Regular Meeting # 1776
UNI Faculty Senate
February 22, 2016 (3:30- 4:44)
CME 109 AB Meeting Room
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. **Courtesy Announcements**

A. No members of the press were present.

B. Senate Chair **O'Kane** listed two consultative sessions for the March 28 Faculty Senate meeting: One by Provost Wohlpart, the other by Matthew **Kroeger**. Provost **Wohlpart's** presentation will answer budget questions generated by Senators at the last meeting. Matthew **Kroeger**, Associate Vice Chair of Enrollment Management, will report on three years of trends in UNI's freshmen applicants, admits, enrolls and conditional admits.

2. **Summary Minutes/Full Transcript of January 25, 2016 (Walter/Burnight)** with the addition of John **Burnight** to list of those present 1/25/2016. Passed.

3. **Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing**
1294 Emeritus request for Zhuojun Joyce **Chen**, Dept. Communication Studies; Kenneth **Lyftogt**, Dept. History; Otto **MacLin**, Dept. Psychology
http://uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-zhuojun-joyce-chen-kenneth-lyftogt-otto
** Motion to docket in regular order. (**Fenech/Zeitz**) Passed.

4. There were no docketed items for consideration.

5. **New Business**
Consideration of Reconstitution of a Faculty Senate Budget Committee, it's duration, charge, composition and reporting:

** (**Swan/Cooley)** Motion to establish a Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee. Passed.

** (**Terlip/Zeitz**) Motion to establish members of a Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee to include the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate as committee chair, a member of the Faculty Senate who would serve as an at-large delegate, and one representative from each of the College Senates and the Library. Passed.

** (**Kidd/Swan**) Members of the Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee will have two-year staggered terms, beginning with some one-year terms. Passed.

** (**Kidd/Walter**) The Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee will meet once a month as a committee and once a month with the Provost's Office. The Committee will work with the Office of Institutional Research to share automatically generated data to report to their Senates. The Faculty Senate representative of the Committee will be asked to report to the Faculty Senate during Courtesy Announcements. Passed.

** (**Swan/Walter**) Senator Tim **Kidd** will serve as the at-large representative of the Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee. Passed.

6. Adjournment (**Gould/Hakes**) Passed.

Next Meeting:
3:30 p.m. Monday, March 28
2016, Oak Room, Maucker Union

Full Transcript follows of 46 pages, including 0 Addendum.

Regular Meeting #1776

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI FACULTY SENATE Meeting
February 22, 2016 (3:30-4:44)
CME 109 AB Meeting Room

Present: Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Xavier **Escandell**, Todd **Evans**, Lou **Fenech**, Vice Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Senate Chair Steve **O'Kane**, Nick **Schwaab**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gerald **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**.

Not Present: NSIG President Paul **Andersen**, Arica **Beckman**, Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**, Associate Provost Kavita **Dhanwada**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Faculty Chair Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Provost Jim **Wohlpart**.

Guests: There were no guests.

O'Kane: Good afternoon everyone. Good afternoon. Did you notice about forty-five minutes ago that the sun came out? I'm always looking for the silver lining in our days. Do we have any press present? None. I see no press. You'll notice we're a bit light up here in the front today. The Provost and both Associate Provosts and Faculty Chair **Peters** are at UNI Day at the Capitol. But they threatened that they'll be back next time. I have heard actually from Provost **Wohlpart** and he said he basically told me the following: He has a follow-up presentation that answers many of the questions that were raised during his and Michael **Hager**'s budget presentation, and he would like to give us another presentation to address all of those questions and they were very good questions. So the next time we meet, which by the way is late March, we get spring break too—the Provost will have a short presentation during a Consultative Session.

3

Furthermore, Matthew **Kroeger** who is I think the Chair of the Recruitment Council, would like to report to us on three years of trends in UNI's freshmen applicants, admits and enrolls and a close look at conditional audits. So we will have two fairly brief Consultative Sessions the next time that we meet. Those are my comments. There are obviously no other comments for today so let's move into…

Smith: What kinds of audits did you say?

O'Kane: Conditional. Did I say 'audits?' Pardon me it should have been 'admits--- conditional admits.

Smith: I was very interested in conditional audits as I'm an auditor.

O'Kane: Okay. We've got a little snafu on the minutes for approval in that I just found out moments ago that John's (**Burnight**) name got left off the attendees list last time. So I think what we could do is have somebody make a motion to accept the minutes for approval based on the fact that this evening I will post the minutes with John's (**Burnight**) name on them. So moved by Senator **Walter**. Seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Thank you. Any discussion? They were rather lengthy with a long budget presentation at the end of that. No discussion? All in favor of the motion, please say, 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' The motion passes. Okay, let's move right into Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. This would be the docket for the next time we meet and we have requests from Joyce Chen **Zhuojun** from Department of Communication Studies, Kenneth **Lyftogt**, from Department of History and Otto **MacLin** from Department of

Psychology. Their forms can be viewed online. So we need a motion to move that to docket in regular order. So moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. Any discussion? We'll discuss next time. Okay, so hearing none, all if favor of the motion, please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' The motion passes. Calendar Item 1294 will be docketed in regular order. We really have only one Business item today and it's an important business item. You'll recall that a year ago, this body---and Tim (**Kidd**) always correct me if I'm wrong---Tim's the guy---Tim **Kidd**. A year ago, or thereabouts, the Senate put together a Senate Budget Committee to…

Kidd: More than that. It was re-commissioned.

