

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
01/09/12 (3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.)
Mtg. #1705

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** had no comments except to welcome everyone back.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** was absent.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** noted that Senate Bylaws Committee has not met since December but will be meeting again soon.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included noting his meetings with the Active Scholar Committee and with the Committee A of the United Faculty as the Faculty Senate representative.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for December 12, 2011 were approved by acclamation with no corrections.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1110 1008 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Social and Behavioral Science (**Bruess/East**). Passed.

1111 1009 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Humanities and Fine Arts (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Passed.

1112 1010 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, Interdisciplinary (**East/Kirmani**). Passed.

1113 1011 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Natural Sciences (**Kirmani/East**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1107 1005 Resolution regarding UNI Museums (**DeBerg/Boody**). Motion to approve (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Passed.
- 1108 1006 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Business Administration (**Smith/Wurtz**). Motion to approve (**Smith/Wurtz**). Passed.
- 1109 1007 Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Education (**Boody/Roberts-Dobie**). Motion to adopt (**DeBerg/Gallagher**). No action. Motion to remove the name change for separate consideration (**Edginton/DeBerg**). Passed. Motion to table the petition until the next meeting due to time expiration (**Terlip/Kirmani**). Passed.

5. New Business/Old Business

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. (**DeBerg/Breitbach**). Passed.

Next meeting:

January 23, 2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 09, 2012
Mtg. 1705**

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

Absent: James **Jurgenson**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** (3:30 p.m.): I'd like to call the meeting to order. We have a quorum. Welcome.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Press identification? Anyone from the press or feels pressed here today? No? Good.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** No comments. Just welcome back.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Chair **Jurgenson** will not be with us today; therefore, I'm guessing he had no comments.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: We'll go ahead out of order. **Karen**, any comments regarding the committees that we have?

Breitbach: We have not met over the Break nor done any work since our last meeting in December.

Terlip: Shame. Shame. (laughing)

Breitbach: Shame. Shame.

Funderburk: Slackers. Slackers.

Breitbach: However, we will be picking up where we left off here in the next couple of weeks, I assume. (many voices talking in background)

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: For my comments, you heard at the last meeting about the Active Scholar Committee that was appointed and also referred to as the 4x4 Teaching Load Committee. That Committee met either 3 or 4 times over Break, so later today or first thing in the morning I'll be sending out a document to the Senate members to look at. We have a deadline of a week from Friday for our recommendations for that, and the Committee has a draft document that's ready to send out now as of this afternoon to get input. So, if you would glance at that document when it gets to you, and if you've got any comments, please forward them to me. We'll be meeting Thursday, I believe it is, this week about that.

Additionally, there was a meeting between the—remind me anybody if I’m not calling this right—the Committee A of the United Faculty and the President with regards to the number of items, one of which has to do with a Faculty Review of the Faculty Disciplinary Process, so I met Friday, or Thursday, with Associate Provost **Arthur**--and Dan **Power** as the Chair of that Committee--on behalf of the Faculty Senate, since that was their desire, so there’s some work going on on that front and the Senate is going to be asked for input on it. And we’re trying to figure out how that will happen. It may require a Senate committee, but we’re hoping not. Hopefully, we’ll have a draft document that needs to be circulated. That would be the end of my comments.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Our first item of business is approval of the Minutes for December 12th. Do I have a motion to approve them? Were there any corrections forwarded? (**Nuss** indicated there were none.) No. Are there any corrections offered here? (none heard) If there are no corrections, we will assume those are approved by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1110 for Docket #1008, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Social and Behavioral Science

Funderburk: Calendar Item 1010, or 1110, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, CSBS packages. Motion to docket? Senator **Bruess** (who indicated) motioned. That’s regular order, I’m assuming. Second? Senator **East**. Discussion? (none heard) All those in favor of docketing in regular

order. (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) So moved.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1111 for Docket #1009, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Humanities and Fine Arts

Funderburk: Item 1111, Curriculum packages from Humanities and Fine Arts. Just as a note, this actually is no mistake, because these curriculum packages started before the official unification of Colleges, so this time they come through in that kind of a grouping because the unified Senates did not vote on them. They were voted by the individual Senates, so that's why you'll see this number. And if you've looked at the petitions online because you had nothing else to do in the last week or so, you'll see that there's an explanation of the Departments that you should go to look at once you get to the website, since the grouping isn't obvious when you get there. But it's easy to get to. So, 1111 the former CHFA.

DeBerg: I move that we docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Second?

Neuhaus: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**. Questions? Comments? (none heard) All those in favor? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) So moved.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1112 for Docket #1010, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, Interdisciplinary

Funderburk: 1112, Curriculum Packages, Interdisciplinary. This is the Women and Gender Studies Package. Motion to docket?

Visitor Question: I apologize. The items that were docketed, those are proposals one of which I believe was of a differing opinion (??), and those will come up in the next Faculty Senate meeting?

Funderburk: Correct. Those will be up for public discussion at the next meeting.

East: Perhaps at some future Senate meeting. It's not clear that it will be the next meeting.

Funderburk: That's true. If we get longwinded on some of these others, it could push it back another meeting. Ok, Interdisciplinary package, do we have a motion to docket?

East: So move. Regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **East**. Second? Senator **Kirmani** (who indicated). Questions or discussion on that? (none heard) Ok. All those in favor of docketing Interdisciplinary in regular order, "aye." (ayes all around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1113 for Docket #1011, Consideration of Curriculum Packages, College of Natural Sciences

Funderburk: And last of the docketing items, 1113, Curriculum Packages from the College of Natural Sciences.

Kirmani: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**. Regular order?

