent.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press were in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** did not attend today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** did not attend today.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Welcome to Sherry Nuss as the new Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate, and welcome to Jesse **Swan** as the Parliamentarian. She also reminded those in attendance that we all are going to have to learn how to do this.

BUSINESS

MINUTES

The Chair returned to the Minutes agenda item, as this is the new agenda order, and she again stated that as soon as they are available they will be circulated to the senators. After the senators have had an opportunity to look them over, then there will be the formal motion to approve, and then they will be posted for the faculty at large.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Chair **Wurtz** asked if anyone remembered if docketing of the **Highnam** request occurred last meeting. Senator **East** said yes, he has it in his notes. Therefore, it will be added retroactively this one time to today's agenda. **Swan** agreed to this retroactive action this one time.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1055 for Docket #953, a consultative session request from Associate Provost **Arthur** to address the Senate concerning the UNI Diversity Initiative. Senator **Terlip** moved to docket this item for the 11/29/10 meeting starting at 3:45. Senator **DeBerg** seconded that motion. Discussion clarified the reasoning for this date/time. Motion passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1056 for Docket #954, a consultative session request from the Chair of the Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council, Professor Eugene **Wallingford**, and a UNI NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, and Chair of the UNI Compliance Council, Anne **Woodrick** concerning faculty oversight of the UNI athletics program. Motion by **Terlip** to docket for 10/25/10 at 4:30. **DeBerg** seconded the motion. **Wurtz** called for discussion. **Smith** questioned the intent of the consultation. **Wurtz** replied that this was presented as a normal

routine and that they want to do this on a regular basis. **DeBerg** corrected the name of the council to the Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council. **Smith** asked for clarification of the reasoning for the time at 4:30. After discussion of time constraints on 10/25/10, **Terlip** withdrew her motion. **Soneson** moved to place this consultative session on the docket for 12/13/10. 2nd by **DeBerg**. Discussion included the time of 4:00. Motion passed as docketed on 12/13/10 at 4:00.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1057 for Docket #955, an Emeritus Status Request from Kathleen A. Kerr, School of HPELS, to be effective August 2010.

DeBerg moved to docket this request in regular order. 2nd by **Terlip**. Discussion of the merits called. Hearing none, vote called and passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1058 for Docket #956, an Emeritus Status Request from Janey L. Montgomery, Department of Teaching, to be effective 30 June 2010.

DeBerg moved to docket this request in regular order. 2nd by **Terlip**. Discussion of the merits called. Hearing none, vote called and passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1059 for Docket #957, a consultative session request from Provost Gibson on budget cuts for Fall 2011. Provost **Gibson** has requested specifically 10/25/10. **Terlip** moved to place this at the head of the docket on 10/25/10. Senator **Marshall** seconded the motion. Discussion was called for on the merits. Senator **Breitbach** asked that it be docketed 3:30 or 3:35 due to her teaching schedule and arrival time to Senate Faculty meetings. **Soneson** moved to amend the motion to have this session begin at 3:45. **DeBerg** seconded this amendment. Call for vote of the amendment; passed. Consideration returned to the original motion now of docketing on 10/25/10 at 3:45. **Terlip** was given the floor and called the question. Vote called; motion passed.

A consultation with Parliamentarian **Swan** occurred prior to continuing.

Consideration of Calendar Item 999 for Docket #958, to receive the Annual Report from the Committee on Committees (dated August 2010 and for 2010-2011).

Chair **Wurtz** asked for a motion to receive the Committee on Committees' report knowing that more work will occur on it later. **Terlip** explained that it was received and docketed at the last meeting, although minutes are not available yet for that meeting to verify this. Some remember this as so; some not. Some do not recall a docket number given, just a calendar number. Due to the differing memories and in an attempt to move to the new agenda format and Robert's Rules procedures adherence, the agenda for today will be amended to include this consideration.