O'Kane: It was re-commissioned last year to apprise the Senate of what's going on in the budget. That provision, to have that budget committee, had a sundown clause, so it expired last spring semester. I think it's time that we talk about reconstituting or not, some kind of Senate Budget Committee. I know that I and Vice-Chair **Gould** and Faculty Chair **Peters** have all met with the Provost and the Provost is extremely interested in interacting with a Senate budget committee. He, as near as I can tell, is extremely interested in transparency and is extremely interested in having the input of the Faculty Senate from a Senate budget committee. He told us that he wants and active committee that would work with both he and Michael **Hager** in such a way that we could really feel that we owned that budget; that it's not something that's being rammed down our throats, but rather that in some sense, we owned that budget. And that committee

furthermore would be a liaison to the Provost Office and Michael **Hager**'s Office. That's from him, from the Provost now. I would like to open up the floor to discussion of the points that were present on the agenda which I'm sorry I cannot project today, and talk about things like, first: Should we in fact reconstitute that committee? Second, how long should the committee hold together—should that be a yearly thing? Should it be a permanent thing but the members rotate yearly? What is their exact charge? What is the makeup? How many members, and who are the members of that committee? And what sort of reporting would they do the Senate and what sort liaising would they be doing with the Provost's Office? So, I'm going to open it up to all of you to begin to talk about those sorts of things. Perhaps we should start with whether or not we should reconstitute such a committee? The floor is open. Yes. Senator **Walter**.

Walter: To see if anyone's had any ideas on coming in this late in the budget historical picture, whether such a committee would have any real jurisdiction? What's their place in the process of approving the budget or commenting on the budget? Liaison is one thing. The actual task job check.

O'Kane: From what I've heard from the Provost and Gretchen (**Gould**) can jump in if I'm missing something, is that the Provost really is interested in hearing our opinions of what's being discussed in the budget. And you're correct that we are a little late in the year, but better late than never.

Kidd: We've been a little lax this year---One, because we've expired and two, because I'm reconstituting my research so that has taken some time. I

would say that we have met with the Provost and Michael **Hager** in the fall more than once to look at some issues about what they're presenting. As far as the budgeting process, we've never had anything where we had regular meetings with the Provost or Michael **Hager**. It's mostly been more of a 'we're asking questions and waiting for answers,' kind of thing which does make getting the information a difficult process. It's not that they're necessarily trying to hide some information, it's that we don't always know the right questions to ask. It's very important to word things very carefully or we won't get the answers we want. Often, it's like, "Well this is in the budget book. This is in this fact book. You can look this up." It's a lot of work. I've done this. It's a lot of details, especially for historical comparisons. So I believe at this point, that the Office of Institutional Research who does all the reports, I believe that they've upgraded their systems quite a bit and now reports are more easy to generate. I don't think we're late, as far as budgeting goes. As far as historical things, a lot of budget decisions are done near the end.

Walter: I'd like to clarify one thing. I didn't mean late in the process, I kind of meant, historically late. The University, has not to my knowledge has ever been run with such suggested openness, so that's why you'd have to dig through the books. This would be a new tradition. Am I mistaken?

O'Kane: Yes. A new tradition, kind of along the lines, it seems to me, what is it called---the Labor Committee?

Gould: Executive Labor and Management Team.

O'Kane: Those sides I can report on that are extremely happy with what's going on. The Union is very happy with the openness of the discussions with the Provost's Office and vice-versa. It seems to me it would be something like that. Other comments about whether or not to reconstitute that committee?

Hakes: Before we reconstitute it, can you remind me exactly how many members it had Tim (**Kidd**), and what it was like? Like how many members it had and how often you met? Before we reconstitute something, I'd like to know what it is we're reconstituting. How many members? How often did you meet?

Kidd: The traditional committee was basically I think four people or five people. One person from the Senate. I was Chair of the Budget Committee when I was Vice Chair of the Senate, which is something you should think of and I continued on as Chair while I was Chair of the Senate, which I don't think that was a great thing. It was an important activity and I think the Chairmanship should not be shared the Senate as well. The four people – How they were chosen? Basically the committee kind of collapsed and didn't do anything for a while. They did something, but it wasn't satisfactory. I'm not sure of all the details. It was reconstituted when I was Vice-Chair essentially and our charge was to look for anomalous transfers between different codes where there were significant amounts of money being transferred out of academics into other places; to take a look at auxiliary funding and to examine the overall budget as in what was the

University's final budget. So that was our charge. The committee makeup was whoever agreed to it.

O'Kane: Tim, (**Kidd**) you don't recall how the other three people were contacted?

Kidd: They were people who were already on the committee and probably were acquainted with the budget.

Hakes: Did they represent each college at all?

Kidd: I can also describe how we discussed how to reconstitute the committee.

Terlip: As I recall when we were setting it up, we had this discussion at the Senate about whether we could just have anybody in there who was interested, or people who really had some working knowledge. And my recollection is the initial committee all were folks who wanted to do it but also understood budgets. I don't know if that will play a factor now.

O'Kane: It seems to me that the original committee at least last year, was mostly involved with preparing a report about what the budget was about. I think in my mind anyway, what we're looking for now is both that activity and more of a liaising function, where there would actually be discussion about the kinds of decisions that the Provost's Office would make. I know for instance it's possible---we've all heard the budget request, that this coming spring that things are going to get tight and we may not get what is

asked for from the Legislature. If that's the case, I know that the administration doesn't want to sit up there on the hill and just make decisions in a vacuum about what has to change. I think they really are concerned with having the voice of the faculty. So I admit, I envision this committee as perhaps meeting with the Provost monthly. Bi-monthly? Perhaps reporting to the Senate maybe twice a year, once each semester.

Terlip: Or as needed.

O'Kane: Or as needed.

Swan: So your discussions with the Provost and other people about this sort of thing, they don't have other ideas of getting faculty input and values in budget decisions? Or do they? Maybe they do and you can tell use about some of the other ideas?

O'Kane: Jesse (Swan) they might but the only one I'm aware of is them reaching out and saying, "We really want the Senate involved in this." I know that's a fairly weak answer, but that's what I've got.