East: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **East** seconded. Questions or comments? (none heard) All in favor of docketing in regular order, say "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) So moved. Very good. Thank you very much.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1005, RESOLUTION REGARDING UNI MUSEUMS
(DEBERG/BOODY)

Funderburk: So, first item of business today is a Resolution Regarding UNI Museums. This was **DeBerg** and **Boody**. We have it online, and if you have supercharged glasses, you can see it [projected]. I think everyone here [visitors], I'm assuming, is the Committee that put forward this resolution for the most part, right? I mean, it's all the Committee here. I guess unless there's questions or if there are any comments from the Committee Chair or others that you would choose to make about this motion, initially?

Darrell **Taylor:** No additional comments.

Funderburk: Ok. Hopefully everybody's had a chance to bring yourselves back up. Do we have a motion regarding this docketed item? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I move that we approve the resolution from the UNI Museums' Faculty Advisory Committee.

Funderburk: Motion to approve. Do we have a second?

Neuhaus: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Neuhaus**. Discussion or comment regarding this? Senator **DeBerg**, do you want to lead off with anything?

DeBerg: Thank you, President **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: (laughing) Merely a Chair.

DeBerg: I would like to make comments of two kinds. The first one is I would like to read from a letter from the Friends of the Museum to the Board of Regents. This letter was sent yesterday. And, secondly, I want to talk a little bit about the process or lack of it that's happened so far in regard to the Museum.

This letter was sent, and it's been copied to a lot of people, by Chad **Swanson**, who's President of the Friends of the University of Northern Iowa Museums. And this is a group of faculty and community people who have stood by the Museum, who raise money for it, who function as a "friends group" as any non-profit would function. I'm only going to read some excerpts from it that I think are pertinent.

[reading] "The Museum was established in 1892 as one of the first museums in Iowa. It has been accredited by the American Association of Museums since 1976, an honor held by fewer than 15% of the museums in this country. The Museum is an integral and vibrant contributor to the University's mission, to the community, and to Northeast Iowa. The Museum and its collection has been situated at its current location on Hudson Road since the early 1980's, with the addition of the Marshall Center School on 23rd Street in the 1990's. Over the last year, the University Administration has sought little or no input from those closest to the Museums, including professional staff, faculty, donors, friends, community supporters, and Museum patrons, as well as regional educators, alumni, students, and volunteers. There has been little-to-no dialogue on the question of the Museum's future, and we have witnessed very little transparency within the University as this process has unfolded. At one point, the Friends were led to believe that a task force would be established to study and report on the question of the Museums and that this task force would include a member of the Friends and members from the community at large. This did not happen. Thus, major decisions regarding the future of the Museums will be made within the very near future without any real input from Museum stakeholders."

They go on—it goes on right to the Regents, "Please do not delegate this decision to the University. I reached out by way of letter to President **Allen**

and Provost **Gibson** last February and received no answer. I invited both of them to a meeting on June 20—in June 2011. Dr. **Gibson** did attend.” And then he says in another paragraph, “Unfortunately, most of that discussion was spent talking about the serious financial woes of the University. Since that time, however, the University has not communicated further with our group. Given an issue of this magnitude, we should--we believe it should be left to your Board to affirmatively decide whether this is the outcome that Regents, and the State of Iowa in a larger sense, wants. Many groups, faculty, and individuals have written letters of support for the Museums to President **Allen** and Provost **Gibson**. I understand that those who have communicated on this issue include the Cedar Falls Tourism and Visitors Bureau, the Iowa Museum Association, the Association of Midwest Museums, the UNI Faculty Advisory Committee to the Museums, the UNI Anthropology faculty, several UNI faculty members, several UNI alums, and local elementary educators. I hope your input will not be ignored. Very truly yours, Chad **Swanson**.”

So that’s a sample of the letter that Mr. **Swanson** sent to the Board of Regents. I wanted to make some comments on the process. And Sue **Grosboll**, the Director of the Museums, isn’t here, but I want to talk about the position that she’s been put in. She was called in to a meeting and basically told that the University Administration had, behind her back, already begun negotiations with the Grout Museum about the disposition of our Museum. And I felt really bad for her, because this would be as if someone went to Iowa State to talk about merging our nano technology lab without telling our Physics Department that this was going on. Or if someone had gone to the Papajohn College at Iowa to merge Business Colleges without telling the Dean of our Business College that this is what they were doing. When I told **Sue** that I was—I was so sorry that she was humiliated in this way, she said, “Well, I don’t feel bad, because this has already happened to the Dean of CHAFA, that these kinds of decisions were made without his input or knowledge as well.”

I don’t want to be at a University who operates this way. I think that the kind of disservice that was done to Sue **Grosboll**, who is after all The Museum Expert on our Campus--she knows more about Museums than the

entire rest of us put together—and to have her, to have them talking to her peers in the community behind her back I think is unconscionable. And it—I’m embarrassed that we would treat a colleague this way. So I wanted to say this for—on **Sue**’s behalf, because she’s not here to say it and probably wouldn’t say it herself, but I think how **Sue** has been treated in this whole process is beyond abysmal. Thank you.

Funderburk: Other comments? Questions? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I’m not familiar with the process issues that you’ve raised, and there may be legitimate concerns about the process, but I don’t think that they would override substantive matters relating to whether this University can continue to afford funding the Museum. If you recall, last semester we were asked to comment on proposed tuition increase, and Faculty Senate said, “No, no. Whatever increase was proposed was too big. We don’t want to lay that on our students.” When we’re told about possible cuts in academic programs, invariably faculty, including the Faculty Senate, express opposition to those cuts. We certainly would oppose cuts to staffing and salary and things like that. But the fact is you can’t do everything in a University. You can’t do everything when—when the State government is cutting back and is not giving you the funding you need, you have to make some cuts. And that’s the job of Administrators, and quite plausibly the Administration in this University has decided that we can’t afford the—the Museum. I’m sure it’s capably run, but I’m not convinced it’s essential to the Mission of this University, even though I’m sure it contributes in various ways to that Mission. So I have trouble—it seems to me that if we support this, we get in a position we’re acting like U.S. taxpayers. We want all the government; we want all the programs; we just don’t want to pay for it. We’re playing the same kind of fiscal irresponsibility, and I don’t think we should do that. I think we have to kind of step up to the plate and let our Administrators make those decisions. Yes, maybe the process could have been done better. Probably it could have. But on this issue of substance, I think that we, to some extent, have to defer to the judgment of Administrators on something like this, and—and I would rather see the Museum cut than important academic programs being cut.