Chair **Wurtz** called for a motion to docket the Committee on Committees' report. Discussion included **DeBerg's** clarification that the report to be docketed is titled "The 2010-2011 University Committee Memberships" document. **Wurtz** suggested that all senators look at this report on the Faculty Senate website under "Current Year" and "Reports," rather than an earlier memo. **East** moved to docket this in regular order. 2nd by **Marshall**. Vote called and motion passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 951, MOTION FROM **DEBERG** AND **TERLIP**

DeBerg spoke first, as is Robert's procedure. She explained that the basic idea came from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts Senate originally. The motion was revised in late August and is asking for a set of recommendations that the Senate will review, amend as it cares to, and then either vote up or vote down and send on to the President. The motion is calling for a group of people to work on a draft that will come to the Senate for their treatment one way or the other.

The floor was opened to discussion. **Terlip** added that the CHFA Senate sent this February of last year, and it was tabled until the end of the year and then brought from the table again, so this is something that has been around for a while.

Chair **Wurtz** called for further discussion. Senator **Breitbach** was recognized and stated that from her on-again off-again Senate participation that the UNI Administration's idea of "shared government" has been on a roller coaster ride. She feels that this motion would take us several steps closer to a shared understanding of shared government and better communication, so she is very much in favor of the motion.

Senator **Smith** was recognized and stated he believes that problems in the past were due to administrators not understanding what shared governance is, so they didn't really know what to do with problems in the past. Rather administrators basically chose to use their administrative prerogatives to do what they chose and perhaps felt that they were consulting but maybe selectively and maybe not adequately. He wondered about the effects of this motion. His concern with this from the start is that the Senate is an advisory body for something like this, meaning the Senate has no authority, so it seems somewhat ineffectual to offer this input. He would be more supportive if he had some reason to believe that it would actually have some impact, that it were going to do something substantive.

Senator **DeBerg** was recognized and stated that it is true that the Administration will take recommendations or not, as they are simply recommendations. But she feels that at least if there are a set of principles and guidelines offered and they are not followed, at least it is really clear what is happening on campus. She is in favor of letting the Administration know the expectations of a group of faculty in regard to certain matters, knowing that they may have an impact or not. It is important for the faculty to communicate what kinds of expectations it has for processes. If we do not have recommendations, then we have no basis for saying that we expected something different and that we believe we are right to have expected something different. She thinks making these kinds of things explicit is always healthy.

Vice Chair **Lowell** was recognized. She added that we cannot know what the recommendations are until the Committee gets together and talks about them. At this point we are not saying we are going to follow any recommendations at this point. We are just saying we need to look into this.

She thinks the faculty need to be more adamant about having their voices heard in general, so she supports the motion.

Senator **Soneson** was recognized. Upon reviewing the Constitution this year, he realized that one of the duties of the Senate is to make recommendations to the Administration. This is part of the Senate's and the Faculty's role.

Chair **Wurtz** interjected a question: Would the Senate be wise to take the time to amend this to include how that committee is going to be constituted? Right now it just lists a 3-member committee. It has not designated it as 3 senators or 3 people of the Senate's choosing, or who gets to choose. Would it be wise to consider having some amendment to this to include process?

Senator **Roth** was recognized. To mesh with the comments of **Soneson**, he agrees with the spirit of the motion and what it says should be happening, but the obviousness of it bothers him. "For appropriate communication and consultation," that is like a student saying to a professor "Well, come to work and teach." He supports the motion, but that is the catch for him.

Senator **Gallagher** was recognized. She acknowledged **Roth's** comments and wondered if the motion could move from the situation specific issue of the merger of Colleges to what has already been called an articulation and refinement of expectations about faculty involvement. Could it be broadened? Could it be some set of procedures or expectations? This could be more applicable if more broadly put because, agreeing with **Roth**, this could be seen as or may be interpreted as (although not true) retributational complaining about something rather than being more refined and articulate about the expectations.

Senator **Terlip** was recognized who stated that the actual motion is broad. The motion reads "any future merger, elimination, or significant reorganization of academics," so it encompasses a broad variety of things. More than that, budget cut discussions will occur next week, and this is going to be happening whether anything happened in the past or not. One of the potential outcomes of any budget cut is this, and she feels that the Senate should weigh in on how that should be communicated to faculty.

