

Special
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/02/12 (3:34 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.)
Mtg. #1713

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** offered comments regarding her decision to withdraw her application from consideration for the chancellor position at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, her alma mater. She cited two reasons: a personal reason and a professional reason. She also noted that she wants to work to develop a good working relationship with the UNI Faculty Senate. She feels her “consultation” role is not working well and has ideas for perhaps the relationship changing.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** was absent today.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that today and at upcoming meetings the report and recommendations of the ad hoc Bylaws Committee will be discussed.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included thanks to UNI students in their recent efforts to lobby for greater support for the State’s public universities and for greater funding from the Governor and Legislature. He also announced the recent formation of a small budget work group at the request of Vice-President Hager which will meet for the first time later this week. He went on to inform Senators that he has appointed Senator **Wurtz** as Chair of the Nominating Committee that was announced at the last meeting, and he encouraged Senators to volunteer to be nominated for next year’s office positions. He also announced that he will be speaking to NISG on Wednesday at their request. Then as a group the Senate chose to

meet Monday, April 30th, with President **Allen** and Provost **Gibson** for a Retreat to follow-up on recent conversations with both. And finally, he requested that dockets 1022, 1023, and 1024 be considered at the head of the docket today as they are Emeritus Requests and will go quickly.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for March 19, 2012, were amended by one name correction [**Edginton**]and then approved (**DeBerg/Edginton**).

Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for March 26, 2012, were tabled as they have not gone out yet to Senators for review.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1130 1026 Five Year Review of President **Allen**.

Motion to docket for April 23, 2012 (Bruess/DeBerg**). Passed.

1131 1027 Emeritus Status Request, Annette **Swann**, Teaching Department, effective 12/21/11.

Motion to docket in regular order (Terlip/Swan**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1125 1022 Request for Emeritus Status, Allen Rappaport, Department of Finance, effective 7/1/12

Motion to endorse request (Smith/Bruess**). Passed.

1126 1023 Request for Emeritus Status, Richard Colburn, Department of Art, effective 6/30/12

Motion to endorse request (Terlip/East**). Passed.

1127 1024 Request for Emeritus Status, David Walker, Department of History, effective 6/30/12

Motion to endorse request (Bruess/Swan**). Passed.

1119 1017 Report and Recommendations of the ad hoc Bylaws Committee regarding committee structure [see appended document on proposed amendments]

Motion to friendly amend Section 3 to read “chair or chairperson” in each instance it now reads “president” (Peters/DeBerg**). Accepted.

Motion to friendly amend to substitute the new language in 3.2.3 for the language that appears in the original proposal (Peters/Neuhaus**). Accepted.

Motion to friendly amend 6.5.2 to read that it is the Senate Secretary’s duty to append the annual report to the Bylaws (Peters/Neuhaus**). Accepted.

Motion to friendly amend Section 3 under Organization regarding extending the rising chair’s term by one year, if it’s due to expire, and his/her constituency not losing a Senator (DeBerg/Breitbach**). Accepted.

Motion to accept and approve the report and recommendations of the ad hoc Bylaws Committee, including today’s friendly amendments (DeBerg/Bruess**). Passed.

1120 1018 Motion to discharge the faculty Strategic Planning Committee

Motion to discharge Strategic Planning Committee (Peters/East**). Passed.

1121 1019 Motion to change the charge and membership of the Faculty

Senate Budget Committee

****Motion to change the charge and membership of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (Terlip/Bruess). Tabled until April 16, 2012.**

5. New Business

Senator **Terlip** will head an unnamed ad hoc committee to draft a response to President **Allen**'s letter to the AAUP and a possible letter to the HLC.

6. Adjournment

****Motion to adjourn at 5:05 p.m. (Breitbach/Edginton). Passed.**

Next meeting:

April 9, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April, 02, 2012
Mtg. 1713**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: James **Jurgenson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.: Ok, if I can call the meeting to order. It's nice to hear this cheerful conversation going on. That's a great thing.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Call for press identification. Where's Emily? I thought she was going to be here every time from now on. [no press present]

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** Just a couple of brief comments. I think you probably saw in the paper where I was selected as a finalist for my alma mater, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, for the chancellor position. I was very happy to have been selected as a finalist for that position. I did go for the interview last week, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday. I got back on Wednesday

and talked to a few people, thought about it, and I did withdraw my application, primarily for 2 reasons. One, when I applied for the position, I—I had hoped to get back closer to my family, and specifically closer to my mother. And so, with her passing, there was not the same sense of urgency to get home, although I still have family in the area and would like to get back there at some point. So that was the personal reason. The professional reason is that, you know, I—I—I—I have to resolve issues that are here at UNI, so I have to work harder, work smarter, work more collaboratively. I—I just believe that I can be a more effective leader for the campus, and that's what I want. That's what I desire. I would--you know, I—I've been thinking about a lot of things, and I think there's a difference—and maybe Jesse [**Swan**] you can correct me, if I'm wrong—there's a difference between working—and I'm—I asked—I pointed you out because of, you know, you're the English professor here [laughter around]—but I think there's a difference between “working together” effectively and “consulting.” You know, “consulting” isn't getting it. I—that's—what we need to do is to work together. And I come, I sit, I listen, I--you know, I have things to say occasionally, but I don't consider that “working together,” personally. So, you know, what—what I would like, Chair **Funderburk**, is to—you know, for you and the Senate to, maybe at our Retreat or before our Retreat, to think about—for me, it would be helpful to have a structure. And I'm not talking about this meeting. I'm talking about a “working meeting” or some other structure whereby we can really begin to work together, communicate more effectively. I--you know, I remember last—about this time last year, it was before we had the budget, and I—I—I asked for your help. I said, “You know, we don't know the numbers yet, but when we get the numbers, I really—you know, I really need your help this summer.” And—and a few of you volunteered and said, you know—“I'll, you know, I'll—I'll help. Just let me know.” And we kept waiting and waiting and waiting on the budget, and, you know—and we finally got the budget in June, and—and I did not follow up on it. And so that's why I'm saying for me it would be helpful if we had a mechanism like this by which we could—we can work together, whether that's monthly meetings or whatever. I'll leave that up to you and the Senators, but that's what I would like, and I just feel like the issues that—that we're facing are

not insurmountable. We all care about the University. We all care about our students, and we—so I'm making my pledge to do what I can to really promote a better working relationship with the Faculty Senate and with the new person (?) . I think that's it.

Funderburk: Thank you.

DeBerg: I have a question. Is it—are you open to some quest—a question? It's just about an update on the search for Library Dean. That's something we haven't gotten for a while, and I—I'm a little concerned about that. That's the only thing. I—I appreciate the sentiments that you just expressed, too, I wanted to say that, but I do have a question about the status of the Library Dean. I've been getting questions from my constituents about it.

Gibson: My understanding is that candidates will be brought in this month. That—and Mike [**Licari**] is not here, but that I think 4—I don't know if 2 or 3 members—but I think there are 4 candidates.

DeBerg: That's all I need to know. Thank you. It is moving forward, though? People were afraid that it had been stopped, so I

Gibson: No, it has not stopped.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Chair **Jurgenson** said he would not be able to be with us today. I also forgot at the top to say that when we speak today, please be loud. I understand from our audio people that it's more problematic today for some reason in this room, so if you can be as clear as possible in speaking.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: Vice-Chair **Breitbach**, any comments today?

Breitbach: The work that I have been doing throughout the year to try to—the Bylaws, the Committees—all of that is going to be docketed here within the next couple of meetings, so we are going to get some stuff done. I want to thank again the people that I’ve worked with: Chris [**Neuhaus**] and Scott [**Peters**] and Jesse [**Swan**] and the Committee on Committees. And it shall be coming before us in the next—today and in the next couple of meetings.

Funderburk: Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: I am much more verbose these days, so, of course, I have comments. [reading a prepared text]:

“On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I want to commend the students who organized and participated in the 2012 Regents United Day at the Statehouse in Des Moines. From all reports, the students did an excellent job of presenting themselves and did a good job in making legislators more aware of the importance of public support for the State’s public universities.

“Thanks also to the students who will be in a rally today at Iowa State Fairgrounds to highlight the need for more state funding for Iowa’s public universities. Attendance by Gov. Branstad and some State legislators, as well as alumni from the three Regents Universities, is anticipated.”

[An aside—I think these are great examples of students getting involved and trying to work in a collaborative fashion and to help the University. So we want to celebrate that as well. I also want to announce that]

[reading again] “UNI Vice President for Finance, Michael **Hager**, approached me about forming a small committee to consider the budgeting process here at UNI. We discussed the fact that currently there is a petition before the Faculty Senate to restructure the Senate’s Budget Committee and, assuming passage, the new group would not be immediately available. Together we came up with a small list of names to begin what is anticipated to be an ongoing discussion. This budget work group will meet for the first time later this week. At the moment, the group includes: VP Michael **Hager**, Bruce **Rieks** (Budget System Development & Reporting Director), Hans **Isakson**, Scott **Peters**, and myself [Jeff **Funderburk**].”

Another announcement also in that last time[reading] “I announced the members of the Nominating Committee, so I had asked Senator **Wurtz** if she would be kind enough to kind of spearhead getting that group together to kind of note who our nominees are for leadership for next year. So as she contacts those members of the Nominating Committee, that’s at my request. So please come up with great, energetic people, and feel free to contact her directly to volunteer to be one of those great and energetic people. (light laughter)

“I also received the request Friday and confirmed today to present to the NISG Senate this week, so I’ll be going to speak with them and have asked Scott [**Peters**] if he can work that into his schedule to go with me on Wednesday night. So you can follow the twitter account until they run out of tweet allotment and stop abruptly as they did last week.”

Breitbach: What time is that?

Funderburk: That is at 7:00 o’clock in this room [University Room] on Wednesday night.

Terlip: Is it open to the public?

Funderburk: My understanding is, yes, it is open. So, please come and cheer me on.

Now after—this is now with regards to that retreat, [reading once again] “After checking with President **Allen** and Provost **Gibson**, we seem to have

two choices for a senate retreat. Either Saturday morning April 28 or Monday, April 30, at 3:30, that would be the Monday of exam week at our normal time. Those are the options that seem to be available. I can either send a note via the Senators mailing list to poll everyone for their availability unless you already know and wish to resolve this now. What is your pleasure?" Shall we do it now or via e-mail?

Wurtz: Question?

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**, yes.

Wurtz: My college has already elected my replacement. I'm happy to attend. I'm happy to let that person know, or do you want both of us?

Funderburk: My personal thought would be that if—if both can be there, it would good, to give both continuity and the chance to have a jump start. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Is this the Senate's Summer Retreat? Is this what we usually do. I don't—or is this a—a new thing. I—I just don't remember when we met in Summer.

Funderburk: This would—I don't know what this would be to be honest. This would be yet another retreat.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok. Fair enough.

Funderburk: It's not—the intent really is to follow up on what the Provost has said and also follow up on our discussion with President **Allen**. The next question I'm going to have would be "Are we burned out, or are we going to have yet another retreat as well?" Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Historically to add to that, the Senate has for many years had a Fall Retreat. It was before the semester began. And I believe last year was the first time that we inaugurated a Spring Retreat, wrap it up, get ready

because we knew the Summer was likely to be difficult. It was a launching to be ready for the Summer, but even then we intended that there would still be a Fall Retreat.

DeBerg: Thank you, **Susan**.