Funderburk: Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: I would just like to add—**Betty**, not all of the facts that you listed there are correct, but let me just say that there—there was more than one meeting with **Sue** that **Ben**—that President **Allen** and I had. We respect highly the work that **Sue** has done over the years. We understand—I understand the contribution that she has made. She was asked to write a report to the President explaining, and in her words, how we can move forward, but the fact of the matter is that building will be closed. So, how can we ensure the collections are safe? How can we move forward? And you're absolutely right, she's the best person on this Campus to make decisions about what we should keep and what we should not keep. There was an extensive report that was done by a representative of the Peabody Museum, and I don't know if you've seen that report, but on one hand it was a glowing report saying that, you know, many of our artifacts are valuable. They are relevant to the academic programs and the Mission of the University. However, our collection is quite eclectic, and there is much of it—much of it that needs to be elsewhere, I mean, to—to put it mildly. So, there is work to be done. I—I have been very clear that the—the building—that building is in no shape. That was never a building for collections, and housing valuable parts of our collection—and there are valuable parts of our collection—in that building is a disservice to the collection. And so—so it's that issue. It's the issue of resources. It's the issue of priorities. But I do feel that we have given **Sue** an opportunity to make recommendations.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I have little knowledge regarding this subject. Is the plan to present the exhibits in disperse locations across the Campus and find those locations, so we wouldn't have an integrated site?

Gibson: Exactly. And that is—that is part of what we asked **Sue**—and when I say “we” I mean _____ and myself—that is part of what we asked her to do.

Edginton: And she would still be in the role of managing those exhibits, or how would that—how would that process work?

Gibson: We have—we have not worked out all of those details.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Are we still looking at possible off-campus locations as well, or are we kind of—maybe that's not a question you care to answer at this point, but.....

Gibson: I—I—no decisions have been made as to this artifact is going here, this artifact is going here. There was a conversation that—well, that **Sue** and Kent **Johnson** have visited the Grout Museum. They have visited the Art—the Hearst Center. So they themselves have visited some offsite centers. But the decision of what's going where—those decisions have not been made.

Funderburk: Comments or questions? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: So one of the things this motion asks for is to retain a dedicated director with faculty standing. Is that—Provost **Gibson**, is that still something the University is considering right now? Or has that been ruled out?

Gibson: I am not—I am not considering that.

Peters: You are not considering that.

Gibson: No. I don't—I don't have the budget for it. As it stands now, and you may recall, I—Academic Affairs had a \$2.2 million deficit, and I met that deficit by using some one-time money. So I am still in the hole, if you will, for almost \$1 million. So one-time money is one-time money, but I—that's a permanent cut. So I still have to find—it's about \$900,000 for permanent

cuts. So at this point in time I am not considering hiring a director for the Museum because I have other priorities.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I think some consideration should be made to taking the Museum out of your budget. I mean, the Gallagher Bluedorn used to be in Academic Affairs' budget. It started out in my College's budget but isn't there any longer. Auxiliaries get much better funding than academic programming, it seems to me. I mean, I just got the financial report of the University, and last year we had enough money in the General Fund to give Athletics \$4,559,447 million. So I think maybe the University should be—or the Museum should be an Auxiliary where—and really the Museum is really a great “front porch” to the University, which is how the President defends this kind of money for Athletics. I had—I have undergraduate students who have been going to—have been coming to the Campus ever since they were little kids because they come to the Museum. It's a great “front porch” to the University. So I think—I don't think you should have to fund the Museum out of your budget. I think that it should be an Auxiliary enterprise, like the Gallagher Bluedorn, like Athletics, and then you wouldn't have to make—you know, you wouldn't have to prioritize it, you know, the Museum which contributes mightily more than Athletics to academic programs. You wouldn't have to make that decision. So, I think that it's a bad budget structure that has you having to fund the Museum, when in fact it is an Auxiliary enterprise in the same way that the Gallagher Bluedorn is. It contributes to the educational welfare of the University but isn't as intricately bound up with education as a department—academic department. So I don't—you know, I—I don't really—we have money, I think, for the Museum. We just don't prioritize it for that.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: Yeah, I would think having the Museum on the Campus is a lot more important than having a football team, and that's all I want to say about that.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: One thing that I think makes it a little bit difficult to—to come down on this motion one way or the other is that we’re in a context of budget cuts, and we know that we have to prioritize in that context, as Senator **Smith** pointed out, but we don’t always have, as faculty members, the same—I mean, we rarely have as faculty members the same level of information that the Administrators have on what exactly is being cut. I mean, you—you do a good job of giving us--Provost **Gibson** does a good job of giving us the overall numbers or how much you have to meet, and it’s going to come from some retirements here and some retirements there, and we’re going to cover it with one-time money, but when we get down to something like this, and the University faculty is being asked to consider—essentially we’re being asked to consider “What role does the Museum play in our curriculum? And how important is it to our curriculum?” Well, that question can only be answered by thinking, “Ok, how important is it relative to other things?” And we know that this is one thing that’s being cut because of budget problems, but we don’t always see where the other cuts are coming from, except that there’s some retirements here and some retirements there, so it’s very hard for me, as I’m thinking about this, to get a handle on what’s the rela—in terms of the cuts that are being made, what’s the relative importance that’s being given to the Museum? And I don’t know if you can shed any light on that. I mean, some of the other cuts that are being made, how much are they harming other programs? Or how much—to what extent are those other cuts? I mean, I think it’s fair to say that even—even in this case the collection exists but with no dedicated director, that’s a pretty serious blow to this particular program. To what extent are other cuts having similar effects on other programs?