Senator **East** was recognized who suggested an ad hoc committee of the Senate where the Chair would ask for volunteers and receive them or not and, if insufficient volunteers, then appoint. He supported acting on the motion one way or the other.

Senator **Smith** was recognized and wondered if this motion is a direct response to the merger of the two Colleges, which might be due decision-making by a new Provost, or is the motion due more to a broader pattern where faculty feel there is a lack of what they see as appropriate consultation with the faculty on major administrative decisions, the administrators' prerogative, but nonetheless where there should be faculty input. If a pattern, then maybe the breadth that Senator **Gallagher** suggested makes sense. **Smith** suggested that if not a pattern but a one-time situation, then is not this just a response to something that may not occur again? Can someone argue for a pattern? he asked.

Chair **Wurtz** noted that from this point forward new points will be heard only.

Senator **DeBerg** was recognized. She stated she feels this merger decision came from the President not from the new Provost, and that bothers her. The handling of the communication may be due to the Provost but not the actual decision. The President told her that "this is how we did it at Iowa State." The President, who was not new, did this with no consultation, and perhaps it was the unhappy combination.

Wurtz asked for any other factors Senators wish to put before the Body as Senators make up their decision to vote for or against.

Senator **East** was recognized. Responding to **Smith**, he sees no pattern with respect to academic units, because those changes occur slowly and rarely on this campus. However, administrators here and elsewhere seem to have a pattern of making decisions without consulting those who are affected in a reasonable fashion. Yes, there is a pattern with respect to other things, but no one notices until there is a major decision affecting many. He feels that if administrators have recommendations, then they might consider asking for input in the future.

Senator **Roth** was recognized with a suggestion not a motion. He proposed drafting a formal memorandum to the President, not to censure his decision, but just saying the faculty are unhappy with how this was done point blank. Because, if this is viewed as a response, then it might be healthy to say we are unhappy with what happened here period. It could be done in a functional way.

Senator **Gallagher** was recognized, and she made a motion to amend the wording of the motion. This she read aloud.

Chair **Wurtz**, according to Robert's procedure, must read the amended wording as the motion. She stated: "We have a motion that we amend this so it reads, *'That the University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate appoint a 3-person ad hoc committee to draft, for Senate review and possible adoption, recommendations to the President for more effective communication and consultation processes with faculty.'*" After discussion with **Gallagher** to end the motion here, **Wurtz** called for a 2nd. Senator **VanWormer** seconded. Discussion on points about the merit of the amendment were called for.

Senator **Terlip** was recognized and stated that broadening the motion that much makes it meaningless and more just stating how we want the President to communicate. She stated that this was geared at those particular things which were of great interest to the faculty in her college, and she was Chair of the CHFA Senate when this was sent forward. Her College Senate sent letters forward as suggested today, and they were told that for a fact in governance that they needed to bring it to the Senate. Then they were told that it needed to be broader. Now that it has been broadened, it seems not to be what is needed either. She feels some faculty would still like to have the motion of how mergers take place clarified, because the consultation process is still not clear.

Chair **Wurtz** asked for more discussion on the merits of the proposed amendment. She recognized Senator **Smith** first and then Senator **DeBerg**. **Smith** stated that he did not feel that the two intents here were conflicting, that there could be specific language on mergers and reorganizing academic units and still include the broader issue of general consultation. So it could

still be stated in such a way as to satisfy **Terlip's** concern and also raise this issue of a general pattern or the broader issue.

DeBerg was recognized and stated that she felt it was easier for an ad hoc group to be more focused. It is extra work, and rather than having some think this group should focus on how to communicate about, say, student fees or academic advising or any of the many other concerns of faculty, she wants to see a more narrowly focused group.

Still debating the merits of the proposed amendment, **Smith** was recognized who stated that the group does not have to anticipate any administrative action that faculty would want communication on. It is just the boilerplate kind of thing. Faculty want to reaffirm the need for consultation, and then to talk about specifics on this, because what is received on this type of issue will not be different from other issues. The point is not to set up a specific procedure but to have general procedures that would apply in other situations as well. He feels the Administration will just ignore an "if/then" specific and simply give more consultation, which is what faculty are asking for.