Funderburk: So, do we have a strong feeling that we want to do this via e-mail, or do we just want to decide now?

Dolgener: Do you suspect it would be how long?

Funderburk: I think that, if I understood the e-mail correct from Pat [Waelber] that if it's Monday, it's basically just the Senate time, the regular 3:30 to 5:00. And I'm assuming if it would be Saturday morning, it's probably about 2 hours that we'd block.

Breitbach: I—I would like to request that we do it on a day when we're all here so that those of us who live far off campus don't have to make a separate trip. [voices agreeing and discussing] So I'm voting for Monday.

Funderburk: Anybody opposed to having it on our Monday? [voices on both sides] I'm guessing that we will have some people unable to attend regardless of the day, so is one day better than the other? [Monday indicated by some] Ok? Well, then I'll—I'll write it down as Monday, the 30th and send a note confirming that to all.

Roth: Would it have been the Saturday previous to that Monday?

Funderburk: It would have been, right. So it's either the Saturday before exams or the Monday of exams, neither of which is terrific, but

Swan: So we have—you have decided?

Funderburk: Well, it sounded like we just did. I felt like Monday the 30th was preferred. 3:30

Breitbach: I decided.

Funderburk: Place to be announced, once we have it arranged. I want to throw out two possible items. If we get that far today to having New Business, and it's not on the docket, but it's items I want to consider under New Business. Should the Senate form an ad hoc committee to consider and draft the following: a letter to the HLC and/or Senate response to President **Allen's** letter to AAUP. So, if we get that far, and someone wishes to take that up, that would be the time I would suggest for discussion on that, under New Business.

Last, to today, I would like to request that we take the Agenda items out of order and dispense with docket items 1022, 1023, 1024, all of which are Emeritus Requests. If we can do those at the top of the Agenda and get that done, just in case we don't get through the other things. [head nods around] I will assume that that is consent to do that.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Ok, now, moving on to approval of the Minutes of March 19th. Were there any corrections offered? [**Nuss** indicates none came via e-mail.]

Edginton: I had a correction. In the section where I was talking about Inter-collegiate Athletics, Iradge **Ahrabi-Fard's** name was mentioned, and it was not—something else was there.

Nuss: Yes, I didn't know what it was. Can you spell it for me?

Edginton: **Iradge.** Let me just get it to you. [laughter around] I can probably spell it, but

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**

DeBerg: Well, I move the approval of the Minutes with Chris **Edginton's** name spelling correction understood.

Edginton: Second.

Funderburk: Second by Senator **Edginton**. All those in favor? [ayes all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Now the Minutes of March 26th, last week's Minutes. Were there any corrections on that one?

Nuss: They haven't gone out.

Funderburk: They haven't gone out? Ok. Because I've been sitting on them, so we'll need to table that. I have my copy. [to Provost] Do you have your copy?

Gibson: I don't know.

Funderburk: Ok, I'll ask Pat [**Woelber**] to make sure.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1130 for Docket #1026, Five Year Review of President **Allen** (request docketing for April 23).

Funderburk: Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. Calendar 1130 is the Five Year Review of President **Allen**. The requested docketing is April 23rd on that presentation. It will be our last regular meeting. Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Move that we docket it in that time slot.

Funderburk: Do we have a second?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **DeBerg**.

Swan: I have a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So I'm just looking at this item online, because it says we are going to approve a summary of the report or something to that effect.

Funderburk: That would be "receiving" the report.

Swan: That's right. Fine. So, when this comes up at docketing, will we get a copy of that report?

Funderburk: Right. The Committee, because of all the things that have gone and the crunch of getting things through, we figured out that the soonest we could get the thing ready was the 16th, so then we'd have it on there for a week. And with the way things are going, I'd like to put it up there so we'd have a placeholder for our presentation.

Swan: Oh, so it will be added so that we can access it?

Funderburk: That's the intent.

Swan: Will we be alerted when that happens?

Funderburk: Yes.

Swan: Ok.

Funderburk: The biggest thing with the way things are going, we didn't want to not have a place in the docket after we got it all finished. Any other discussion? All those in favor of docketing on the 23rd, say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard]

Consideration of Calendar Item 1131 for Docket #1027, an Emeritus Status Request from Annette **Swann**, Teaching Department, effective 12/21/11.

Funderburk: Calendar 1131 is an Emeritus Status Request from Annette **Swann**, Teacher—Teaching Department. Motion to docket?

Terlip: Move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**, regular order. Is there a second?

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Swan**. Any discussion? All those in favor of docketing in regular order, say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Very good.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1022, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, ALLEN **RAPPAPORT**,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, EFFECTIVE 7/1/12

Funderburk: Ok, so the next item up then will be docket item 1022, Request for Emeritus Status for Allen **Rappaport**, Department of Finance. Is there a motion to bring it? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Move to approve emeritus status here.

Funderburk: Approve or recommend.

Male voice: “Endorse.”

Funderburk: Senator **Smith** and Senator **Bruess**, second. Discussion or presentation? All those in favor, “aye”? [ayes heard all around] Those opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Ok.

DOCKET #1023, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, RICHARD **COLBURN**,
DEPARTMENT OF ART, EFFECTIVE 6/30/12

Funderburk: 1023, Request for Emeritus Status for Richard **Colburn**,
Department of Art. Motion?

Terlip: I move.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

East: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **East**. Discussion or presentation? All those in favor

Breitbach: I have a quick comment. [laughter as voting had sporadically begun] You know, there are some—there are some professors, and I’ve had their children in the Laboratory School, and so I know them as awesome parents. And they were also awesome professors because they really cared about how they interact with the students. Sort of a—he was—he was both an awesome professor; I heard the students talk about him. And he was an awesome parent with his kids. So

Terlip: I would also add that he did great service for the College of Humanities and Fine Arts and was a leader over there, and that should be greatly appreciated for all the time he put in.

DeBerg: And I would like to add for the Minutes that he is a world-class photographer. I don’t want to forget his creative work. [voices agreeing]

He—he really was a leader in the Art Department for many years on the fine work that the faculty produced as artists themselves. So

Funderburk: Ok. All those in favor, “aye”? [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Passes.

DOCKET #1024, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DAVID **WALKER**,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, EFFECTIVE 6/30/12

Funderburk: Docket 1024, Request for Emeritus Status from David **Walker**, Department of History. I also wish to note that NISG passed a very nice resolution commending Dr. Walker for his years of service and forwarded the resolution along to us. So, is there a motion? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated].

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Swan**. Discussion or presentation? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I would like to say a few words. **David** is completing his 37th year at the University of Northern Iowa. He came to us owing to some unfortunate economic problems at the University—the Minnesota State University System in 1975. He was at Mankato State, and they cut back, and so he came to the University here starting that year. His area of expertise is the American West. He wrote a book about the iron range or as we say in Minnesota, “The Range,” and that was a work. And then he also did a nice work on the Western Territorial Governors in the 19th Century. He was, of course, as you’ve already mentioned, a fantastic teacher. His courses on the American West, Native America, were always oversubscribed. There was always a Waiting List to get into those courses. And, in particular, he was—he always offered a junior-senior seminar in our Department, and is perhaps his—the most popular one was the Lewis and Clark Expedition, which once again we limit that at 15, and so that was a

problem trying—trying to—he would cover all those particular students. He received the Regent’s Award for Faculty Excellence in 2009 and has been on phase..... [to Provost **Gibson**] Are there any more of those 5-year phased available? [laughter all around as she shakes her head] Well, he’s—this—he is, I think, one of the last of the 5-year phased individuals. So this will be the end of his career, and he has had a fantastic career.

Neuhaus: I would just echo that if we had “honorary librarian” positions, he would have got one. He was in there all the time. And he really helped me and some of the others sort of pioneer the use of Google books a number of years back. That History of the West really became something special. Once that was available, we could bring that to bear as well. He was very open to those sorts of changes and experimenting, so he will be sorely missed.

Bruess: I also wanted to add one more thing. Many of you probably didn’t know him from the History Department, but as the Associate Dean in the Graduate College position he held for a long time.

Edginton: If I could comment, too. David interviewed me when I came here as part of the interview process, and I was moving funds from the University of Oregon to Northern Iowa. \$450,000, something like that. And he was very, very supportive of enabling that process to take place and doing it with great ease, so I—I really appreciated the counseling he provided to me.

Funderburk: I could also say that as a junior faculty member, he was terrifically helpful to me in the days when we would actually have these \$500 research awards. [laughter all around and voices commenting] Only those of us with little hair left remember those days. He was very helpful in instructing new faculty and teaching the ropes, so I really appreciate that. Any additional? All those in favor? [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Very good.

DOCKET 1017, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC BYLAWS COMMITTEE REGARDING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Funderburk: Ok, so back to the top of the docket now. Docket 1017, Report and Recommendations of the ad hoc Bylaws Committee regarding committee structure. Motion to accept and approve.

DeBerg: I so move.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Senator **Bruess**, I see you [who indicated a second]. Discussion? Or is there presentation from the Committee?
Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Ok. Some of you may recall that two weeks ago or so I sent around an e-mail that gave that there were some changes to the amendments—some amendments to the proposed amendments. [see appended document to these Minutes/Transcript]

We, or our Committee, thought we had an agreement with the Committee on Committees in terms of putting the Vice-Chair in as Chair of the Committee on Committees. But when the Committee on Committees saw the final language, they objected to that, and so our Committee decided to accommodate their objections. Rather than—rather than putting it up for re-docketing and going through the whole process again, we felt that the easiest way to do this would be immediately move to amend our proposal. So, I have actually 3 movement —3 motions, sorry, for amendments.

The first is a mistake that I made when I drafted the resolution. I used the word “president” instead of “chairperson,” because I looked at the language from another Bylaw, so my first motion would be to amend the recommendations so that all instances of “president” in Section 3 will read “chair or chairperson.”

Funderburk: Is that offered as a friendly amendment then?

DeBerg: I second that amen—was that a motion to amend?

Peters: Yes.

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Ok, second by **DeBerg**. And it's a friendly amendment which is to just put it through or we can vote on it now. Who actually made the amendment [sic, motion]? In this case, you [indicating **DeBerg**]. Senator **DeBerg**, you actually made the amendment—I mean made the motion.

Bruess: She made the motion.

DeBerg: Ok.

Funderburk: Do you accept it as a friendly amendment? Would you do that for us? (?)

DeBerg: Oh, yes. Ok. Sure. I get it.

Funderburk: And the second? Senator **Bruess**?

Bruess: Uh huh, yeah.

Funderburk: Ok, so for the second amendment then.

Peters: This is the language that the Committee on Committees objected to the original language. You can see [on the projected screen] at the bottom on the table labeled “Docketed Proposal.” Our proposal was originally to insert the Vice-Chair of the Senate as the Chair of the Committees. The new proposal proposed 3.2.3 would be to “serve as a non-voting member of the Committee on Committees” but to give the Vice-

Chair “the power to convene the committee and appoint an administrative assistant to assist in the coordination and communication of the committee’s activities.” So I would move to amend to substitute that language 3.2.3 for the language that appears in the original proposal.

Funderburk: There’s a motion. Is there a second? Second from Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated].

DeBerg: I just have a question. What is the language of the original proposal? I’m having trouble following this.

Peters: The document’s proposed language is to the left. The change I’m recommending now is to the right.