Gibson: Well, I mean, that’s a much broader discussion that we will have very soon. But I—I would like to say that, you know, sometimes we have to explore other structures, and so I have never said that, you know, we are—we are boxing up all of the artifacts in the Museum and putting them in storage. I have never said that. What I have said is that the building will close. At this point in time I cannot afford to hire a director, but I do think there are ways in which the artifacts can still be on exhibit, on display, that

they can be taken care of properly, but under a different structure. The two main criteria for accreditation: you must have a building; you must have a director. So, unfortunately we will lose that accreditation. And that is unfortunate. But again I am faced, the University is faced, with some very serious financial issues, and so I—I—I have to weigh certain things and make decisions. The whole issue of programs and program closures, that is a topic, as I said, for future discussion.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: And I mean, I agree with **Jerry** on that—that the—it—I mean, he made a good comment, and the last comment was a very cogent one, too. I think in order to entertain these things, there has to be some coherent discussion about what values are coming into play here. You know, what—a bigger picture—so that we can choose among the values that are under consideration when things are—when these kinds of decisions come up, and I think there’s a general sense of not being prepared to answer this question. It—it’s very hard, because, you know, depending on what gets cut, there is a set of values being played out here. You know, are we going to really lean hard on the Arts and Humanities and, play up the, you know, the Science/Technology/Engineering/Mathematics theme (thing?). Is it—is this—because that gets close to the, you know, that whole marketization of higher education, and if you look—have you been watching what’s happening in the U.K. and even in this country, too? I think that there has to be a discussion pretty soon—as soon as possible, what’s the big picture? How can we have a coherent framework with the attendant values to make these kinds of decisions?

Gibson: I agree with you 100%, and—and I’ve said many times last semester when I was making the \$2.2 million cut, “This is not strategic.” I said that many times.

Gallagher: How can we get there?

Gibson: Well, well—we’re—we’re--going to get there. We have to get there. But I had to meet a deficit, and I had a deadline to meet a deficit,

and so pulling that, you know, not filling this line, taking this line, taking this—this phased retirement, you know, so that I could meet my deficit. That—that was not strategic, and so what we must do this semester is to come up—and I said “we”—with a strategic way of looking at cuts. First and foremost meaning the \$1 million that I am already in the hole, but secondly if we are to put money into stronger programs, viable programs in which every College—every College has programs where if they had more faculty, they could do more. And so whether we get the new money from the Legislature, I don’t know. I hope we do. But if we don’t, the only way to grow our viable, strong programs is reallocation. And I, you know—when we look at enrollment data in some of our programs, when we look at how many students we are graduating in certain programs, the numbers aren’t adding up.

Gallagher: I would like to reiterate. I’m not unsympathetic here. I’m with you 100%. The—the issue is just how do we get to that place? I mean, it’s not

Gibson: We will.

Gallagher: You know, it’s not as if the weight of the world is right here on top of you, it’s just that, well, something (Provost sighs), I know, it feels that way, and my sympathy’s on that one. But I wonder if we can table this perhaps until more information is—or is that a bad idea?

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I—I would like to know how much money has been raised by Friends of the Museum and by the University Foundation for the Museum within the last 10 years?

Gibson: Very little. Very little. I can get that number to you. The Friends have, for whatever reasons, they have not raised a lot of money. The Foundation did have a—a plan a few years ago before I arrived to conduct a campaign for the Museum, and what they found was that there was not a

lot of interest in giving the kind of money that would be needed for a new building.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: No, I take it back.

Funderburk: Withdraw. Senator **East**.

East: I hate to say it, but I agree with what everything that everybody's already said. (light laughter around)

Funderburk: He said, "Let's reiterate." (more light laughter)

East: I—I'm un—I think it is as Senator **Peters** said, it's very hard and perhaps inappropriate for the Faculty Senate to be making recommendations about this particular program in considering the lack of data we have about it, but more importantly considering the lack of data we have about other programs that might be considered for—for cuts. But I think the same is true of the—of the Administration. They ought—the Administration, I believe, ought to be making this decision, but they ought also to be making it in terms of priorities and having the whole list of possible cuts on the table, and frankly that appears not to have been the case. It's already been decided that, or seemingly has been decided that this particular position will not be renewed or sought--be filled when it's, when it's empty, when it's vacant, and that therefore the Museum's gone, likely never to come back, because once you make that kind of decision, it's likely to be permanent. The—while I—I think it's nice and well, good that—that the University is trying to be—take appropriate action for the—the—the exhibits from the Museum, the exhibit—having the exhibits on Campus does not make a Museum, and it doesn't bring kids to look at the exhibits, or the programs put on by the Museum won't fill that role, whatever that is. So this is—this is in my mind what would appear to be a very final decision, and sadly I think it's a decision that's been made already and with not in the context of the overall possibility for program cuts, and I—I agree wholeheartedly with Provost **Gibson** that we need to be looking at the

totality of cuts, and that we—we should be making—we shouldn't be—I don't know if we should be making cuts, but we should certainly be evaluating programs for the possibility of cuts. That should be an ongoing process, not—not one that happens in the 8th year of budget cuts, but in every year or every other year, programs should be looked at. Are they good programs and are—and—and are they continuing to be good programs? We've not done that in the past. We've not done that in, as far as I can tell in my 27 years, 26 years here, and it's—it's very frustrating that we've gone through, I think, probably 10 or 12 years of cuts, and that's never been done by any Administration, so it's—I don't want to be trying to poke—poke at you, **Provost**, but it's a problem, and—and I think it's a problem—it's a problem, I think, partially that—that you do have responsibility for in this case that you're making a decision kind of in an—in isolation, and I think that's a little sad.