Swan: Part of the question of course, it was a big statement they were making about involvement, and so I started to feel that if we didn't do this, at least right now, they would want to interpret that as faculty not having ideas or not wanting input. Of course we have lots of ideas and lots of input. We've had this committee for many, many years and many different configurations, and there was an administration that destroyed lots of things, including the operations of the Faulty Senate and that committee.

We have a lot of that history and it's not that old history. So it's not that people don't have ideas, and there are lots of ideas of communicating---you know, lots of ways of communicating the ideas, so we really shouldn't feel like there's just <u>one</u> way---a new budget committee. But, if there's a desire to get some direct responses from some faculty on something happening right now, we could easily have an ad hoc budget committee and think of some good faculty and colleagues to ask to be on that, to meet with the Provost and other administrators right now about anything specific they might have in mind--- and not have to come up with a whole system that some people are going to be reticent about, given our not-so-old and indeed recent history.

O'Kane: Comments about those comments? I hear Senator **Swan** saying rather than putting together say a permanent standing committee, that we just put together an ad hoc committee.

Swan: Especially if the Provost or other administrators have something specific they want feedback from.

O'Kane: I think that I can say the answer to that is 'no.' They really want something standing that they can regularly interact with concerning budget.

Zeitz: I like the idea of a standing committee. I think once we get our foot in the door it's important to keep the door open. I think that we've got the

opportunity to provide input. That's what the Provost is saying---provide input and be able to report on output.

Kidd: One thing I would say is it took me about six months to learn how to read through all the budget issues. I don't think I'm an expert even at this time. It did take me quite awhile to understand how to go through things and look at the numbers and the object codes and I would recommend that you have something which has something more than a six-month term, because especially if you have new members, they're not going to know what's going on. It takes a lot of effort to get involved.

Walter: If this is so valuable to the Provost and others in administration, perhaps we can offer a trade of some sort. If they will supply us with somebody with some deep expertise in reading object codes and understanding all this stuff, it would lower our learning curve a little bit. Not somebody that would stand between us, but it would certainly help speed up that learning curve, which I understand, I believe Tim: I think it's going to be a pain in the neck. So that would be something. If you want us on board, help us be effective---some kind of a tradeoff.

Kidd: Yes. What we talked about in the fall actually was to have a committee which had more representation from the Colleges. Currently it's not very representative. We used to have one representative from Education, but they became a department head. Bruce **Rieks** or Gary **Yost** would be very good as a---I'm not sure what you'd call it---a non-voting member of some sort, to work with things. They've both been very helpful

in working through these things. What we'd recommend was to basically make the committee, and our charge would be to yes, generate a report which shows the financial health and potential for the next year and (?). The other part was to assist with the financial information that should be coming to departments and colleges in the spring and fall. This would be for next year, to report about the spending for the last year, and then in the spring we'd have the budget for the following year in College format for colleges; Department format for departments. We've got that pretty much worked out. But we've never had the opportunity to have some kind of a monthly meeting or bi-monthly meeting with the Provost. That would be something new and I think would be very valuable.

O'Kane: I do too. I'm convinced of it.

Swan: That would be something new in relation to the last five or six years, but not new in the history of UNI, so we could look in our records and constitute the budget committee when it did work well and when the administration worked with the budget committee or we can constitute it the way that Senator **Kidd** is proposing it, but reminding ourselves and our colleagues that we're not here to look at accounting. The budget committee doesn't look at accounting; doesn't operate systems or anything like that. A budget is an expression of values and judgments and that's what this committee would be involved in. And if anybody's bringing up accounting matters to obfuscate the discussion of values and judgments then we or our colleagues need to say, "We're not here for that." We really do want to talk about what kind of judgments are being made and where

our resources are being placed, and perhaps praise that or perhaps criticize it, and say it should go someplace else.

O'Kane: I think you've said it very well.

Swan: So we should encourage our colleagues to want to be on such a committee, even if they have no interest in object codes or reading accounting documents or an anything like that. In fact, I think some of those colleagues would be the best to be on this committee.

O'Kane: I would agree. How does that sound to you, Senator **Kidd**, because I know you dug into the numbers and object codes? Senator **Swan** is suggesting do we need to…

Swan: If someone wants to do that, I think it's very good, and I think it gave Senator **Kidd** an awful lot of authority when he spoke about these things, and it certainly can do that. But that's not the only way one should feel one can develop authority to speak about values and judgments.

Kidd: My response would be that I think it's important to have at least one person who will be comfortable with that, but for the entire committee, it's not necessary, but we need at least one person that is comfortable in that and will not be seen as having an agenda. You will look at numbers. I'm a scientist and I can make numbers dance if I want to, so do accountants. We need someone who's going to be able to try to be neutral and is good with numbers and see trends.

Terlip: It seems to me that there is some consensus that we need a committee, so I'm going to propose a structure and if you all don't like it, it's fine. I would think it would be great if the Vice-Chair of the Senate would serve as the Chair of the [budget] committee and then we would have one representative from each college and then have a non-voting member that Tim (**Kidd**) talked about. And in terms of terms, I think initially we should set it up so that that half the committee has a one-year term and the other half has a two-year term.

O'Kane: Is that a motion or should we pick that apart?

Terlip: Okay. I'll move it. Now you can pick it apart if you want to.

O'Kane: Do we have a second for that? Seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. Questions?

Gould: Could we have a representative from the Library as well?

Terlip: It is a College.

Gould: It is a College but sometimes people don't always remember to include it.

O'Kane: My question would be does that representative from each college come from Senate members, or could it be Senate members and/or-- or directly from the colleges? Do you have a feel for that?

Terlip: If the Vice-Chair of the Senate is on it, it would seem you've got a natural liaison person there who would obviously be able to talk to the Senate. Again I'm going back historically and my mind may be going, but it seemed like at one time we even talked about having the College Senates elect their representative who might be a Senator, or who might be just a great person who understands numbers in the College.

Kidd: I believe what we had recommended was two members of the Senate and a member of each College Senate.