DeBerg: Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: She [indicating **Wurtz**] was first.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator **Wurtz** and then Senator **Breitbach**.

Wurtz: I’m curious. On your “administrative assistant,” that’s going to be a “Sherry” for the Committee on Committees?

Peters: Actually, this was something that came out of discussion I think that maybe Jeff [**Funderburk**] and Karen [**Breitbach**] had with the Committee on Committees and Associate Provost **Licari**, I think? Or maybe Associate Provost **Arthur**. And so the thought was that someone working in the Provost’s Office would be able to help coordinate the Committee on Committees’ work, report the results of elections, help the Committee on Committees track the different College elections, gather the information, and report it back to the Senate.

Funderburk: Can I comment on that specifically? The person currently that we're talking about is the one who has to collate the data also for the Faculty Roster anyway, and so a lot of this information is not—this position already is in touch with the people who did the election. What we discovered last Summer is we have no process for reporting elections on campus, so this is hopefully a way to be able to address this problem by someone who is here all year round and who has direct contacts with the folks who actually run the elections

Wurtz: Yes, and I would add absolute support for that. That the ability to do that administrative work is not something the faculty is going to be in a position to do and do well, so, yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**

Breitbach: You—the two of you just said it for me. Thank you.

Funderburk: Is there any other discussion on that amendment? Do we wish to do that as a friendly amendment, or do we need to vote on that one specifically?

DeBerg: I would accept it as a friendly amendment.

Funderburk: Yes. Senator **Bruess**? [who indicated affirmatively] Ok. Excellent and well-accomplished.

Peters: And the 3rd amendment, there was the—the original language in the proposal comes at the end of the description of the Committee on Committees' job and said, "This report shall be appended [to these Bylaws]." The language explains that the report that the Committee on Committees issues every year shall be appended to the Bylaws and made available where the Bylaws are made available. This is so that we can have one place that everybody knows this is where you go to find out who's currently on all the committees. The Committee on Committees did not think this was necessary because their report is already given to the Senate,

and therefore people should just be able to look it up on the Senate's website. But we felt that it was nice—it would be nice to have this report in one place where everybody could always find it. So the amendment I'm proposing tries to make it clearer that it's not the Committee on Committees job to append this report to the Bylaws. It shall be the Senate's job to do that; the Secretary to the Senate shall do that. So the proposed amend will be to change the final section of proposed 6.5.2 to read, "The Secretary of the Senate shall append this report to these Bylaws."

Funderburk: Ok. So that's the motion. With a second we will have some discussion. I see interest in discussing it. Is there a second for this amendment?

Neuhaus: Sure.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **Neuhaus**. Then, Senator **East**, you had a question or a comment?

East: Yeah, I was curious as to why you chose the Secretary to do the—the—I mean, if—if the Vice-Chair is an ad hoc, ongoing member of the Committee, it seems like it would be reasonable for the Vice-Chair to sort of do that.

Peters: That's a very good point. [light laughter around] I was thinking of it in terms of the—the Secretary's duties in terms of keeping the records of the Senate straight.

East: And that may be the most appropriate for this.

Peters: I was thinking of it in that sense, but

East: Yeah, that may be most appropriate.

Funderburk: Do we have other questions or discussion on that one. Is it acceptable as a friendly amendment as well?

DeBerg: I would accept either as a friendly amendment. [laughter around] It can be the Secretary of the Senate or the Vice-Chair of the Senate. So I guess it would be whatever you would like—whatever you all would like as the friendly amendment.

Terlip: Yeah, again, I assume this doesn't preclude the fact that those memberships are listed in other places and it will be linked or something? [**Peters** nodding.] Ok. That this is not the only place it's going to be.

Peters: Right. But at least it's a place that everybody knows this is the current list.

DeBerg: That's a good idea.

Terlip: But—but making sure those links work will be critical, or we'll have confusion again.

Funderburk: Well, currently having a list anyplace will be an improvement. [laughter around] Any other discussion? I think that was accepted friendly amendments, so those are the 3 amendments you have?

DeBerg: And which version of the 3rd, is the Vice-Chair or the Secretary that we're going with? My only question is, does the—will the Vice-Chair have the same facil—will the Vice-Chair have the same expertise with the website as the Secretary does?

Funderburk: Likely not. Currently, the Secretary doesn't have access to the website, but that's also part of the changes. Now, we'll actually have the Secretary duties assigned. But going forward we do see that as

DeBerg: Ok. Well, my—I guess my concern is that whoever does this should be the one it's easier for, who doesn't have to learn the website and

whatnot just to add this one report, which makes me kind of want to stay with the Secretary.

Funderburk: Ok. Other discussion? Is there other discussion then on the complete petition as amended? Are we ready to vote on this? No other comments, questions? A lot of—there's a lot of verbiage there.

Peters: Yeah, there's a lot of different proposals.

Terlip: I—I have a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: In the first part where "...the president's service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term, it shall be extended," I guess I have some concerns about that. I don't—I think that sort of usurps some power from the constituents by automatically making that extension. So I guess I was curious why it was added.

Peters: Could you just remind me what section that is? I'm sorry.

Terlip: In Section 3 under Organization. It's the very first part. [see the appended document to this transcript]

Peters: Oh, yeah, I just scrolled too far. Then, ok. So we had talked about a number of different options in our Committee. One option was actually that, I think, Jesse [**Swan**] recommended--and honestly I have no recollection of why we went with this particular option. But one option that Jesse [**Swan**] recommended was that if someone would be set to come up as president [sic, chair] but their term would otherwise end, then they would be able to—their term would be extended and their College would still get to replace that person. So, we could—you know, we could alter the language slightly to do that as well. Honestly, this is the language in terms of the—the Vice-Chair's seating as Chair. The language I took was I think from Iowa's Bylaws, and—and they had it this way, and I think I just sort of

left it that way. But it wasn't anything intentional in terms of forestalling representation certainly.

Funderburk: I think I have Senator **Breitbach** and then Senator **DeBerg**.

Breitbach: We did that because we—we didn't want to limit the pool of Senators. We then could nominate somebody to become the Vice-Chair and then become Chair, and we also didn't want to limit the representation, because the Chair is a non-voting member, so it would—we—we just felt that was the best way to go. And we did discuss a lot of different options and settled on this one as the best one for continuity and, you know, consistency.

Funderburk: I will comment that I also talked with the Iowa State people. That's—it's not—when I talked to the President-elect and the President, it was not clear to them that there was a requirement that they be on the Senate to be the President of the Senate, because they had extended terms as well. And so this is not unusual for our Sister Institutions.

Terlip: It—I guess it just troubled me because it sounded like it was this automatic extension.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**, and then we'll get back to you. Senator **DeBerg**

DeBerg: Yeah, it seems to me that this isn't promising every Chairperson a 4th year. This is for—I think if we said, "if the rising Chairperson's service in the Senate would otherwise end...." I mean, it's—it's only if the vice-president [sic, vice-chair] is in his or her final year that we'd have to grant them another year.

Terlip: Yeah. Exactly.

DeBerg: It's not that every president [sic, chair] gets a 4th year automatically, so we—I mean, think that's the—we want to work on wording that says that, right? Isn't that the intention?

Breitbach: Yes, that was the intention.

Peters: So if the—if the Chairperson's service—if the new Chairperson

DeBerg: Rising.

Peters: Incoming? Or rising?

Breitbach: I liked your wording of "rising." Rising. That's—that's a good word.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: My concern was not with keeping that person on as Chair and non-voting and leading the Senate. My concern was with the College Senate not getting to re—put another person on who would vote for them.

Breitbach: But they will.

Terlip: It doesn't say that.

Peters: We don't—yeah, we don't specifically say that, so if—if we want to do that,

Terlip: So, we need an amendment

Peters: we would need an amendment that would add an additional sentence that would say

Breitbach: Add—add an additional sentence that says that they—that they will be replaced.

Funderburk: I will point out that that's no different than how it currently is, for what it's worth.

Neuhaus: Right. I mean, it's

Funderburk: CHAS has one less vote because I Chair. Senator—Senator **East**. He had his hand up before that, and then Senator **DeBerg**.

East: I would like us to consider yet another alternative to the Chair of the Senate and that is that—that—that the Chair of the Faculty chair the Senate. I think, we—at our last meeting, it was discovered or noted that there is some confusion at other institutions about our having two representatives of the faculty, the Senate Chair and the Faculty Chair. That that has created confusion it creates with who they might to talk with or should talk with. It's created, I think, some confusion locally in addition. Finally, it—it robs someone of a vote. The fact that a Senator, representing a College or a constituency, is not allowed to vote except in cases of ties robs that particular constituency of a vote on the Senate. Whereas, if we were to have the Faculty Chair serve as Chair of the Senate, we would solve the problem of confusion as to who represents the Faculty Body—well, two of the—the non—the faculty that is not the UF representative—representation—that there is only one person. So it seems to me the cutting down from 3 people representing the—leading the faculty to 2 people leading the faculty would—should cut confusion substantially. And I think some of you know that this was attempted—an attempted change, I think, 8 or 10 years ago and was voted down, but I think if the Senate proposes it and notes that there have been problems, some confusion about who the Regents or faculty at other univ—the Faculty Senates at other Universities--faculty representatives at other Universities should converse with, that perhaps the faculty would allow that kind of change to be made this time.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Two things. That was actually the focus of that Spring Retreat, and then when we actually got to the next year, we had other things that ended up not doing that. You are right that that is going to take a Constitutional change, and it was discussed, and there was no interest at that time for calling the faculty together to create a Constitutional change. The one piece that I think maybe doesn't make—or the one piece that I think makes sense perhaps that we have both positions is the fact that we as a Senate can set aside a faculty vote and force the faculty to come back together and re-vote and reaffirm that. Now, I don't know that that's ever been used, but it was built into the system that that was possible. It does also create a venue whereby faculty as a whole can ride herd on us as a Senate. That the faculty can go to a non-Senate member, to the Chair of the Faculty, and say, "Would you call a meeting because we're not real happy with where our Senate's going?" So we would be losing that balancing back and forth. I happen to think we'd do just fine losing it, that we could build other things in, but we do need to acknowledge that that was the intent of having this dual leadership.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I—you know, I'm sort of pondering this. There's some pluses and minuses on both of these. I—I suppose the idea if we were to go the route you're suggesting, Phil [**East**], would be that the Vice-Chair would be the Vice and these both would be faculty-elected folks. And the reason I—I guess I would suggest that part of what we want and part of what we're trying to get at here is this idea—it's very common in a lot of organizations—is to have that Vice-Chair go through a year knowing that they're going to be in that chair the next position and learning that sort of thing. It's, I think, something that's at—at times been a bit, well, I think Chair **Funderburk** has said that he wouldn't have minded having that, and I think—think others as well. It's—it's a learning period. You get to play with some of the problems. You understand them a little bit better. You're—you're a bit more prepared. It could be done, you know. We could say Vice-Chair and Chair both elected by faculty with that knowledge that they're going to proceed, but it's—it's—and I suppose if we went that

route, that would be the—the way that I—I would encourage it to go. To have that—that person in the wings, knowing that they're the rising Chair as it were.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: The whichever, if the Vice-Chair automatically succeeds, could the Committee talk—did you have a discussion about what if you had somebody really good who wanted to do it for 2 years? That couldn't happen under this model. Was there any discussion of the pros and the cons of that?