Gibson: Well, I—I—let me just say that I—I have looked at data for our programs. I mean, I—I—I have looked at. I haven't been—whereas decisions may not have been made yet, but I have looked at data for our programs. I've looked at, as I've said, how many students are coming into certain programs, to programs? How many students are graduating from programs? And the decision not to hire a director is part of a dec—of—of a larger set of decisions that I made last semester in not filling faculty positions. So, you know, and—and—and that was made—those decisions were made last—last semester, in consultation with—with Deans because they understood that certain positions could not be filled. So the process has already started, it's just that it has not been strategic.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**, then Senator **Edginton**, then Senator **East**, then Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: (light laughter around) Write those down, yes.

Funderburk: That's your job.

Wurtz: It seems to me that what we're talking about here is that we are all feeling we need to get through strategic more quickly, so my question is,

“What can the Faculty Senate do that would allow speeding up that process? Are there blocks that are identifiable that there are things that we can do to remove blocks, to build pathways around blocks?” That until we figure out how we can get to strategic really fast, we’re going to keep talking about this stuff, but we don’t really have the ability to come up with good advice with decisions.

Gibson: The first step is to meet with United Faculty. If—if we are talking about program closures and possible layoffs, the first step is to meet with United Faculty, and we have a plan—we plan to do that. That is the first step.

Wurtz: And, of course, it’s no role there for Faculty Senate, but if you’re

Gibson: Well, I—I think, you know, Faculty Senate will be involved, but according to our Master Contract, there is a starting point that is already designated.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I—I’m not sure I see how the resolution is contrary to what the **Provost** has stated. She is saying, as I interpret your comments, that we need to look at alternative structures, and the resolution suggests that we might look at alternative structures, different ways of doing things. It doesn’t say we are going to retain a fulltime person in that job. Someone could—someone’s gotta be assigned in the University to maintain those exhibits, to maintain those structures, or to find that alternative structure, so, you know, on that basis, I think I would vote in favor of the resolution, and the resolution does make a commitment to maintaining the collections, supporting the exhibits. How you go about doing that, you know, in—in—in light of the constraints, the budget constraints that you have to deal with, that’s your prerogative, that’s your decision. So—so I would encourage the Senate to support the resolution on that basis as opposed to, you know, deferring it out of the fact that we don’t have relevant information. It is an academic program. We do have the responsibility of making value judgments about academic programs on this Campus. Even if

we don't have information about Athletic programs and Wellness Recreation Services and so on and so forth. This comes directly under our purview and interest as a Faculty Senate.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Oh, my turn? Just in response to Provost **Gibson**, yes, this—this—it is similar--cutting this, deciding not to fill this particular line, is similar to deciding not to fill other lines, except that my guess is that this is the only line that you decided not to fill that also cancels the program. I suspect that none of the other lines actually had the result of cancelling a program, which, at least in my understanding, this one does.

Edginton: But are we?

East: Yes.

Edginton: Are we cancelling a program?

East: You can't have an accredited Museum without a director.

Edginton: Not—not the way it's structured now, but what we're hearing is that it can be restructured in a different way, and we need to look at those alternatives.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **Roth**.

DeBerg: So what about my idea of taking the Museum out of your budget? I mean, it seems to me that that's—I mean, I'm looking right now at the Auxiliaries budget from last year, and there seem to me to be more extra money in the Auxiliary side of things than in the Academic Affairs side of things. So, I mean, I think that was a good idea actually. I mean, I think that needs to be raised. Why shouldn't the Museum be competing with the Gallagher Bluedorn rather than with, I don't know, Math? I mean, what do you think?

Funderburk: Senator **Roth** then Senator **Smith**.

Roth: I wanted just to throw something out there, and this—this is certainly far less than ideal, especially with respect to the current museum directorship. In the interest in keeping the Museum as—as such, would it be possible in any way, shape, or form to assign the Museum under a different umbrella of Administration on Campus. I mean, keep it unaccredited until a future time where we could separate it back out under museum directorship? Is it possible to merge it somehow with—with some other administrative entity on Campus to keep it as a Museum?

Gibson: I—I’m—I’m not quite—I’m not quite sure what you’re asking. You know, what—what the President and I have asked **Sue** to do is to present us with some ideas for alternative structures, so

Roth: Ok, and I’m sure you looked at many.

Gibson: Yeah, I mean, some Museums are housed in Libraries, for--for example.

Roth: Right, that—that’s what I was wondering, and

Gibson: I mean, that’s—that’s one—one possible structure. Some Museums are housed, you know, in other Departments, but they—my, you know, from--my experience is that they are academic in nature and not someplace else. So that’s what we’ve asked for.

Roth: Sure. Thanks.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: And it seems to me we are trying to have our cake and eat it, too, here, and I’m a bit concerned about that. We seem to be trying to be able to support this but yet not support its implications. I think we have to recognize this measure, if we approve it. If we support this, we are saying, “The faculty basically feels we should have a Museum director, we should