Wurtz summarized that currently members are debating the merits of the proposal to change the wording of "appropriate" to "more effective" and also that the group is informally back to saying "for example" and including the list.

Senator **East** was recognized and then Senator **Terlip**. **East** noted that he would like to speak against the amendment, feeling that the point about the ad hoc committee needing a focus is valid. If the charge is for the committee to be done this fall yet, then that is useful and important. But also, if the Senate receives this, then it can act on it how it pleases and, in particular, language can be added that shows favor on consultation about any type of substantial reorganization or change in anything in particular as it relates to changing academic units. In other words, saying they see the kind of communication sought and knowing to apply it to other situations as well. Therefore, he speaks against the amendment.

Terlip stated that simply reaffirming that consultation is desired and letting the Administration decide the nature of the consultation, then this might as well be dropped. This motion is to give voice to what faculty would like the Administration to know. Whether they choose to accept that or not, the faculty cannot know. The Senate should be the definitional people. The Administration is free to turn it down.

Wurtz repeated the proposed amendment items and asked for any further discussion on the merits.

Senator **Terlip** was recognized who said she had no problem with changing "appropriate" to "more effective." She would just like to keep it focused. **Wurtz** replied that the vote will show this and asked for any further discussion on the merits of the amendment. Hearing none, she asked for all in favor of the amendment to change "appropriate" to "more effective" and to include specific circumstances in cases of, please say "Aye." Opposed? "No." Due to the closeness of the vote, Chair **Wurtz** asked for a show of hands. Those in favor were 7. Those in opposition were 5. Abstentions ? None.

Wurtz continued with the statement that the debate now continues on the amended motion. **DeBerg** was recognized asking for a reading of the current motion as amended.

Wurtz stated that the motion in front of the Senate now reads: *"That the University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate appoint a 3-person ad hoc committee to draft, for Senate review and possible adoption, recommendations to the President for more effective communication and consultation processes with faculty, specifically actions related to including future merger, elimination, or significant reorganization of academic units. The committee's recommendations should be consistent with national standards for shared governance, and be submitted to the Senate by the end of the fall semester 2010."* To further senators' understanding of the changes, the Administrative Assistant projected the motion on the large screen and inserted the changes.

Senator **Roth** was recognized who asked to make another small change from "more effective" to "more effective and engaging" communication. Chair **Wurtz** noted this new amendment to the motion. Senator **Gallagher** seconded. Discussion on the merits was called and **Wurtz** recognized **Roth** who feels it is important to give statements to the Administration that faculty were unhappy with the way communication has been but adding "engaging" gives a sense of cooperation without diminishing the strength of the motion.

Senator **Gallagher** was recognized and spoke in favor of this amendment by saying she felt it did not diminish the task of the ad hoc committee. It just gives room for other issues later and the possibility of **Roth's** idea about sending a letter.

Wurtz reviewed the amendment, saying two senators have spoken in favor of the amendment, and asked for any information which might raise questions as to its benefits. Hearing none, a vote was called for the amendment to include "and engaging" after "effective." With only 3 abstentions, the amendment passed.

Wurtz again read and clarified the motion verbally, and it was fixed on the projected screen. She called for debate on the merits of this motion. Hearing none, a vote was taken. Motion passed.

DOCKET 952, EMERITUS STATUS, HIGHNAM

Next on the Agenda was the Motion to Approve Faculty Emeritus Status for Clifford Highnam. **Soneson** moved to approve this motion. 2nd by **Gallagher**. Discussion of the merits of this recommendation called for. **Terlip** was recognized, and she indicated that she had comments to include in the minutes, but does not have them at this time. It was agreed that such comments may be included later. Vote called. Passed.

Wurtz declared a five-minute recess, to consult with the parliamentarian.

Wurtz called the senate back to order. The business for the day being accomplished, the chair declared the meeting adjourned.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss, Administrative Assistant, UNI Faculty Senate