Peters: I remember talking about that at one point. I think there—there was one meeting that I missed, and I think it was the meeting maybe when the other two members of the Committee kind of settled on the Vice-Chair—the Vice-Chair's succeeding as Senate Chair the following year. I don't know if they talked about that issue at that meeting. I know we did talk about it at some point. I know we talked a little bit about it might be harder to find people willing to do the Vice-Chair, if you have—if you're committing to 2—2—effectively committing to 2 years of service. And this does, as you point out, effectively put term limits on the service as Chair, but I think our sense that, at least for the discussions that I was present at, was that the—the—kind of the learning curve argument weighed—outweighed those other negatives.

Funderburk: Other comments on that or responses or other questions? I haven't heard an amendment that we are capable of making here with this. So Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I—I would like to at least make an amendment to clarify the language in the—in the paragraph that's in bigger font than the other. Is that appropriate at this point in the discussion? Ok, so the language that I would like to suggest is this: "If the rising chairperson's service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as vice-

chair, it shall be automatically—the term shall be automatically extended one year.”

Breitbach: Can I?

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: I also want to add a sentence that we would—that there would still be a regular election for a representative so that the cycle within that College is not disrupted.

DeBerg: Yeah, and how would you like to word that one? I—I wasn’t all over that one.

Breitbach: I was going to ask you.

[Several voices offering suggestions and discussion back and forth.]

Final choice: Such extension would not replace the normal election cycle for a new Senator from the Vice-Chair’s constituency.

Funderburk: That was a motion. Is there a second for that? Senator **Breitbach** do you want to second?

Breitbach: Yeah, I’ll second.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach** has seconded. I’m guess that we—do we want to discuss it further? Are we in agreement at that point that we will accept a friendly amendment? Seeing as how the [several voice overlapping]

DeBerg: So here—here’s what I have because we added a line, so: “If the rising chairperson’s service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as vice-president [sic, vice-chair], the term shall be automatically extended for one year. Such extension would not

replace the normal election cycle for a new Senator from the vice-chair's constituency." Good.

Funderburk: Sounds good. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I—I mean, I think the amendment's fine, especially the clarification of completing his or her term as vice-chair, which is absolutely what it should have read in the first place, so thank you. I would just say that as far as the—not disrupting the normal cycle portion of it, as—as Chair **Funderburk** has pointed out, this would just be the same as—as it is right now, that the College effectively doesn't have a vote, the difference being that if they don't like that person's service, I guess, they—they can't get rid of them. That's the biggest difference, is that they have to keep them on the Senate one—one year longer. You know, the Chair could always vote, right? I mean, you could cast a vote on things, if you wanted to.

Funderburk: There are times I could.

Peters: You could at certain times.

Funderburk: I will note that I see the distinct advantage with this.

Peters: Yeah, that's a good point. So, I think it's a good amendment.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I think it's a good amendment, too. I'm just saying this for clarity's sake. In that exceptional eventuality that the Chair extends by one year, and then we elect someone from her College to be—that College will have 2 votes possible. The Chair can vote, typically doesn't, does it to break a tie, as he chooses to, anything like that. So we just have to know that—I think it's a good thing to do, so I'm not—I'm just so everyone knows in that one-year exception, that one College or constituency will have potentially an extra vote.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: And I don't think that's a problem,

Swan: I don't either.

Wurtz: because if we keep reminding ourselves that we come from a constituency, and we bring the insights that we gain from living in that spot--that, if you don't live there, you don't know about it--but we so clearly—at least as we're currently charged in our documents—do not represent them in terms of counting constituencies. So that really shouldn't be a problem. I think you're right.

Neuhaus: Just a—just a

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Just a—could you repeat that—that ending that you have there one more time?

DeBerg: The last sentence?

Neuhaus: Yeah.

DeBerg: “Such extension would replace”—“Such extension would not replace the normal election cycle for a new Senator from the vice-chair's constituency.”

Funderburk: Ok. Are we all happy with that language? Is it accepted as a friendly amendment then from the original motion? [both motioner and seconder responded in the affirmative with nods] Ok. Very good. Are there any other items in this portion? Ok, I'll assume then we're ready to vote? All those in favor of accepting the recommendations

Breitbach: Phil [**East**] has a comment.

Funderburk: Phil, did you have—Senator **East**?

East: Yeah. Punitively (?) this doesn't actually say where the Chair and Vice-Chair come from, does it? Does it say that they're both selected from this—oh, it does. "Normally the nominations will be made from the nominating committee," so if—if I wish to—if I would need to amend where the—where they're selected from. Ok. Thank you.

Funderburk: All right? All those in favor then of accepting the report and recommendations from the ad hoc Bylaws Committee as amended, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [1 heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Motion carries.

Wurtz: I thought of one question.

Funderburk: Yes.

Wurtz: Is it the Senate's wish, having passed these Bylaws, that the Nominating Committee should at this point come up with a slate that designa—that recommends or whatever the term is—a Chair for next year and a Vice-Chair for next year with the understanding that that Vice-Chair will be the first one following the new Bylaws?

Funderburk: Ok, just so we're clear. Are we all clear that these go into effect immediately?

Wurtz: Thank you.

Funderburk: Ok.

DOCKET #1018, MOTION TO DISCHARGE THE FACULTY STRATEGIC
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Funderburk: Ok. Docket item 1018, this a motion to discharge the faculty Strategic Planning Committee. Do we have a motion? Senator **Peters** [who indicated], move to discharge. Do we have a second.

East: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **East**. Is there any discussion on eliminating the Strategic Planning Committee? Seeing no discussion, all those in favor, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Those opposed? [1 heard] And abstentions? One abstention as well, so motion passes.

DOCKET 1019, MOTION TO CHANGE THE CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Funderburk: Docket 1019, Motion to change the charge and membership of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee. A motion?

Terlip: So moved.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** on the motion. Second? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. Discussion. I think we’ll have some discussion on this. Who would like to go first? Do we want any explanation first from the Committee? [voice saying “yes” and heads nodding] Would that help? Ok, is there somebody who would like to speak from the Committee, which is Senator **Peters**, Senator **Swan**, Senator **Breitbach**? Don’t all of you at once speak.

Peters: We—well, first of all I guess we can flash back to the very first—the first or second meeting of this academic year where there was a report from the existing Senate Budget Committee that came to us that we tabled, mostly for lack of clarity in terms of what it was asking us to do. And we—the—when our Committee first met, we had in front of us a recommendation from the Committee on Committees that I think had been presented to the Senate maybe the previous year that recommended

eliminating the Faculty—University Faculty Senate Budget Committee. But it became clear to those of us on the Committee and--and to myself that—that with the current budget issues on campus that we needed to find a better way to communicate with the Administration about budget priorities. Also, I became more aware of the history of all this. As a representative from—from CSBS, I found out that—that this had come before the Senate previously from SBS from a motion from the SBS Senate, and that after some discussion, it had been tabled then.

So, our recommendation is to revamp the Senate Budget Committee to give it a clearer charge because we don't think it really has a very clear charge at the moment, and I think that's largely what the existing Committee was asking for. Now, it should also be noted that the Committee on Committees is not very eager to run any more campus-wide, at-large elections. That has been made pretty clear to us in the course of our work with that Committee, and so our proposal then, given that, is to have the College Senates choose the representatives on this particular Committee.

Funderburk: Very good. State your name loudly for our transcriptionist.

Dunn: Cindy **Dunn**, D-u-n-n [Associate Professor, Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology], I'm here actually representing the Faculty Senate of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and first I want to thank both Senator **Peters** and the other members of this Committee, because I know they've done a lot of work, and Senator **Peters** has been communicating very well with our Senate. We have several people on there who've been interested in this and following it for a while. And basically I just want to speak in support of continuing to have a Budget Committee, revamping it along these lines. To some extent, it feels a little bit like closing the barn door after the horse is gone, but one of the issues that a lot of us have been complaining about recently is that faculty have input into University Budget decisions. But I also think that if we're going to have effective input, it needs to be informed input. And we can't just go around saying, "Well, don't cut this. Don't cut that." And I thought Cathy [**DeSoto**, Chair of

United Faculty] actually made a very important point at the meeting a few weeks ago when she held up the budget and said, “How many of you have read this?” and nobody, you know, including me, raised our hands. And so I think it would actually be very useful for this Body to have an independent committee that could do the work of digging through, figuring out how to understand the Budget, and providing you all with an annual summary of “Here’s how the money is being spent. Here’s where it’s gone up, where it’s gone down, how percentages have changed, what have you,” at the very least so that you have information, so that you could then, if you have questions about, “Well, why did this percentage go up?” you could address those to the Provost, to the President, to the VP for Finance. And if it seemed appropriate, this Senate could then make, you know, meaningful and hopefully constructive recommendations to, again, either the Provost or the Administration in general about how some of those Budget priorities might be changed. I was very encouraged when Senator **Peters** told us that apparently President **Allen** has said that he would be open to meeting periodically with a Faculty Budget Committee. I think that would be great both in terms of giving us perhaps more understanding of the financial constraints that the Administration is facing and giving President **Allen** some direct input of faculty views and sort of in the spirit, I hope, of Provost **Gibson**’s remarks at the beginning that this might even be a step towards rebuilding some of the trust that has been fractured so badly in recent years. So, that’s really all I wanted to say. Nothing necessarily about the specifics, but that I do think it’s really crucial to have a Faculty Budget Committee. Thank you.

Funderburk: Thank you. Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: Yeah, I—I would just like to say that I would hope that the Provost’s Office could also work with this Committee, because, as you know, the Provost’s Budget is 70% of the University, and so it is good to have the big picture, but I would—I would hope to be able to work with this Committee as well as we move forward with decisions that need to be made with Academic Affairs.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: I don't know that the decision needs to be made now in terms of how to do it, but I think it would be very important for us to point out that this is a highly specialized field of expertise. Budgeting at this level for a Univ—or for an organization that is as large and complex as we are, and that anyone who serves on this Committee has to be willing to take on the obligation to get the training to understand how this works. That's not an inconsequential resource requirement to do that kind of thing. Their time, plus who is the person that is going to provide the "Here's what you need to know about budgeting for this kind of an organization." That if we're going to specify the expectation of the work, we need to clarify the provision of the resources that will enable these people to do the work.

Funderburk: Senator **East** and then Senator **Smith**.

East: I think that it would be very useful for the Senate to have a Budget Committee that would provide them with information about allowing us to become more informed about how UNI spends its money, how the—how changes—how those kinds of things change, making recommendations to us as to what they think might be useful to—for—useful suggestions to make. I don't think that this particular Committee, a committee of the Faculty Senate, would necessarily be the best way to work together, as the Provost has—has suggested that we do. I—I think that we'd run risk of people getting on this Committee who have axes to grind and therefore not being very—being useful to the Senate but not being very useful to the working-together process, and so while I believe that this Committee could provide a lot of insight and information and expertise for the Senate to use, I'm not very comfortable with it being a mechanism whereby the faculty work together or—or are consulted with about the budgeting process, in particular, meeting with the President or meeting with the Provost once a month while perhaps useful if we have a President and Provost who are—who very much want to hear and to the extent possible follow faculty input. A meet and confer model is not very good, I think, as the basis for actual, ongoing working-together budgeting process. And so I—I think that

the Senate needs to meet with—I—I assume with the—the Committee that Jeff referred to earlier—meet with the Administration, come to some sort of framework there that—that the Administration has had some input into the formation of the Committee and the process and they have buy-in into the actual working-together consultation that will be involved. And so, while I recommend we do this, it's not clear to me that this is the way we want to have our consultation occur.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I—I think there's—there are kind of two sides of this. One is the flow of information from the Administration to the faculty about budgetary issues, and I agree that this Committee would be very valuable there and that that could be handled. But on the other side, the issue of faculty having input, and that's a—that word encompasses or covers all sorts of things from just saying, "Well, we like this, or we don't like that." It—it's really more of an issue of what kind of influence would the faculty have? Obviously, you are not going to have control. What kind of substantive influence would or could the faculty have on budgetary priorities here. And so my question is, "What's done at other institutions? Are you familiar with this? The Committee that looked at this, our Sister Institutions, peers? Is there a mechanism whereby the Committee whatever that faculty have substantive influence on budgetary priorities and decisions, and, if so, does this device that's being proposed here, you know, promise to—to provide that kind of influence or an appropriate level of influence for us at this institution?"