have the facility, we should have the things that allow this to be a nationally accredited Museum.” And you can raise issues of whether we have all the information we need or not, but with the budget situation that’s—when we had Sue **Grosboll** here, she said it was about \$300,000 bucks a year. That’s a big chunk of change. We can’t afford everything. We have to be, you know, kind of honest about this. If—if the Administrators want to find another way of doing this outside of Academic Affairs, fine, but we as a faculty should not be saying, “Oh, well, we have to have this. We think this is really important,” given that we have expressed opposition to—to tuition increases. We’ve expressed concern about program cuts. We were opposed to anything that would save money, and then comes along something where it is recognized and for various reasons here is a way of saving \$300,000, “No, no, we don’t want to do that.” That’s—that’s just fundamentally inconsistent. It’s—it’s irresponsible. And so I—I just don’t think we can justify supporting this—this measure. I—I think it’s well intentioned. I understand that. But I think somebody—at some point the faculty have to show some management fiscal responsibility as well. It’s not just the Administrators make the hard decisions. We have to be responsible in that way, too. And supporting this is not, in my view, responsible.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I agree, **Jerry**. I—I—I don’t like the “We don’t want to pay taxes, and we don’t want to have any cuts either.” It’s ridiculous. But I think what the faculty does want, though, if we are to take an active role, and I think we absolutely should, is “What’s the big picture here?” “What—what are we trading off, and—and what does it mean?” And we don’t have that kind of a framework. And—and that makes it very difficult to—to make these kind of decisions. It really does. I’d be happy to make a decision, but I—I mean, some framework for making what I think are intelligent and decisions that are consistent with the values of academia, what we are about as a University and so on.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I don't feel like I'm irresponsible in supporting this. I—I—I think I know—I have a sense of where I want cuts to come rather than the Museum. I'm just looking at Schedule 8, and we have one more athletic team than we need, right? And wrestling costs us \$355,000 a year, expenses not counting scholarships. That's about what the Museum comes in at in terms of improvements. So I believe I'm being responsible in saying, "Why do we have more athletic teams than we need, when we can cut wrestling or any number of them?" I just picked wrestling out because its numbers kind of match, and they're asking for money to like redo the West or East Gym, I get the directions mixed-up, which is a lot of money there, too. So I would rather, if we are going to put money in a building for something, put it into a building for a Museum and cut the superfluous athletics team that we don't need. So I think there are ways to say, "We as a Faculty Senate want, you know, between a quarter and half a million dollars to go to the Museum rather than to certain other places that this money is going." So I'm happy to advocate cuts to make up for this Museum cost.

Funderburk: Other comments? Questions? Anyone?

Funderburk: Senator East.

East: I would also be happy to suggest cuts, but that doesn't seem to be allowed. I mean, or at least to be a part of the decision-making process. I mean, \$300,000, let's see, that's 1, 1½, 2 Administrators, right? (voices agreeing and light laughter) I can identify one or two that I think could go.

Male voice: Are you going to name names, or are we just..... (light laughter)

East: Well, I won't, but I could (more laughter). But still, to some it could—and I would like an Administration that sought that information and actually seemed to listen to it, but in the absence of that, I—I still tend to agree with **Jerry**, that it's very hard for me to say, "I support this in isolation from anything else." And we'll see in a few minutes how I'm going to vote.

Gibson: I think that one thing the President has been very clear about is that everything is on the table, so I don't know that Athletics has some kind of unprotected status. I—I mean, he's said everything is on the table. We all—we all have to face the fact that the budget situation—you know, we're in dire straits, and—and we've gotta make some changes, across Campus, not just in Academic Affairs.

Funderburk: Are there any other questions, comments? Senator **Peters.**

Peters: Yeah, just to say that I think after listening to everybody, I think that I'm sort of looking at this motion more as a sense of the faculty indicating that the Museum has played an important role in the curriculum, has supported a number of academic programs. Sue **Groscroft's** (sic, **Grosboll**) presentation a month or two ago, I think, was fairly convincing about the role that it--it has played in a number of programs, and I guess, as I look at it, I think that I would probably support the resolution as a statement from the faculty saying that this should remain a priority for the University, and even if realistically perhaps it turns out we cannot achieve all the things in the motion, it may be an important statement from the faculty to say that this is something that—that we would like to continue be—to continue to be recognized as something that contributes to the curriculum of the University.

Funderburk: Questions and comments, and also for clarity, since we have a lot of guests, and some of you are probably the Museum Committee that brought this petition, you are also welcome to make comments or questions as well. It's not limited to Senators. It's open to anyone here. And just identify yourself loud for our recording.

Colburn: Carol **Colburn** from the Department of Theater. And I really appreciate hearing everybody's careful consideration on this resolution, which truly has received a lot of careful consideration from the Faculty Advisory Committee, which is a group of dedicated faculty from across the entire Campus if you were to learn (?) that Darrell [**Taylor**]-is the Chair, and I have been with this Committee for a number of years and seen the growth of programming at the Museum with limited budgets, rich aspects

to the collection. And I know when I first came here the collection was in storage and unavailable, and it became, you know, a whole new means of supporting my teaching when it became available and when—especially when we started to have rotating exhibits available, so I would urge you to, if possible, to find a way to have that continue.

Taylor: And, yeah, I'm Darrell **Taylor**. I'm the Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee, and I would like to add something to what Betty **DeBerg** said about the—the UNI Museums being a front—front door? A door front? Was that what you said?

DeBerg: Front—front porch.

Taylor: A front porch to the University. Like the Gallagher Bluedorn and like the Gallery of Art and like the Strayer-Wood Theater, we are a face to the public. We are not just serving the University community; we are serving the Waterloo-Cedar Falls community and the regional community as well. And that—that's something that the UNI Museums does like no other organization in the area. We need to continue putting forth programming that invites the public to the University.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: I very much agree with the desire of having the Museum and the Museum services, and I like the idea that as faculty we should be making statements that say, "This matters." The problem is that this motion doesn't make a statement that says, "This matters."

Male voice: No, it does not.

Wurtz: This motion makes a statement that says, "We are saying there must be a director; there must be a building." I could vote in favor of a motion going along the lines of what you [**Peters**] are describing, a statement of support and value served to help this get into the decision-making when we are ready to be strategic. But I can't support approving this one as it's stated at this time.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I call the question.

Funderburk: Do we have a second for call the question?

Dolgener: I second.

Funderburk: There's a second on calling the question. All those in favor of calling the question? (ayes heard around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Question has been called. All those in favor of the motion before you, say "aye." (ayes heard) Those opposed? (nays heard) The Chair's decision is this is going to be a Roll Call, so

Funderburk: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I'm for it.

Funderburk: That's one "aye." Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: Against.

Funderburk: One against. Senator **Wurtz**

Wurtz: Against.