Terlip: Okay.

O'Kane: How big is our committee now getting to be? Is that six, seven, eight?

Terlip: Seven, eight with the Vice Chair.

O'Kane: Is that… sometimes, committees work best when they're smaller. Is that becoming unwieldy?

Terlip: Including the Library would be five.

O'Kane: Okay. Six members. How many members, Senator **Kidd**, were on your previous committee, four?

Kidd: It started with five.

O'Kane: Does anybody know how many members are on the Labor Relations Committee?

Terlip: Three, I think from each side---three or four.

Kidd: The reason for a member from each College Senate would be to have a direct person who would report to the College Senates on the issues instead of having to try to send information.

O'Kane: What is the sense of the Senate? Does that seem to be what you would all like?

Cooley: I'm wondered when you said the Provost issued this invitation, you said he had some pretty clear ideas about how he expected this to operate.

O'Kane: No. I hope I didn't say it exactly like that.

Cooley: It seemed as though you said that he wanted to have…

O'Kane: He's excited to have it happen.

Cooley: He wanted to have a lot of exchange with the Faculty Senate.

O'Kane: Yes.

Cooley: Does that imply that he wants it to be made up of people who are on the Faculty Senate?

O'Kane: Gretchen, do you recall? I don't remember that being part of the conversation.

Gould: I don't remember either. He didn't, from my recollection as well. I don't remember he clarified that.

O'Kane: But he did want it to represent the Senate.

Cooley: Okay. Then does the membership have to be from the Senate?

O'Kane: That was my question. What do you all think?

Terlip: I like Tim's idea.

Evans: What was your last recommendation, Senator **Kidd**?

Kidd: It was two members of the Senate and a member of each College and we had thought we it would be good if we could have members of the College Senates.

O'Kane: So we're looking at seven. Is that correct?

Kidd: That would be seven.

McNeal: And then a non-voting member.

Kidd: And a non-voting member.

O'Kane: Wait, let's back up. Would the Senator represent their College?

Evans: There's two Senators and they represent their college, and then the additional members would be from the Colleges that aren't represented.

O'Kane: And the Chair of that committee would not matter? That would be irrespective of the other members, correct? So you could have two from two different Colleges?

Hakes: If we were going to <u>not</u> have a College send someone from their Senate because it was already represented by someone then we should do the same thing with the Senate Chair, also. We just want information going both ways, so it could be that flexible. We need the Colleges or the Library to send a representative, if there's not one from here. [from the Faculty Senate] That would keep the numbers smaller.

O'Kane: So I'm thinking that committee then could be five.

Hakes: It could be five.

O'Kane: So the Chair of the Committee would be from one College, and then we'd appoint one other person from another College. And whatever Colleges are not represented, they're Senates would elect somebody, and that's five.

Zeitz: But we were talking about the flow back into the College Senates of information.

O'Kane: Yes.

Zeitz: …and because the person who is represented here, is not a member of the College Senate, it won't necessarily have that flow. It seems to me, that maybe it's too big, but it seems to makes sense that we have one specific representative from each College, and if we do end up with two people that are from the same college that's not necessarily a problem because they're in a leadership role.

O'Kane: Would we not have somebody from every college?

Zeitz: What I'm saying is, the thing is that if we counted like if I was the Chair, and I was from the College of Education and we didn't have anybody else from the Senate of the College of Education, we wouldn't necessarily have a flow because I don't go to those meetings. I guess I could if I had to, but if we had someone that was from the Senate then we would have that flow of information between the Senates---the College Senates.

Hakes: You're referring to the College Senates.

Terlip: The College Senates.

O'Kane: So we're looking at either six or seven. We're six, if there is a representative from each College. Pardon me there's five if there's a representative of each College plus the Chair, OR one from each College and the Chair and a Senator. The floor is still open on this matter.

Gould: When are we looking to commence this committee?

O'Kane: I think as soon as possible.

Gould: Okay.

Swan: My comment was something along the lines of Senator **Zeitz**. What sounds so appropriate about Senator **Kidd**'s proposal, which I take to be the committee's---the previous committee's proposal, is indeed the communications both ways. So what seems to be important is to have a Senator from a College Senate on the Budget Committee for the communications from College of Ed Senate to the Budget Committee, to

the administration and then back. So however we do it, it seems that we should have at least one Senator from each College Senate. If you're worried about it being too big, which I actually wouldn't worry about it being too big, people are always wanting to come and present to this body---this is a very big body, and we do things like that. So, I wouldn't worry about it being too big, but if you are I would think that the four Senators from the four Senates would be the kernel of the committee. We wouldn't do away with that. We wouldn't say, just because you're in the College of Ed on the Faculty Senate, you're taking care of the College of Ed. You need to be on the College of Ed <u>Senate</u> to be the College of Ed rep to the Budget Committee. That's what I'm saying---that those four Senators from the four Senates need to be on the Committee, whatever else we do or don't do.

Kidd: I'm not afraid of a larger committee because of how the work load is distributed, especially because it's been people staying on forever. Most of the workload goes down to one or two people essentially. From my experience in trying to understand what is important at the College level, I'm good with CNS, but what's important for CSBS--- I don't know. That's why I'd recommend College Senates be involved. I recommended two Senators because one, I think it's a really good idea to have the Vice Chair [of the Faculty Senate] be the Chair of the [budget] committee so they can call the meetings because they have those automatic meetings with the Provost. That way, scheduling is nice. But also that person--- that would be the Vice-Chair--- that would be automatic. That would be a revolving term.

And then another Senator would be on a two-year term. Does that make sense?

O'Kane: You're suggesting seven on the committee?

Kidd: How many Colleges are there?

O'Kane: Five, including Library.

McNeal: The non-voting person, that makes eight.

O'Kane: Who is the non-voting person?