Funderburk: Is there a Committee member that has a direct response to Senator **Smith**? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I will admit that we did not do, you know, research into how other institutions handle this. All I can say is it's comparable to the model that—that President **Allen** used at ISU when he was the Provost there and which he indicated worked very well. I know I—I had a conversation, too, with Vice-President **Hogan** who indicated he was part of a similar kind of budget

committee at another university that—that worked very well. Now, whether those—I know—I’m pretty confident that the one at ISU did not—you know, was not sort of something comparable to the “cabinet,” which is, I think, more what Senator **East** would—would prefer. I don’t know about the—the committee that Vice-President **Hogan** was talking about.

Funderburk: And if—if you [to **Terlip**] will indulge me again, also, before we get too far from Senator **East**.

Terlip: : That’s ok.

Funderburk: I think there’s a—a good value in part of what he [**East**] wrote in the e-mail I think you all saw this afternoon, if you had a chance to read it, of—and the notion of--of allowing administrative buy-in to it. I wonder if one possible way to include that into this current proposal, could be that the College Senate offer 2 names and ultimately the Administration could pick 1 of the 2? Just food for thought. Ok, what I’ve got I think is Senator **Terlip**, Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Breitbach**. I felt somebody over there, but I don’t know who it was, and then Senator **Swan**.

Terlip: In some ways it seems to me—I hate to say this—that we’re almost talking about two different committees. I think we’re asking for a more of a Budget Oversight Committee who would analyze the facts and figures and needs the more-specialized knowledge, and perhaps a more representative group of faculty who could meet regularly. Now, you have to obviously have some liaison, but perhaps we need to be thinking about two groups to really do this well.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I have two comments. We should call the faculty at ISU and see how that—Ben **Allen**’s model worked there. I think that would be very interesting to talk to them about that. Secondly, I’m interested in Jerry **Smith**’s concerns that this faculty group actually have some influence, because I don’t want it to just be another spin zone for the PR stuff coming

out of the President's office. You know? That's really—that really bothers me. It's so easy for small groups meeting with the President to just kind of, you know, sit there and take in all the stuff that's said. We know how much emphasis this Administration puts on spin. So that—those are the two concerns that I have. We—we need to talk to ISU about that model there, and I am really interested that we have some sense that a harder (?) faculty committee might actually be listened to. Those are the concerns I had.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: My—my comments actually address Dr. **Terlip**'s comments. I don't think that this committee would preclude us from requesting a meeting—a special meeting with either the President or the Provost to talk specifically about a certain issue, whether it's going to be a—a big reduction affecting our Budget or perhaps the Legislature is going to give us a windfall or some other change or a—a trend, a change in a trend, a spending trend that—it doesn't preclude us from saying, "The Senate as a whole would like to meet with the President and the Provost to talk specifically about that." I don't think we have to have—do everything through committee. So

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Yeah, this Budget Committee and the way it was formed in part addresses the faculty—a common faculty desire to sort of try and establish some facts and simply express these facts to interested parties, and this is why, I think, part of the reason it's—it's been designed this way—to then tell us, the Senate, what our colleagues who've devoted themselves to—to finding out the facts, understand to be the facts in ways that might contradict somebody else's presentation of the facts. It does not address the much—the very important political dimension of budgets, and I think this is what's sort of being discussed already. And I think that we don't want it to. We want it to be our Committee, the Senate's Committee, that we would ask it to look at claims that are made, budgetary claims that are made, and to do their level best to tell us what their judgment about those

things are. And then we, as the Committee—the Senate—would do the political work of budgets, expressing values, expressing priorities, with the President, the other Departments, such as the Provost’s Office, in other ways, so the working together needs to be with the Senate, I think, and not the—the Budget Committee, if the Budget Committee is our Committee that we get faculty views from. And so with that I was thinking that I don’t—I don’t entirely agree with the—the formation of it. Somewhere I would like to be able to put in its charge that we can send a request to the Committee to ask for relatively quick responses. Currently, it’s March 15th we’ll get an Annual Report, which is good, I like that. But I’d like to also be able to do what we do with all of our committees, we send things to the Committee.

Terlip: Look at the point above it.

Swan: Oh, does—does it say that?

Terlip: Yeah, it already does.

Swan: [reading under breath; see Petition 1121/1019 on the Faculty Senate website for proposed changes; other voices clarifying, too] “It may at any time, as it deems appropriate, report to the Senate regarding its work. . .The Committee shall provide information [to the Senate] as requested and shall take up motions [referred to it by the Senate].” Is that—is that—if that’s what we’re—so we can send work to the Committee?

Terlip: Uh huh.

Swan: Oh, well, that’s very good. That—that’s very good. But that takes care of it then. That Committee isn’t to do political work. It’s—it’s meeting with the President or the Cabinet or Vice-President **Hogan**, it isn’t to do political work. It’s to get information, and the information that the Administration as it understands it to be, and then it goes out elsewhere to find similar information, public documents, thereby maybe forming a

report to us that contradicts the administrative presentation of the information. But it is not to argue with Administration at all. It is not to assert value at all. It is to report to us. That's how the Bylaws [sic, Budget] Committee, in part—and I was thinking about it—that we then would have to go on and do the work with the Administration, the President, if we wanted changes in the administrative decisions about the Budget, drawing on this Committee. Thank you.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **Edginton**.

Terlip: Ok. Two comments, I think given that, I think calling it the Budget Oversight Committee makes their charge a little clearer by naming it that, because it's really just to oversee and look at things. Secondly, Part D of the description of the Committee, I don't know if this amendment will be friendly, but it says that the Report is put together with recommendations approved by the Senate are going back to the Administration. I think we also have to send that to Student Government, and we also ought to send it to the Board of Regents so that they're clear on our take on budget issues. And that we would request that—that the President send his—his or her responses to the same places. So, I don't know if those are friendly things or unfriendly things. The Committee will have to tell me.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Yeah, I—you know, having listened to the conversation, and especially in light of Senator **Wurtz**' comments and Senator **Smith**'s comments and Senator **Peters** and even perhaps Senator **Swan**'s comments [laughter around], I'm won—I'm wondering if we ought not to table this, and we ought to take a little bit of additional time to study it. I was particularly taken with Senator **Peters**' comments or his admission that we haven't looked at our comparative universities in particular and the need to find out what processes are being used there. Could we just hit "pause" for a short time? And maybe, you know, if Senator **Peters** could go back and gather some of that information that's being requested here, deal with the issue that Senator **Smith** has put on the table relative to influence rather

than information gathering, I think it would be very useful for the whole group.

Funderburk: Provost **Gibson** and then Senator **Wurtz**.

Gibson: Yeah, because I—I mean, what I’m looking—I—I, you know, in this present form, I don’t know how it would be operational to assist me. I’m not clear with that. Now maybe it can, but I guess what I’m looking for is—and—and we can talk about it at the Retreat, maybe that is a better place, but, you know, what I’m looking for is a group, whether it’s called the Budget Committee or whatever, that can talk about—and I—mine is specific to Academic Affairs, so, again, what are the issues in Academic Affairs, the budgetary issues, options there? You know, that’s—that’s—I—I—that’s what I’m looking for, some kind of feedback in the discussion—a working group. I—I mean, I don’t know what to call it, but....

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**, Senator **Neuhaus**, and Senator **Gallagher**.

Wurtz: Ok, and this brings us back to last Spring’s Retreat where we were focusing at that point hoping we would know more of this reorganization, and we talked then about the fact that you [to the Provost] have to run this place 12 months out of the year, and if we want to be participating in some of this, we can’t be operating on the Academic Year, Fall/Spring semester, and then say, “Oh, it’s Summer. The Senate doesn’t do stuff in the summer.” So we need to restructure ourselves so that we are available to be an operative Senate year-round.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus** and then Senator **Gallagher**.

Neuhaus: I—I guess one of the things hearing—hearing what—what the Provost has said, we probably could also stand to have some input both from you [to the Provost] and from the President, just to get a sense of, you know, in an ideal world where—ok, it’s going to be a less-than-ideal world, it’s been so far. What—what are some of the things that—that you might ideally like from this? One other thing I think we—we do need to ponder—

I think, actually Senator **Peters** brought that up in an e-mail, we are—we do have a Union on campus. That does make it slightly different, that—that, I mean, that that is something that has to be acknowledged in terms of how we—we think about certain budget matters, so if we do review some things, I—you know, we could certainly take a look at what ISU did, but it might be better if we took a look at a couple of shops that had unions and see if there's something in existence like that. Is there a working model at a university that has a union in it? If that sort of works a little bit better. Because ISU doesn't have that situation. I think it makes it a little different from—not a lot, but it really makes a little difference.

Funderburk: I will note also that ISU seems to be very verbose when they create things. We've noticed on some other committees on which I've worked that some of their committee charges are hundreds of pages long. [laughter around] Senator **Gallagher**. Senator **Smith**. Senator **DeBerg**.

Gallagher: I'd like to address what Senator **Neuhaus** just said. I—I guess I'd like to see the Faculty Senate become a, I guess, a more autonomous, stronger voice for the faculty, and, you know, I—I just wanted to throw that in. And—and secondly, I'm interested in echoing Senator **Wurtz's** comment about somebody who has some real serious expertise in looking at a budget. I just think that's essential, and I—I'm not sure the way this is currently framed, if we have people revolving, you know we may have people whose eyes glaze over looking at budgets like that, and I'm just not sure that would be the epitome of wisdom to—to have it that way. Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg** is next.

DeBerg: Well, I think, Provost **Gibson**, we're probably talking about 2 different groups. We might want to have a Senate Academic Affairs Advisory Group or something like that. That makes sense to me. I—I would like to make a motion to table this—I would like to move to table this motion so that some of the concerns that have been raised today could be taken into account by the Committee working on it, whoever that might be.

Edginton: Second—I second that motion.

Funderburk: The question may be settled. Discussion on the motion?

Smith: Yeah, that was going to be my—that was my—I was going to get in line to say that. I think we, quite frankly, for the informational flow from the Administration to the faculty, I'm not sure that you need as big a committee as being proposed here. And on the other side, I think what we need to do is talk to the Provost and the President and find out what other schools are doing to get a sense of what's possible, and then try and put something together that's really designed to help faculty have more input and influence upon budgetary decisions. And that—I don't think this was designed as much with that in mind, so I—I—I support the tabling motion.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I would actually like to add to that list to maybe talk to our faculty and see what they're confused about and what they would like information about so that we know what to report to them as well, because they may not want to hear all of the nitty gritty stuff. Maybe there are specific areas that should be focused on for them.