Funderburk: Senator **East**

East: Nay.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: For it.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: For it.

Funderburk: Vice-Chair **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: Against.

Funderburk: That's against. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: For.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Against.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: For.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Against.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: For

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: For.

Funderburk: Sherry, do you have an accurate count?

Peters: I got it. I had 9 (many voices and light laughter). I had 9 to 6.

Funderburk: That's what I was thinking. Nine in favor. Six against. Motion carries. Moving on.

DOCKET #1006, CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (**SMITH/WURTZ**)

Funderburk: This is Calendar Item 1108, Docket 1006, Consideration of Curriculum Packages from College of Business of Administration. Before we start that, I want to just read the one item that is referenced on the petition which is about University Policies 2.04, Curriculum Changes (<http://www.uni.edu/policies/204>). And I read this only as information.

“The University Faculty Senate shall delegate to the UCC and the GCCC responsibility for final faculty approval of all curricular proposals except: a) departmental or college appeals subsequent to appeals at all appropriate subordinate levels; b) UCC or Graduate Council appeals; c) new degrees or programs which differ from existing degrees or programs to the extent that the University faculty should be consulted. The University Faculty Senate shall transmit all approved curricular proposals to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Following appeal [sic, approval] by the Executive Vice President and Provost, the proposals will be sent to the

[—uh, not approved, should be reviewed—] the proposals will be sent to the President for approval and transmittal to the Council of Provosts.” So, do we have a motion on the curriculum package from the College of Business? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Move to approve the curriculum package of the College of Business.

Funderburk: Motion to approve. Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Second that.

Funderburk: Second. Discussion? Comments? Questions? Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: Before the Senate begins the discussion of the curriculum package from the College of Business, I just wanted to say on behalf of the UCC that—I’d just like to thank the members of the UCC, and I’ll speak for **Shoshanna [Coon]** here and thank the members of the GCCC as well. These are two really hardworking Committees, and there were a lot of faculty who put in a lot of time to review these packets, and I think they did a very diligent job on both Committees, and so I just wanted to extend my thanks to them for their hard work. Without—without that, this whole process breaks down. So I just want to go on record as having thanked them.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: I believe what you read suggests that—that mostly we’re supposed to—to—to say “aye” to whatever the Curriculum Committee said that was undisputed. I would like to suggest that—that—that’s not the process that’s been followed in the past. The Campus would not have been aware of that process as we’ve not followed that process in the past, and that we should not follow it this year. And, therefore, I move that we divide the question from there, for the College of Business, by Department.

Funderburk: Motion to divide the question by Department. Is there a second for that motion?

Smith: I'll second that.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Smith**. Discussion on the motion to divide the question? Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Well, the process that Chair **Funderburk** read appears in the Curriculum Handbook, and—which was passed by this Senate on April 28, 2008. I went back and read the Minutes from April 28, 2008. [http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/minutes/04_28_08minutes.pdf] There was no discussion of the Senate's role in the process. It—it had—the Curriculum Handbook section H says—I'm looking at it right now; it's on page 8. (http://www.uni.edu/provost/sites/default/files/UCC_handbook.pdf) It says, "The University Faculty Senate delegates to the UCC and the GCCC responsibility for final faculty approval of all curricular proposals," except in the instances that Chair **Funderburk** explained. And there was no discussion of the relative role between the Senate and the UCC and the GCCC. It was--the motion passed; the current curriculum process was adopted; and I guess as someone who is going through this first—for the first time, I don't understand why we would reinvent the wheel when we've had people on the UCC who have been delegated by the faculty, elected by the faculty to do this. We have University Policy approved by the Senate less than 4 years ago, and it says that the "Senate shall defer to" that Body. I don't understand why we would reinvent the wheel and go back through and question all of their decisions.

Funderburk: I'm noting that the current motion on the floor is to divide the question. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Well, then the question comes, "Why do we have to vote on it at all? If we totally delegate it to them, why—why does it come before us?"

Peters: That's a good question.

Smith: And, the fact is historically

Peters: I would say, “Why should it come before us unless a Department appeals and unless the UCC—the UCC appeals, etc., etc. Why should it be before us?” It can sit on the Calendar—the Campus—everyone on Campus knows it’s there. They—and then, if they have to appeal, then they bring it before us, and we move it off the Calendar onto a Docket, and we act on it. Otherwise, it seems to me that I don’t—I haven’t spent months with it, like the members of the UCC and the GCCC have, so I don’t know why I should second guess those decisions that they have made.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**, you want to finish?

Smith: But, yeah, I—I was here the last time, and some issues were raised that we felt that were legitimate concerns about proposals that were approved by the UCC, and ultimately the Senate said, “No, you’re right. We don’t agree with the UCC on that.” Why shouldn’t we continue to have that kind of oversight? That doesn’t mean we have to get into every specific proposal, but it seems to me that if individual Senators have concerns about specific proposals, we can discuss it. Maybe there is a bias towards agreeing with the UCC, but I don’t see why we should rule out our—just kind of deny us the opp—the opportunity to kind of reconsider and reject. And—and Departments can always go back and do it again and make a better case, but I don’t see why we—curriculum is so important. The faculty says it’s important. It says it’s the most important thing we do. Historically, and I remember in talking--a former Associate Dean in talking about the UCC’s approach to curriculum, she said that, “Well, they tend to take our colleagues and Departments at their word and kind of approve what they propose. They are often not all that critical. They are often not looking at big budget perspectives.” And I know from having served on the Academic Program Review Task Force, we’ve got lots of programs that don’t have many students. And we get those programs because we approve them. The UCC approves them. We end up with a lot of courses that we can’t support. It seems to me that if the faculty is responsible for the curriculum, then part of that is any way we can we should have—be looking at it and being critically evaluative of it. And this—this Body can do that and should.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**, and then Senator **Edginton**.

DeBerg: I withdraw.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator **Edginton**, then Senator **Roth**.