Kidd: Our suggestion was that we'd have someone we could liaise with, someone who would be expected to work with us. They would be there when we meet with the Provost. I know Bruce **Rieks** has done this.

O'Kane: Is this person necessary?

Kidd: As a committee member, I don't know. They'll answer the questions that we have. It's sometimes nice to have someone who can answer questions as needed.

Walter: A technician, kind of.

Kidd: Yes. An interpreter. It just depends. They would not be all that beneficial for the discussions of what you're talking about Jesse (**Swan**), the values. But they're more important for digging into stuff, for helping us generate reports. It wouldn't have to be a member.

Terlip: For the members of the College Senates, based on your experience, would it be better to have them serve multiple-year terms or just a single year?

Kidd: That's a good question. I would say two-year terms would be good. I agree with you in setting up a committee, you'd want to have it expire after one year, but I would also think it would be fine if a current College Senator was finishing up with one College Senate that they would be one year on the Budget Committee. They should still be able to communicate with their College Senates.

O'Kane: That suggestion would have the entire composition change, except for the Chair, every two years.

Kidd: No. Like what she (**Terlip**) said.

Terlip: Half for one year when we start, so then it would be staggered after that.

O'Kane: But we'd have to decide which Colleges then start with a one-year term. So there'll be either two or three one-year appointments.

Terlip: Yes. You'll need some continuity because the Vice Chair will rotate.

Cooley: How long are the appointments on the College Senates because maybe we don't have to choose?

O'Kane: Three years.

Cooley: Three? Okay. So maybe we can get someone in the last year of their College Senate term, or as a default someone who has a few years left on their term.

Kidd: The concern that we've always had is getting people who want to serve on the committee. It's not been a problem with, 'Oh, we want to serve longer."

O'Kane: I have a feeling if the [budget] committee focuses more on what Senator **Swan** suggests, about values and our mission, that much of the tedium goes away from that process. In fact, it could be very invigorating.

Cooley: I think it might be good idea to have more than one-year terms because our school year doesn't match up very well with the budgetary process, it seems to me. So if you could stagger it so that it doesn't match up with the school year, because the budgetary process, from the little I know--- doesn't seem to actually match up with the academic year. So you'd want someone there two years to learn how the heck to do it, and then to be effective.

Kidd: It would be a two-year term. What we're trying to say is we don't want everyone to expire at the same time.

Terlip: So we started part with the two-year and one-year, and then all they would all be two-year.

Zeitz: And there's a question as to term limits. Can they re-up?

Terlip: Are there term limits on the College Senates?

O'Kane: You've been on the Senate, Michael (**Walter**) right?

Walter: This is my second year.

O'Kane: No, not this Senate, the College Senate.

Walter: It was a while back. I don't remember.

Terlip: I was on it. I think it's two in a row.

Zeitz: I was on the College of Education Senate.

Walter: A question that relates to Senator **Swan**'s remark: I've acquired the annoying habit of asking people when they come up with ideas: In five or ten years, what do you expect to measure in terms of this, to see if this is---or was a good idea. That's kind of tedious, but let's ask, 'What is it that's broken or worn out, or needs fixing, that this is an answer for?'

O'Kane: Are you asking me?

Walter: I'm asking the room.

Zeitz: Distrust would be one.

O'Kane: I agree. I'm happy that we can provide input in the budget, which is something awfully refreshing. I think that Senator **Swan** has said that it's something that hasn't happened in a good long while.

Swan: Another answer to the question would be, an adjustment in allocation of resources towards an increased funding and supply of academics, including programs and faculty and library supplies---that sort of thing. So in ten years, if that occurred, I would thing this would be a good thing.

Walter: And we could measure that.

Swan: …and we could measure those three things.

O'Kane: I suggest that we either approve or disapprove of having the committee, and that we also then move ahead with the composition and how that composition is formed and then spend the rest of our time talking about the charge of that committee and the kinds of reporting that will occur.

Terlip: I would like to withdraw my earlier motion.

Swan: Which she needs to do, to do what you want to do.

O'Kane: I don't think the second has a say in that, do they?

Swan: The second should agree to withdraw.

Zeitz: I agree.

Swan: I move to establish a standing committee—do you want it to be of the Senate or of the Faculty? I move to make to make a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, a Budget Committee.

O'Kane: Do I have a second? Senator **Cooley**. I think we've discussed that. All in favor, 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes.

Swan: So it will be called the Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee? Just to make it clear that it's a Faculty Senate Budget Committee?

O'Kane: Very well. We now have one of those. Next question is 'Who's on it?' What's it made up of? I think Senator **Terlip** if you could modify your original motion. Could you restate it perhaps?

Terlip: Okay. I would move that the [budget] committee be comprised of the Vice Chair of the Senate, who would serve as chair of the [budget] committee, one other Senator, and a representative from each of the College Senates, including the Library.

O'Kane: Do I have a second? Senator **Zeitz** ever so slightly got there first. Any further discussion on that? Notice that we've not got term limits in that motion. We can have another motion to that effect.

Swan: So with this composition, I find that, I don't know if it needs to be official or not---I'd like official, but the representative from the Senate is at-large representative and is to think in University-wide terms, not so much her College, as the College Senate representatives would be.

O'Kane: That sounds like a friendly…could we restate it then?

Terlip: So, it would be a committee comprised of the Vice Chair of the Senate who would chair the committee, a member of the Senate who would serve as an at-large delegate and one representative from each of the College Senates and the Library.

O'Kane: Senator **Zeitz**, I assume that's okay with you? Any further discussion on the membership of that committee?

Kidd: I would recommend two-year terms.

O'Kane: Let's make that a separate motion. We're going to have to ask how to do that. All in favor of the membership of the committee, say 'aye,' 'opposed,' 'nay,' abstain, 'aye.' Motion passes. We now have a mechanism to staff that committee. The question, among other questions, one of the ones that remain on the table is the duration of the appointments to that committee. May I have a motion to address that?