Funderburk: I want to make—throw one thing into the hopper also to be considered is if we're doing—if it is tabled to be looked at again, we also need to consider the fact that the Senate, unlike UF, is—is non-restrictive in its membership, so you can be a UF member and be a member of the Senate. If you're not a UF member, you don't vote and take part in their committees. Because of bargaining and negotiations, maybe a time when a member of the bargaining team for UF is involved in the type of thing that would prevent this Committee from functioning then if they're a member of that Budget Committee, and that would be one reason I suggest having some ability to have multiple names considered, just so that the Committee doesn't stop functioning in given years because of something outside of our control that needs to be considered. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So if we're moving to delay the—our consideration of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, I'm not hearing how we're going to try to work better with the Provost and the President, the Senate, and so I wonder if we can't—if—our faculty government structure is that the Chair of the Faculty and Vice-Chair of the Faculty, if they choose to or if the Administration wants to, works with the Administration and reports to faculty, gets committees, if they want to, or comes to the Senate, etc. It seems like these days that's not working as well, and so the Senate maybe should create a—a group, if we call a committee, that's to work with the Provost directly, work with the President directly, on issues of concern and keep reporting back to us, though it would be—and it would be members of the Senate. It would be us, here. Delaying action on this other Committee that would just give faculty views of the budget, you know, independent from the Administration doesn't get us toward working better, more dynamically with the Provost and the President, and so I'm just mentioning this because I think we need to do that. We don't need to table that right now.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Well, I was going to make a little bit different point and that is that, you know, your initial comment could be added to a list that Senator **Peters** and his group could look at, but I think, you know, that—I think we need to be careful about moving forward a motion that would put into effect a structure that might be affected by another structure that would be more compatible if they were synchronized together effectively. So, I—I would encourage you to vote to table so that we can take just a little bit of time, not a lot of time, but a little bit of time to look at some of the questions that have been raised here, and with the idea of synchronizing those two elements together in an effective fashion. We may be able to do it in one—in one committee, I don't know. Maybe not.

Funderburk: Would the petitioner consider tabling to a specific date so that it does not appear that we are tabling this indefinitely?

DeBerg: I would. Is—what about 2 weeks? It's tabled until our Senate meeting of April 16th? What do you think, Scott [**Peters**]? Is that not enough?

Peters: Let's go for it. Let's see what we can do.

DeBerg: Ok.

Funderburk: I do note that April the 16th currently is the policy—EPC policy day, but if—we can still go for that date. Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: Yeah, I—I just want to—I—I know you—you know what the situation is in the Legislature, that we do have the House that is recommending a \$3 million cut. The Senate is actually wanting to give us some money, but that—that cut is—is there. And—and there's also the tuition freeze. If that happens, that amounts to an additional cut, and then the—the University does have obligations for salary increases. So, I'm—I'm saying all that to say that I—I—I hope that we can get this resolved whatever the structure or structures might be, and then I do think that there might be, once we hear back from the Legislature, there might be a necessity for the committee or committees to meet this Summer, depending on, you know, what happens.

Funderburk: I guess a question is to you and maybe the Committee as well, and, sorry to be putting more work on your plate, Ginny [**Arthur**], but I wondered if Associate Provost **Arthur** would be an appropriate person to consult with also. Perhaps work to see if there are some concerns the Administration might have at the formative stage as an advisor in this process when we come back on the 16th as opposed to coming back with another recommendation that we already see a problem? Would that be an appropriate point to work with the Administration?

Gibson: I—I'm not quite sure that I understand what you're saying.

Funderburk: (words unclear)

Breitbach: Jesse [**Swan**], Chris [**Neuhaus**], Scott [**Peters**], and myself.

Funderburk: Would **Ginny** be the appropriate person to potentially work and consult with?

DeBerg: Do you mean the Provost herself, since it's her group? Get some feedback along the way.

Funderburk: Right. I've got Senator **Neuhaus**, then Senator **East**.

Neuhaus: Another thought. This is—this is sort of the ambitious thing here. You know, we're trying to come up with this budget thing that will do all and be all and yet not cause problems. That—that—that sort of sounds ambitious. It may be that in 2 weeks we find some—some model that—what I would suggest if we don't—if we don't find something we agree on, I—I would really favor some sort of at least an ad hoc group that would work through the Summer, that's willing to work through the Summer, maybe bring in some folks from beyond this group, if that's—that's going to help. There are some things I think that need to get in motion sooner than this. I also agree, on the other hand, and—and—I don't—I can't—I'll credit Chris [**Edginton**] with this, but it could have come from a number of you. We do want to try and get it right, you know. I mean, it's—we—we don't want to create something that we regret a couple months/years from now. So, you know, I'm—I think we'll give it a real good go, and see what we've got in 2 weeks, but should this not quite be where we'd like it to be at that point, I think I would really recommend that we consider some sort of a bandaged version of this or something that can work forward through that—and—and we think about it yet further, because I think this is—this is a very good thing. I think it is something we really need to do, but I think it's also a very difficult thing, too. I'm not sure what we'll have for you in 2 weeks.

Funderburk: Senator **East**, and I'll note that it's 1 minutes until 5:00.

East: I assume that the—the bulk of our Retreat will be spend talking about how we work together, that that’s the point of the Retreat. It seems to me that the Senate or individuals on the Senate, individuals in the Administration can be thinking about ideas about how that might work. I—I agree with Jesse [**Swan**] that I—I think it very clear that the Budget Committee as described here does not necessarily the working-together idea that has been expressed and that we need to deal with that, and that we have a meeting in 3 weeks that—or so—that will deal with that, 4 weeks, I guess.

Funderburk: If we are going to continue this, we need a motion to extend.

Edginton: I call for the motion [others clarifying “call the question.”]

Funderburk: Call the question, Senator **Edginton**. Second by Senator **Dolgener**. All those in favor of calling the question, say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? One opposition, so the question is called.

Terlip: No, I was raising my hand to be recognized.

Funderburk: Oh. The question being called is to table this until April 16th. Ok. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I would like to after the vote move to extend for 5 minutes so that we can

Funderburk: We need that at least for the vote.

Terlip: Ok. I thought we had voted. I’m sorry—so—but [several voices sorting this all out]

Funderburk: We had a call of the question. We need to vote that now. All those in favor of tabling until April 16th, say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] The motion

is tabled. Now, if we've got an extension for 5-minute request, still? [Terlip nods.]

Peters: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Peters**. All those in favor of extending for 5 minutes, say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard]

NEW BUSINESS

Terlip: I would like to address the two issues that you brought up in terms of forming an ad hoc group or two ad hoc groups related to writing Senate responses to things. I think we should do that, but I'm not quite sure how to proceed from there—if you want to appoint, if you want volunteers, what are you looking for?

Funderburk: I think I—it—well, my sense of the Senate, based on e-mails, I thought was mixed pretty evenly from the ones I saw. If there's a group, I would think it would be more voluntary to draft such a response. I did respond to Senator **Swan**, at least in the case of the HLC. I don't see it as a time-sensitive issue, but others may argue otherwise. But with the AAUP response, that's not time-sensitive. It doesn't have to be done this week. So if there are people who are specifically interested in working on one or both of those items, I would prefer them to volunteer for a drafting committee as opposed to putting people on the committee who specifically don't want to do it in the first place there. At the end we'd have something to work from to bring forward.

Swan: Get Forrest [Dolgener] (?) to do it. [laughter around]

Funderburk: Do I hear you volunteering to chair such a committee, Senator **Terlip**?

Terlip: Yes, I will.

Funderburk: Thank you very much. Partners in crime?

Terlip: I do need dates, though, for the—if you’ve got anything, to let me know.

Funderburk: Shall I leave you to find your committee?

Terlip: I suppose.

Funderburk: Because I don’t hear overwhelming numbers of volunteers at the moment. At least on e-mail, Senator **DeBerg** [who had already left] expressed interest, so perhaps she will follow-up with that.

Terlip: I’m sure Jesse [**Swan**] would help me, wouldn’t you, Jesse? [voices and laughter]

Funderburk: Are there any other items we need to do today?

ADJOURNMENT

Breitbach: Adjourn. [5:05 p.m.]

Funderburk: We do. I consider that a motion to adjourn.

Edginton: Second.

Funderburk: Second by Senator **Edginton**. All those in favor? [ayes all around] Opposed? [everyone making preparation-to-leave noise] Thank you very much. See you next week.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss, Administrative Assistant, UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

April 9, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Appended:

- 1) Motions to Append Bylaws 4-2-12, pg. 54
- 2) UNI Senate Bylaws as amended 4-2-12, pg. 59

Motions to Amend Bylaws
4-2-12 Meeting
University Faculty Senate

ORIGINAL MOTION

Recommended Senate Bylaw Revisions Regarding Committees

Ad hoc Committee on Bylaws
(Karen Breitbach, Christopher Neuhaus, Scott Peters, Jesse Swan)
2/23/12

All text in this typeface is unchanged.

Additions are represented in this typeface.

All text in ~~strikeout~~ would be dropped or replaced.

Changes to Section 3

3. ORGANIZATION. At the last regular meeting of the spring semester, the Senate shall elect, from its newly elected and continuing members, a chairperson and a vice-chairperson to take office beginning May 15. ~~a vice chairperson to take office beginning~~ **May 15.** The chairperson shall be the person whose term as vice chairperson is just ending. No one may hold two offices simultaneously or serve consecutive terms in the same office. If the president's service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as president, it shall be automatically extended for one year.

Normally, nominations for the office will be made by a nominating committee composed of outgoing Senate members. However, the Senate may decide in a particular spring semester (by two-thirds majority of members present and voting at a Senate meeting for which this matter has been announced, at least a week previously, as an item of business) to suspend this nominating procedure for the election in question and to substitute, for that election, another nominating procedure that seems more appropriate and/or workable. In any case, the procedure used shall permit nominations to be made from the Senate floor prior to the election. The chairperson of the Senate shall appoint the secretary of the Senate from among Senators.

3.2 Duties of the vice-chairperson. The vice-chairperson shall perform the following duties:

3.2.1 Preside, in the absence of the chairperson, at meetings of the Senate.

3.2.2 Assist in preparing the official calendar and docket of the Senate, in cooperation with the chairperson and secretary of the Senate as required.

3.2.3 Serve as the chair of the Committee on Committees and appoint an administrative assistant to assist in the coordination and communication of that committee's activities.

3.2.4 3.2.3 Other duties as the chairperson may request or as may be appropriate in the temporary absence of the chairperson.’

3.3 Duties of the secretary. The secretary shall perform the following duties: 3.3.1 Publish and distribute to the university faculty and to the President of the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) within one calendar week **after Senate approval** (as possible and Practicable) the minutes of the Senate meetings.

Changes to Section 6

6.0 COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND THE FACULTY. Except when otherwise directed by the faculty, all standing committees of the Faculty and all ad hoc faculty committees shall report to and be accountable to the Senate (see Faculty Constitution, Article V, Sections 3.9 and 4).

6.1 Committees of the Faculty Accountability. Committees of the faculty which normally report to the Senate shall be accountable to the Senate as the faculty's delegate. The Senate may schedule regular or special reports from its **faculty** committees; it may approve reports in part or as a whole; it may amend them; it may return them to the committee for revision or for additional information and recommendations.