Swan: What do you want, Senator **Kidd**? Your motion is…?

Kidd: That they are two-year appointments beginning with a one-year appointment so they are staggered and members all don't disappear at once.

O'Kane: Would you add to that how we would choose among the…? We would either need to have two of the Colleges have a one-year original appointment or three. And if we have two, then perhaps the first [Faculty] Senator would also be a one-year appointment. It goes three and three.

Swan: The Vice Chair is going to be one year.

O'Kane: The Vice Chair will always be one year. They're not representing a College.

Gould: Will it even be one year? At least…

Kidd: Yes.

O'Kane: This first one will be a short one.

Kidd: One and a half years.

Gould: So when I'm [Faculty Senate] Chair next year, I'll also be on the Budget Committee?

Terlip: No. The new Vice Chair will be.

Gould: Okay, that's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure.

Terlip: So you've got two months.

O'Kane: Okay. So what do we all wish to do?

Kidd: The first term should extend throughout next year. Work over the summer is an important thing because what the budget is in May is not what the budget is in July. It's important to be able to see how this evolves. Second thing is, we never had a problem with people only serving one year. People seem to volunteer quite happily to serve. So if you'd like to make that formal, I don't think that's going to be a problem.

Swan: Oh. So is this what you're saying? You're saying that if we appointed/elected ---whatever we're going to do---for two years, but then next year say 'two of you have to stop now,' and you'll get four volunteers and figure out which two will do it. Let the committee handle who is going to come off.

O'Kane: It would be three people because the Chair rotates every year, and then we'd have to have two or three of the colleges be one-year OR...

Swan: But let the committee handle that.

O'Kane: The committee can handle that easily.

Kidd: The one year term would not end in May. It would extend to May of 2017 initially.

O'Kane: Have you formulated that thoroughly as a motion?

Kidd: That sounds complicated. How about two-year terms? It doesn't matter if the second year they're not on the Senate.

O'Kane: Very well.

Swan: I actually think it is important that they be on the Senate both years because that's the communication.

Hakes: At least they should have been on their College Senates so they know how to access that body.

Swan: But anybody can have access to that body. In real life, none of us do go to meetings we don't have to.

Kidd: I'm open to interpretation of that.

Swan: I know. I do think it's best that the person just be on that Senate for two years.

O'Kane: Very good. I like that. Did we get a second on that?

Swan: Second.

O'Kane: Second by Senator **Swan**. Any further discussion?

Swan: So what's the motion, Chair?

O'Kane: Senator **Kidd** can you give us your motion?

Kidd: Members will have two-year terms and they will consist of members of the [Faculty] Senate and the College Senates and the persons who serve will only be persons if they are actually on that body.

O'Kane: Very well.

Swan: So two-year terms. Is that part of the motion---advising the Committee of staggered terms, once they're formed? It doesn't have to be part of the motion.

O'Kane: Okay. I have a second by Senator **Swan**, any further discussion?

Terlip: I don't know if this is a separate thing but, after this year, do we have a date by which the new folks need to be selected and appointed, you know what I mean?

Kidd: People should be selected by March of each year.

Swan: Can it follow the Committee on Committees calendar, however they work it?

Terlip: I don't know. That's why I was asking.

Swan: Just have it follow the Committee on Committees work calendar.

O'Kane: Okay. All in favor then, 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' Motion passes. It seems to me we have two more things to talk about. One is the charge to that committee, and the other is how that committee is both going to report and liaise with the Provost's Office. We'll take up the first one, the charge. It seems to me that what Senator **Kidd** had said about the original committee, probably should still stand, but I think layered on top of that and more perhaps even more important is what Senator **Swan** had to say about our values. I would entertain a motion to formulate a charge to this committee.

Swan: I wonder if you and Faculty Chair **Peters** might draft a charge for us to approve at the next meeting?

O'Kane: I actually like that idea.

Swan: You can draw on and contact other people. I think that will be much better than trying to do something here when someone---not me---but someone might want to leave.

O'Kane: Sold. I will do that. We do not have a charge. I'll bring this up as New Business probably next time. Is that okay?

Terlip: Isn't it Old Business?

O'Kane: Whatever it is: Revisiting Old Business. Reporting: Here's me speaking out loud. I would like to see that committee report at least twice a year. Seems to me that that committee should meet with the Provost Office and the appropriate people along with the Provost, a minimum of every other month. Tim (**Kidd**) is shaking his head, saying 'one month.' This was my opening offer.

Swan: How much should they meet, Senator **Kidd**?

Kidd: We were meeting bi-weekly. That means twice a month.

Swan: That's very good. That's much more frequent than once a semester. This is why it's important.

Kidd: The thing that we never had a chance to do was to meet with the Provost on a regular basis. That would be a very different way of getting information back and forth.

O'Kane: Yes.

Kidd: From my meetings last year with the Provost as Chair of the Senate, there was a lot of information I got out of that, and so if we could meet once a month with the Provost, and then the other meeting just be among the committee ourselves, I think that would be good.

Terlip: Could we say a minimum of one time a month with the Provost?

Kidd: Sure.

O'Kane: The Provost is very good. If you members of the committee were to email the Provost ahead of time and say, "We have these kinds of questions,' I'm sure he would have those answers—they would be there. Can somebody formulate a motion? Tim (**Kidd**)? Can you make that a motion?

Kidd: Sure. Motion that the [Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee] committee meets once a month with the Provost and reports to the Senate and once a month additionally among themselves, and reports in the fall term (early fall) considering the budget of that year, and in the spring concerning the budget of the future year.

O'Kane: Very well. Do I hear a second?

Swan: Could we keep talking about it?

O'Kane: We could have a second and then talk about it.

Swan: But we could change it maybe a little bit.

O'Kane: That's fine.

Swan: So the Senators on the Senate…It sounds really good to me, once a month with the Provost, once a month with the committee, and so that seems like if the College Senate meets on say Mondays twice a month, it would be the other two Mondays maybe that the [Budget] committee would meet. Do you see what I'm getting at with scheduling?

Kidd: On Mondays, it's alternate Mondays. The College Senates meet the Mondays that we don't.

Swan: So that would make it a problem with the Senator and Vice Chair of the Senate, because they already meet on the alternate weeks.

O'Kane: This will be a juggling act with the Provost's secretary Pat, and all of the constituents of the committee's schedules.

Swan: What I wanted to get to and was thinking about, is the College Senators will meet with the committee; will meet with the Provost and in between will meet with the College Senates, and it should be a constant communication. The University Senator and perhaps the Vice Chair would be meeting with us every other week as well, and there should be a constant communication going on. That's why the reporting should be constant. I was worried about saying 'once a semester' reporting. It should be every other week, maybe once a month at least---they should always be telling us something.

Cooley: I share Jesse's (**Swan**) sentiments on the reporting. I think it's not necessarily but potentially a waste of time to have this committee drafting two reports a year; presenting two reports a year. I also think that there's a significant philosophical difference in the reasons behind the committee. So looking backwards, at the previous year's budget may not be as meaningful as it was in the past. I don't know. I think that it will be especially meaningful to discuss future budgets, but if we're in the loop, and we're

having constant conversation about the formation of these budgets moving forward, I don't know how important it will be to prepare a formal document and say 'This is what's happened in the past.' Maybe in the beginning it will be, but as the committee moves forward, I think that that type of reporting---looking backwards, will become less significant and perhaps time-consuming in a way that's not very practical.

Swan: It could always be made.

Terlip: I fully agree with constant communication. My take on it was that they would prepare two formal documents, but they would also be in constant communication. I think initially, until everybody understands the process, having what happened, being able to compare it with the spring, would be good idea and you could always change that later.

Kidd: Just from speaking with many faculty, there's some misconceptions but also some real concerns about budgeted spending and actual spending in the University.

Cooley: That's true.

Kidd: That's why I thought it would be nice to have something in the fall to compare the two. Now that they finally separated, and the process has become cleaner, it's getting easier. The other thing is, one of the charges for the committee would be at the beginning to make this an easy process. This information can be generated automatically which could be fact-

checked by anyone if they wished to. It should not have to be myself, or someone else delving through the fact book. It shouldn't have to be this way. They can generate all the information that we want.

Cooley: Who are 'they'? It's not the committee?

Kidd: The Institutional Research Office. Your department secretary can actually get access to that information. It's just a matter of getting access. What we need to work out is what information has to be generated for us?

O'Kane: I agree that we should not burden this committee with too many reports to write. Is two too many or is one sufficient?

Kidd: I think if we make it so that it's automatically generated, that the data is automatically generated, that's the key. That's what took all the time, digging into all the details. For some things we had to, but the general updating, it shouldn't take that much.

O'Kane: It seems to me we could change your motion to something like report at least once each semester to the Senate or more often as needed. One more comment about Senator **Swan**'s comment, I'm not sure that the Faculty Senate can impose on the College Senates, something they must do. I don't know.

Swan: We can pose a Senator here in that way to tell us what happened at the meeting last week. People are going to talk if they know that's the expectation. I think it should be the expectation, that at every College

Senate meeting, you should say what happened at the [Faculty Senate] Budget Committee including 'Nothing that would mean anything to you.' That could be the report, right, or any kind of communication, just a five minute report back or discussion to get feedback from the other Senators, and College Senate Chair et cetera. I would want to say that the University Senator on the [Budget] Committee at every Senate meeting have time to discuss the Budget Committee with us, if there's anything to discuss, without then having to say that, "You must meet and have a formal report once a semester.' The formal report could be pro forma, just a hassle--- not really necessary. When we have had formal reports, we haven't taken them. I believe the last budget committee, we actually took their report in the fall and not in the spring, so that was work that we were requiring our colleagues to do, that then we didn't pay attention to. So that's why I don't want us to do that. We should just say, 'You're on the Committee. Every week, tell us, if you need to talk to us about and we'll try to take five or ten minutes to discuss it.'

O'Kane: It sounds like we have a request to change the motion. I would like to say one more thing about it. I wonder if we should, rather than each time the Faculty Senate meets, but once a month--- because they're only going to meet with the Provost once a month.

Swan: But they're going to meet another time and it might be that other time that something interesting and important comes up, and if they talked the last time, they might not want to talk because it's just once a month. It's as needed. So really if there is nothing, and they say, 'We've got nothing

going,' we don't want to spend any time. But if they say, 'Oh, now I do have something. I need your advice about what to say,' then we want to listen it seems to me.

Kidd: I just wanted to comment that the reason the report wasn't generated last spring was because the budget wasn't generated last spring.

Swan: So even if we require it, it can't happen.

Kidd: The second thing is the Vice Chair is in front of the room and during comments may be the perfect time.

Swan: Oh, yeah.

O'Kane: I can add that to the Courtesy Announcements I suppose.

Kidd: Yes. Exactly.

Escandell: I was just wondering, especially since there will be these meetings with the Provost, if---I'm a big fan of the minutes---instead of getting this information filtered, if there's a way of, for the sake of transparency, if those minutes can be somehow recorded and produce minutes, because that usually for me is the best way to get actually get the 'what happened.' I don't know if that's a reasonable request or if there is a more formal way of accountability in a way?

Kidd: I can respond to that. The way we currently get set up--- to get minutes because we don't have the manpower. We have people that are

trying to do something but don't have the time. However, I'd recommend the Vice Chair taking minutes. [laughter] If minutes were to be taken, I think it would be the Vice Chair.

Escandell: My point is that I'm not so much concerned about the actual reports and really the numbers, but more about the processes and the discussions that might behind the scenes or as these things happen, moving targets as these things are being discussed and constituencies that are competing for resources and so forth. It's not like even there will be agendas and things like that. Again, I just want to have a little more of that. Or again, I might volunteer to be part of the committee.