6.2 Committees of the Senate. The Senate shall have the power to create, change, and discharge **standing and ad hoc** committees, standing and ad hoc, accountable to it; the Senate may schedule regular or special reports from its committees; it may approve such reports in part or as a whole; it may amend them; it may return them to the committee for revision or for additional information and recommendations.

6.2.1 Delegation of Senate authority to Senate committees. The Senate may, by majority vote, delegate to any of its committees the power to decide and act upon a problem subject to subsequent Senate review (See Faculty Constitution, Article V, Section 3.10).

6.3 Committee reports: Form. The Senate requests committees reporting to it to present their reports according to a schedule furnished by the chairperson of the Senate. Recommendations for specific action by a committee should be transmitted immediately to the chairperson for calendaring. Since the Senate is not principally a fact-finding body, the Senate requests committees to present with their reports and/or recommendations whatever information and documentation may be necessary to allow the Senate economically to deliberate upon the committee's recommendation.

6.4 Committee reports: Procedures. Committee reports, as they are received by the chairperson, will be placed on the calendar of the Senate, normally in the order of their reception. Those reports that the Senate wishes to discuss or which appear to require Senate action will be moved to the docket following the procedures set forth below.

6.5 Selection of committee members. The Committee on Committees shall coordinate college elections for committees and shall hold elections for all at-large positions on committees. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies via appointment until such time as it is able to conduct an election to fill the position for the remainder of the term.

6.5.1 The Committee on Committees shall report the results of all elections to the Chair of the Senate no later than April 1.

6.5.2 The Committee on Committees shall issue an annual report to the Senate that describes the charge of each committee and updates the membership of the Senate and all committees. This report shall be presented to the Senate at its final regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester. The Committee on Committees shall at this time recommend to the Senate the discharge of any standing or ad hoc committees (except for standing committees established by the Faculty Constitution) which in its judgment have become superfluous. This report shall be appended to these Bylaws.

~~6.5 Committee review. The Committee on Committees shall, in its annual report, recommend to the Senate the discharge of any standing or ad hoc committees (except for standing committees established by the Faculty Constitution) which in its judgment have become superfluous.~~

AMENDMENT #1

Motion to amend Section 3 to replace “president” with “chair or chairperson” as below.
Accepted as friendly amendment

At the last regular meeting of the spring semester, the Senate shall elect, from its newly elected and continuing members, a vice chairperson to take office beginning May 15. The chairperson shall be the person whose term as vice chairperson is just ending. No one may hold two offices simultaneously or serve consecutive terms in the same office. If the chairperson’s service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as chair, it shall be automatically extended for one year...

AMENDMENT #2

Motion to substitute the following for Section 3.2.3 was accepted as friendly amendment

3.2.3 Serve as a non-voting member of the Committee on Committees. The Vice-chair shall have the power to convene the committee and shall appoint an administrative assistant to assist in the coordination and communication of the committee’s activities.

AMENDMENT #3

Motion to amend final sentence of 6.5.2 was accepted as friendly amendment:

The Secretary of the Senate shall append this report to these Bylaws.

AMENDMENT #4

Motion to further amend Section 3 to clarify the term extension of the chair was accepted as friendly amendment. Final version reads:

At the last regular meeting of the spring semester, the Senate shall elect, from its newly elected and continuing members, a vice chairperson to take office beginning May 15. The chairperson shall be the person whose term as vice chairperson is just ending. No one may hold two offices simultaneously or serve consecutive terms in the same office. If the rising chairperson’s service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as vice-chair, the term shall be automatically extended for one year.

Such extension would not replace the normal election cycle for a new Senator from the vice-chair's constituency...

Bylaws of the University Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa

1. POWERS. The University Faculty Senate shall be the principal representative agency of the university faculty. The Senate shall have power to act for the faculty on all matters in its jurisdiction as defined by the Faculty Constitution (see Faculty Constitution, Article V, Sections 3 and 4).

1.1 Exceptions. The Senate shall not have power to amend the Faculty Constitution and the Senate shall not have power, except in emergencies, to set aside a decision of the faculty taken during the current academic year; exercise of such emergency powers shall require a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

2. MEMBERSHIP. The University Faculty Senate shall be composed of members elected by and from the voting faculty from each undergraduate college (including academic units which function as a college although otherwise designated), elected by and from the Library Faculty, and elected by and from the non-voting faculty. Two non-voting senators, elected from the non-voting faculty shall have full rights of debate and motion but no Senate vote.

2.1 Representation. The number of senators to be elected by the members of each undergraduate college and the Library will be determined by the following formula: one senator per thirty voting faculty members rounded to the nearest multiple of thirty, with a minimum of at least one senator from each college. When the number of voting faculty from a college falls exactly between two multiples of thirty, Senate representation will be based on the larger multiple.

2.2 Review of Faculty Roster. The number of voting faculty members from a college used to calculate representation to the Senate will be based on the fall semester edition of the Faculty Roster. The Committee on Committees will review this edition of the Roster of Faculty soon after its release and notify college Senators when changes in the number of voting faculty would cause a change in the number of representatives to Senate from that college. Should errors be discovered upon issuance of the new Faculty Roster, the Chair of the Faculty shall amend the Faculty Roster.

2.3 Terms. Terms shall normally be for three years, with terms of one-third of each group defined in 2 (above) to expire each year. Terms begin on May 15.

2.4 Limitation on terms. A senator shall serve no more than two consecutive full terms.

2.5 Alternates. Senators shall appoint alternates from their elective constituencies and shall notify the secretary of the Senate of the names of such alternates. Alternates normally serve during the term of the senator and exercise the full duties and responsibilities of a senator during those meetings that they substitute for a senator.

2.6 Vacancies. In case the absence or the incapacity of a senator should extend beyond a complete semester, or if, in the Senate's judgment, it is likely that it will so extend, the

Senate shall declare the office vacant and shall request of the appropriate college or university faculty agency that the position be filled as provided in the Faculty Constitution (Article V, Section 3.3).

2.7 Member ex officio. The chairperson of the faculty shall be an ex officio member of the Senate, without vote, but with the privileges of motion, second, and debate. If a senator is elected chairperson of the faculty, he/she must resign as senator.

3. ORGANIZATION. At the last regular meeting of the spring semester, the Senate shall elect, from its newly elected and continuing members, a vice chairperson to take office beginning May 15. The chairperson shall be the person whose term as vice chairperson is just ending. No one may hold two offices simultaneously or serve consecutive terms in the same office. If the rising chairperson's service in the Senate would otherwise end at the conclusion of his or her term as vice-chair, the term shall be automatically extended for one year. Such extension would not replace the normal election cycle for a new Senator from the vice-chair's constituency. Normally, nominations for the office will be made by a nominating committee composed of outgoing Senate members. However, the Senate may decide in a particular spring semester (by two-thirds majority of members present and voting at a Senate meeting for which this matter has been announced, at least a week previously, as an item of business) to suspend this nominating procedure for the election in question and to substitute, for that election, another nominating procedure that seems more appropriate and/or workable. In any case, the procedure used shall permit nominations to be made from the Senate floor prior to the election. The chairperson of the Senate shall appoint the secretary of the Senate from among Senators.

3.1 Duties of the chairperson. The chairperson shall perform the following duties:

3.1.1 Preside at meetings of the Senate.

3.1.2 Prepare, with the assistance of the secretary of the Senate and the vice-chairperson of the Senate, and subject to the approval of the Senate, the official calendar and docket of Senate meetings.

3.1.3 Call regular and special meetings of the Senate.

3.1.4 Prepare and arrange for the distribution of notices of regular and special meetings of the Senate so that the notices are received a minimum of three class days in advance of the meetings (as possible and practicable). Such notices shall normally contain the calendar items and docket items for the meeting.

3.1.5 Sign requisitions against the budget of the Senate.

3.1.6 Make decisions on parliamentary and procedural questions in fulfillment of the provisions of these bylaws, subject to approval of a majority of the Senate.

3.1.7 Maintain liaison, as required, with the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) and the officers of administration.

3.1.8 Transmit to the faculty or to other components of the university or, consistent with Board rules and regulations, the Board of Regents or its committees, actions of the Senate directed thereto.

3.1.9 Represent to the press and to the public the established policies and positions of the Senate as appropriate.

3.1.10 Serve, as provided by the Faculty Constitution (Article II, Section 2), as vice-chairperson of the Faculty.

3.2 Duties of the vice-chairperson. The vice-chairperson shall perform the following duties:

3.2.1 Preside, in the absence of the chairperson, at meetings of the Senate.

3.2.2 Assist in preparing the official calendar and docket of the Senate, in cooperation with the chairperson and secretary of the Senate as required.

3.2.3 Serve as a non-voting member of the Committee on Committees. The Vice-chair shall have the power to convene the committee and shall appoint an administrative assistant to assist in the coordination and communication of the committee's activities.

3.2.4 Other duties as the chairperson may request or as may be appropriate in the temporary absence of the chairperson.

3.3 Duties of the secretary. The secretary shall perform the following duties:

3.3.1 Publish and distribute to the university faculty and to the President of the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) within one calendar week after Senate approval (as possible and Practicable) the minutes of the Senate meetings.

3.3.2 Assist the chairperson of the Senate, as required, in the preparation and distribution of notices of meetings of the Senate and in the preparation and distribution of the calendar and docket of the Senate as provided in Sections 7.6 and 7.7 of these bylaws.

3.3.3 Keep the minutes and other official documents of the Senate in a safe and accessible place.

3.3.4 Furnish to faculty non-members and to officers of the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG), on request, pertinent document of the Senate.

4. MEETINGS. At least one regular meeting of the Senate shall be held each semester.

4.1 Call for regular meetings. The UNI Faculty Senate reserves for meetings the second and fourth Mondays of every month of the Fall and Spring terms from 3:30 – 5:00 PM at

a place to be determined by the chairperson of the Senate, or, in her/his temporary absence, by the vice-chairperson of the Senate.

4.2 Call for special meetings. Special meetings of the Senate may normally be called by the chairperson of the Senate, or, in his/her temporary absence, by the vice- chairperson of the Senate.

4.2.1 By petition. Upon petition of five current members of the Senate or upon petition of thirty current members of the faculty, normally directed to the chairperson of the Senate, the chairperson of the Senate shall call a meeting of the Senate. The petition, in either case, shall contain a statement of the subject to be considered and the action deemed desirable by the petitioners. Petitioned meetings shall be called by the chairperson. A petition which in the judgment of the chairperson does not meet the above stipulations concerning: (1) number of proper signatures; (2) statement of the subject to be considered; or (3) the action requested, may be returned to the petitioner by the chairperson with a specification of the correct procedure for resubmission.

4.2.2 On request of an administrative officer. Upon request by the President of the University or of the Vice-President and Provost to the chairperson of the senate, the chairperson of the Senate may call a special meeting of the Senate. Such request shall contain a statement of the subject to be considered and an indication of the action deemed desirable by the officer of administration.

5. FUNCTIONS. The University Faculty Senate functions within the broad grant of authority delegated to it by the Faculty Constitution as provided above (Section 1). Within that grant of authority, Senate functions may take the following forms: policy formation, integration and coordination, consultation, and adjudication.