Kidd: I think transparency is wonderful, but we would have to have a secretary--- someone who is not taking part in discussions. Whoever is busy writing down all the information that's going on does not have time to take full part in discussion.

Swan: That's right.

Escandell: Maybe the members of the Senate don't consider this valuable. I was just giving my…I'm a big fan of minutes, that's all.

Swan: I love our minutes and many of our colleagues love the Senate minutes and so I second that. With this kind of committee though, at times, to be really fruitful and beneficial, if it's going to be people need to feel comfortable making mistakes, saying erroneous things that are corrected at the next meeting and with the kind of minutes that we have, no sensible

person is going to do something like that. These meetings are of course open to the faculty. Faculty could always attend and participate but people do need to feel comfortable criticizing too---I mean criticizing forthrightly. Sometimes it's hard to find the best political words to use to express a criticism, and so you just say it in a way that you certainly don't mean and don't want to say.

Escandell: That would be an element.

O'Kane: I agree.

Swan: I'm not sure that's ever going to happen, right? But that's often when the best work in communications occur to transform the budget allocations.

Terlip: If the Vice Chair is going to be reporting each time, it's going to be in the Senate minutes so the rest of campus should have some idea of what happens.

Swan: I didn't think it would be the Senator, who was appointed to the committee who would be reporting each time, the Vice Chair has lots of duties already including chairing now, this [budget] committee. If those two agree that the Vice Chair is going to do the reporting, then that would be okay, but the Senator, I thought was going to do that report.

Terlip: My point was that if that report is given at the Senate, my point was that it would be in the Senate minutes and everybody would hear.

Swan: And the discussion we would have would be verbatim in the minutes and very much in line with the transparency that we've been talking about. So what's your motion now Senator **Kidd**?

O'Kane: Could you read your original motion Tim (**Kidd**)?

Cooley: I'm sorry to return to this point. So there may or may not be some reports, and 'they' would help with these reports. If you could be little bit more precise about who 'they' are when you ultimately describe these reports. If it's someone from the Office of Institutional Data, let's name that person who's going to prepare or participate in the preparation of a report if possible.

Kidd: Right now I would suggest Kristen **Moser**. I believe she would be the person. I can't say for sure, or Bruce **Rieks**; he has more knowledge over the actual details: One of those two, or some combination. I think the [budget] committee has to…the hard part is how to begin; what are the questions and how to ask them in a way that the people who generate the data understand. But I think that will move a lot faster and be a lot more productive if we have monthly meetings with the Provost.

O'Kane: I think we're at a spot where we might need to restate the reporting and liaising activities. Can you give that a whirl?

Kidd: Sure. I would move that the committee would work with the Office of Institutional Research and the Finance Office to create data, which is automatically generated data, which could serve as the basis for a report on

the future budget in the spring and the comparison of the budgets in the fall.

O'Kane: Sorry. I got ahead of myself. We're still back on the motion to meet as a committee, we haven't voted on that, right? To meet as a committee once a month and as a committee with the Provost's Office once a month.

Swan: And report to the---each College Senator reports to his or her Senate all the time---regularly, and that the Senator reports to the University Senate every time.

McNeal: As needed.

O'Kane: As needed. But they will be asked each time, "Is there a need for reporting?"

Swan: But if we say 'You report to the Senate every time that your asked then you say, 'I have nothing to report,' that's how you do it. But if you say 'as needed,' then it's never on the agenda or the expectation until the person says 'I have something.'

O'Kane: Very well. That is the motion that's on the table and it's already been seconded. Any further discussion on that?

Swan: Do you have a second on that?

O'Kane: Is there a second on that? I need a second. Second by Senator **Walter**. Further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstaining, 'aye.' Motion passes. Actually, the last motion that Senator Kidd brought up, I'm not sure that we need to have a motion to that effect. Is there any further discussion about the whole issue of the Faculty Senate Standing Budget Committee?

Swan: So you and Faculty Chair **Peters** and whoever else you can get together will look at the charge?

O'Kane: We'll have that for you next time.

Swan: Okay. Good.

O'Kane: Okay. Very well. If there are no items of new additional business…

Kidd: So we wish to have this committee. It's been voted on. So we should choose the members of the Senate now, if possible, to start initiating meetings with the Provost.

O'Kane to Gould: So we have the new, sorry, Chair of the Committee (refers to **Gould**). You'll have to contact the Senates. All of the Senates.

Swan: Tim (**Kidd**), you should be from the Senate.

O'Kane: Yes. Sorry. I misspoke--the College Senates. Someone will need to contact them.

Kidd: What I'd recommend is that usually March is kind of a time when they start to solidify things a little bit and so it would be good if the College Senates would be ready for a meeting with the Provost before Spring Break.

Gould: Okay.

Swan: That's for you, the Chair (refers to **Gould**) to contact the Chairs of the Senates to try and get this done. I don't know that they'll be able to do that.

Kidd: Tell them that they'll be meeting with the Provost. I think that will make it more incentive.

Swan: What I heard, and I didn't hear about this, I move that we put Senator **Kidd** on this Budget Committee for representing the University Senate.

O'Kane: Who's got a second? Second by Senator **Walter**, all if favor, 'aye,' 'opposed,' nay, abstain?

Cooley: I abstained. I want to hear what Senator **Kidd** has to say about this.

O'Kane: I've already asked him if he got nominated, would he be willing. [Laughter]

Cooley: I didn't know.

Kidd: Yes. It's hard to get this word done and be the Chair at the same time. It's really challenging and that's been killing me. I would love to work on this.

O'Kane: Wow. I think we're done. Can I have a motion to adjourn? Motion by Senator **Gould**. Second by Senator **Hakes**. All in Favor? Goodbye!