5.1 The policy formation function. The Senate acts for the faculty in the reception of policy proposals initiated by its members, by faculty non-members, by committees of the Senate or the faculty, by officers of administration, by the student government, or by the non-academic staff. The Senate deliberates and decides upon these matters by majority vote.

5.2 The integrative function. The Senate acts for the faculty in developing greater coordination or cooperation between the several components of the university and their constituencies, including the relationships of faculty and administration, faculty and students, faculty and alumni, faculty and public, and consistent with Board procedures, between the faculty and the State Board of Regents and its committees.

5.3 The consultative function. The Senate acts for the faculty in making provision for informal consultation with the officers of administration, including the academic deans, but particularly with the President of the university and the Vice-President and Provost. While the Senate encourages these offices of administration to present resolutions to be placed on the calendar and docketed for consideration in the normal order of business, the Senate recognizes that some problems are too diffuse, tentative, or delicate to lend

themselves to such treatment and therefore makes provision in its procedures for timely consultation and advice.

5.4 The adjudicatory function. The Senate shall act as an appeal body in case of a disputed interpretation of the Faculty Constitution as provided in the Faculty Constitution, Article VI, Section 5. The Senate shall act as an appeal body in case of an alleged violation of a provision of the Faculty Constitution as provided in the Faculty Constitution. Article VI, Section 6. 6.

6.0 COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND THE FACULTY. Except when otherwise directed by the faculty, all standing committees of the Faculty and all ad hoc faculty committees shall report to and be accountable to the Senate (see Faculty Constitution, Article V, Sections 3.9 and 4).

6.1 Committees of the Faculty. Committees of the faculty which normally report to the Senate shall be accountable to the Senate as the faculty's delegate. The Senate may schedule regular or special reports from its faculty committees; it may approve reports in part or as a whole; it may amend them; it may return them to the committee for revision or for additional information and recommendations.

6.2 Committees of the Senate. The Senate shall have the power to create, change, and discharge standing and ad hoc committees; the Senate may schedule regular or special reports from its committees; it may approve such reports in part or as a whole; it may amend them; it may return them to the committee for revision or for additional information and recommendations.

6.2.1 Delegation of Senate authority to Senate committees. The Senate may, by majority vote, delegate to any of its committees the power to decide and act upon a problem subject to subsequent Senate review (See Faculty Constitution, Article V, Section 3.10).

6.3 Committee reports: Form. The Senate requests committees reporting to it to present their reports according to a schedule furnished by the chairperson of the Senate. Recommendations for specific action by a committee should be transmitted immediately to the chairperson for calendaring. Since the Senate is not principally a fact-finding body, the Senate requests committees to present with their reports and/or recommendations whatever information and documentation may be necessary to allow the Senate economically to deliberate upon the committee's recommendation.

6.4 Committee reports: Procedures. Committee reports, as they are received by the chairperson, will be placed on the calendar of the Senate, normally in the order of their reception. Those reports that the Senate wishes to discuss or which appear to require Senate action will be moved to the docket following the procedures set forth below.

6.5 Selection of committee members. The Committee on Committees shall coordinate college elections for committees and shall hold elections for all at-large positions on

committees. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies via appointment until such time as it is able to conduct an election to fill the position for the remainder of the term.

6.5.1 The Committee on Committees shall report the results of all elections to the Chair of the Senate no later than April 1.

6.5.2 The Committee on Committees shall issue an annual report to the Senate that describes the charge of each committee and updates the membership of the Senate and all committees. This report shall be presented to the Senate at its final regularly scheduled meeting of the spring semester. The Committee on Committees shall at this time recommend to the Senate the discharge of any standing or ad hoc committees (except for standing committees established by the Faculty Constitution) which in its judgment have become superfluous. The Secretary of the Senate shall append this report to these Bylaws.

7. PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE. Except as provided by these bylaws or by the Faculty Constitution, Robert's Rules of Order (latest revision) shall be the parliamentary guide for the conduct of Senate business.

7.1 Quorum. The presence of one-half of the elected members of the Senate or their alternates shall constitute a quorum.

7.2 Faculty review of Senate action. Action taken by the Senate shall become effective fifteen days after publication of the action in the minutes of the Senate. Within this period, any action of the Senate, upon petition of thirty faculty members, shall be referred to the faculty for review and the decision of the faculty shall be final.

7.3 How matters may come to the Senate. A matter may come to the Senate for consideration by being brought up by a member of the Senate or the faculty according to the procedural provisions set forth below; it may be referred to the Senate by an officer of administration; it may be communicated to the chairperson of the Senate by any senator, faculty member or group, student, or non-academic staff member. Any person or persons in the university community may address a petition to the senate on any matter within the Senate's jurisdiction by presenting the petition in writing to the chairperson of the Senate and the chairperson shall cause the petition to be entered on the calendar of the Senate. The Senate requests that such petitions be accompanied by information or documentation that may assist the Senate in making a determination on the matter petitioned and that the petition clearly state what action the petitioner(s) desire(s) the Senate to take.

7.4 Order of business. The order of business in each meeting of the Senate shall be as follows:

7.4.1 Call to order.

7.4.2 If required, consideration of challenges to the minutes.

7.4.3 Consideration of calendar items for docketing (motions under discussion at the time of adjournment of a meeting shall be automatically entered as the head of the docket at the next regular meeting).

7.4.4 New business

7.4.4.1 Urgent business may be docketed for immediate consideration by a two-thirds vote of the senators present.

7.4.4.2 Other new business, once moved and seconded, may be docketed in regular order by majority vote of the senators present.

7.4.4.3 Senators may at any time, submit a written motion to the chairperson of the Senate (with a copy to the secretary of the Senate) and it shall be entered on the calendar.

7.4.4.4 The annual report of the University Curriculum Committee will normally be handled as a special item following consideration of the calendar and preceding the items of the regular docket.

7.4.5 Consideration of docketed items in numerical order.

7.4.6 Adjournment.

7.5 Form of Senate resolutions. Except for business introduced under the provisions of 7.44 (above), the individual or group desiring Senate consideration of an issue shall submit a petition using the forms found on the Faculty Senate website or by filing a print or electronic petition with the chairperson and the secretary of the Senate. The issue should be put in the form of a resolution and, if in print, signed by the petitioner. The chairperson will then assign the resolution a Calendar number. The resolution should present such facts as are needed to establish the importance of the problem and to indicate its present status and should close with the standard phrase, "Therefore, be it resolved..." or some other form of specific proposal in which the petitioner shall clearly indicate the kind of action he/she deems advisable.

7.6 Preparation of calendar and docket. The secretary, as outlined in 3.1.2, shall place resolutions by number, together with all supporting documents and references, on the website of the Senate. The items on the Senate docket shall be listed by title and number. The chairperson of the Senate shall be principally responsible for insuring that the complete calendar and docket of the Senate is up-to-date and is available to senators and the faculty through the Faculty Senate website.

7.7 Calendar to docket. At the opening of each meeting, before new business is called for, the Senate shall dispose of the items on the calendar. By majority vote the Senate shall decide: (1) to place the resolution at the head of the docket. (2) to docket the resolution in regular order. (3) to docket the resolution because of special circumstances for (date) and to notify the sender(s). (4) to refer the resolution to a standing committee. (5) to refer the resolution to appropriate officer of administration. (6) to refer the resolution to ad hoc committee. (7) to return the resolution to the petitioner with a request

that it be resubmitted in the form of a specific proposal for Senate action. (8) to return the resolution to the petitioner with a request that additional/supporting evidence or documentation be attached. (9) to return to the sender because of a Senate decision not to enter the item on the docket at this time. (10) to make some other procedural disposition of the item. The secretary of the Senate (or his/her designee) shall tag each resolution together with any supporting documents with a calendar sheet containing the title of the document to be presented and the following form: (see link on left) Members of the Senate may move one of the standard motions on the form in order to transfer the item from the calendar to the docket, although they may move some other procedural disposition if they choose. While items on the docket will normally be considered by the Senate in the order docketed, upon request of a senator, with approval of the majority of the Senate, a change may be made in the order of consideration.

7.8 Rights of faculty non-members. Members of the faculty are welcome to attend Senate meetings, except for executive sessions.

7.9 Students. Students, including representatives of the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) and student press, are welcome to attend meetings of the Senate, except for executive sessions.

7.10 The public. Meetings of the Senate, except for executive sessions, shall be open to the public, including the press. Space considerations may limit the application of this provision.

7.11 Voting. Action by the Senate shall be determined by voice vote, division, written ballot, or roll call.

7.11.1 Forms. In case of doubt by the presiding officer or upon call by a senator, the Senate shall divide. A written ballot may be ordered by majority vote of the Senate. Upon request of four members of the Senate, the secretary of the Senate shall call the roll of the membership in alphabetical order and record the Aye and No vote on each member.

7.11.2 Representation of the voting faculty. When the Senate acts representatively on these matters which comprise the distinctive functions of the voting faculty (see Faculty Constitution, Article IV, Section 4) privilege of motion, second, and debate shall be afforded all members of the Senate, but votes shall be cast only by those elected senators or alternates who are current members of the voting faculty.

7.12 Executive sessions. An executive session of the Senate is a meeting or a portion of a meeting the proceedings of which are secret. Only Senators, their duly selected alternates, or others whom the Senate may by majority vote invite shall be permitted to remain in the meeting room.

7.12.1 Executive sessions: authorization. The chairperson shall declare the Senate to be in executive session when the Senate, by a two-thirds vote, authorizes such a session.

7.12.2 Executive sessions: subjects. The business of the Senate is normally conducted in open and public session. An executive session will be authorized only when compelling reasons lead the Senate to believe that the matters to be discussed, if publicly disclosed, would do serious and perhaps irreparable harm to individuals or to the university.

7.12.3 Executive session: motions. During an executive session the only motion in order is a motion to rise from executive session. When made and voted upon, if the motion carries, the Senate finds itself sitting in ordinary session.

7.13 Consultative sessions. When an officer of administration wishes to report to the Senate or ask the advice of the Senate on a matter of the sort described above (Section 5.3), the Senate, by majority vote, may authorize a consultative session. Alternately, the Senate may wish to hear a report from an officer of administration on a matter of joint concern; in this case a senator may move to invite the appropriate officer(s) of administration to counsel with the Senate.

7.13.1 Initiation. Either the administrative officer desiring a consultative session informs the chairperson of the Senate or alternately the chairperson of the Senate, majority approval of the Senate having been recorded, shall transmit an invitation to the appropriate administrator(s). In either case, the matter shall be placed on the docket, as for example, "Consultative to the President on ..."

7.13.2 Procedure. During the consultative session, the administrative officer normally presents opening remarks and then leads the ensuing discussion. The consultative session may be terminated by the officer of administration or by the chairperson of the Senate when either feels that the session has accomplished its purpose. During a consultative session, the only motion in order is the motion to rise from consultative session. When made and voted upon, if the motion carries, the Senate finds itself sitting in ordinary session.

8. AMENDMENT. These bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the Senate provided that a notice containing the text of the proposed amendment is sent to the Senate membership at least five class days in advance of the meeting at which the amendment is considered; no amendment not in conformity with the requirement of the faculty constitution shall be in order.

9. ADOPTION. These bylaws shall become effective immediately upon their adoption by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and these bylaws shall, in case of actual or apparent conflict, take precedence over the provisions of the current Policies and Procedures Manual as they apply to the Senate.

Amended December 12, 2011

Amended April 2, 2012