Edginton: Well, further that there is some instruction from the Board of Regents, and I want to read this to you from page 29 of Instruction for Curricular [called the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook] (http://www.uni.edu/provost/sites/default/files/UCC_handbook.pdf), Form H-C, that deals with Program/Department Name Changes, which is a part of the Curricular Package, and I hope to bring something up a little bit later with the College of Education. “These types of items are handled directly by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. They must be reviewed by relevant College Faculty Senates, the University Faculty Senate, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Council of Provosts, and the Board of Regents.” So I don’t think we can abdicate our responsibility for at least items that deal with program/department name changes. I mean, the—the instructions are very clear.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: Ok, so I’m—I’m a—I’m a physicist. I—I have no problem making judgment on—on Business things and Business programs, but to be fair to your program, then I would request more time to research what I’m talking about, because I would be the guy to go back and trust the Department and trust that the work has been done. You know, your program-specific decisions have been done at the Department level, so if—if I’m going to—if I’m going to try to override that, I would like more time to research what you’re about, because I don’t feel comfortable making a—a judgment call like that on Department of Business courses, for example.....at that level.

Funderburk: Comments or questions? And a reminder that the motion is to divide the question. Which was first? Senator **Gallagher** and then Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Oh, I'm sorry.

Gallagher: No, that's all right. If there's an issue that comes up, I—I think that perhaps a, you know, full-scale, start-over-from-the-beginning review is maybe not what's being completely called for. But if there is a contentious issue, something of concern that emerges, then certainly. Right? But there's no procedure for, you know, isolating those things. Are we just counting on them bubbling up, or how's that work?

Funderburk: I think that's a good question. And there have been instances, I can speak to that, there have been instances where things have come to the Senate correctly as an opposition from either the Departmental level bringing it or split decision in the Curriculum Committee. That's possible as well, so that they might bring forward that.

Gallagher: Do we know what those are?

Funderburk: Well, we don't have an established process for that. If there's a process, I didn't find any reference to it.

Gallagher: And we'd want—we'd want the relevant faculty members, Departments, what have you, to be able to understand that there is a process for handling these kinds of, you know, business.

Funderburk: One might assume that would be. With the month notice that it is going to be on the table here in a public meeting, that they'd be a part of that. Senator **Peters** did you have.....? Ok, so it's Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **East**.

DeBerg: One of the things I looked at to help me get a sense about what kind of conflict there may have been in the Curriculum Committee is there is a something that you can hit on on [UNI] Curriculum Online (<http://www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review>) that's called "Consultation Summary." (Consults Summary; voices agreeing). And I found this was helpful because there were some, you know,

Departments—there are some “resolution not possible,” not very many. There are some “has impact,” “has objections.” And that’s helpful to me to get a sense. I would have a sense of looking at this whether or not, you know, all hell broke loose in the—in the Curriculum Committee in one Department after another or something like that. So that’s what I’m looking at for every College as I get ready for these discussions.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: As Senator **Gallagher** has suggested, there’s not a process for individual faculty to examine any of this. And not only that, even if there was a process, gaining access to the—to the—to the proposals is a royal pain that you have to click here and click there and click somewhere else. It’s very difficult to find all of this information in a reasonable fashion. The—while the—and while the Curriculum Committee meetings are open to the faculty, they are not highly advertised to the faculty where one might go and—and interact with the Departments. The—the Curriculum Proposals are not even available to faculty, or haven’t--in the past were not available to faculty until after they had been approved by the College Senates. So until there is a process whereby all faculty are notified about proposals, have easy access to the proposals, and can easily object to proposals or raise questions about the proposals, I think it is incumbent on the Faculty Senate to continue the tedious process that we have.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters** and then Senator **Dolgener**.

Peters: At--at the risk of—of—of briefly lengthening that tedious--tedious process, I—I’m looking at the process that we created or at least that we signed off on less than 4 years ago, and I think the answer to the question is that Departments or Colleges which have a problem either with the UCC or the GCCC can file a petition before the Senate. Similarly, the UCC or the GCCC can file a petition before the Senate. There is--in the process that has been set up, there is no role for individual faculty members to play. And—and I’m not sure that that is a bad thing. I’m not sure that individual faculty members necessarily should be questioning—should be able to, on their own without support of substantial things like a Department or a College,

question these decisions that have been made. I'll just call—I'll just say one more quick thing about this and that's that the very last line of—well, I guess it's not quite the very—the very last line that describes the Senate's role in the Faculty Handbook says that “the Senate can review issues of substantial University-wide impact,” and—and it then says “This is understood to be a rare rather than a normal activity of the Senate.”

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: Based on the described procedures that the Senate did approve, I don't see how we can do something different unless we establish different procedures.

Funderburk: Additional comments? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I wanted to say that I agree with what Senator **Peters** has been saying. I've been a participant—this would be now my third—and I'm really looking forward to it (light laughter)—it's my—it's my third time on the Senate to go through this process. The first time was my first year on the Senate, and that was in 2008, and that process worked precisely the way the statement in the catalog stated it should. We voted up or down on the entire packages unless there was some sort of crisis or some disagreement in the UCC or between Departments and so on. And in the last one, which you are all familiar with, that was a disaster, and the reason it was a disaster is because one or two people had information available to them from Academic Program Review which no other Senators had, and that—that was just a monkey wrench in the whole thing. It was almost a vendetta on the part of certain people, and it was—I heard from lots of people that we were a laughing stock the way we handled that whole process. And I definitely do not want to see that happen again with my third participation in the curricular review process.

Funderburk: The motion on the floor is to divide the question.

Breitbach: I call the question.

Funderburk: Vice-Chair **Breitbach**, motion to call the question.

East: Point of order.

Funderburk: Yes, Senator **East**.

East: I—I—my guess is that the motion to divide the question depends on—on the—is actually one that depends on whether or not—well, it doesn't address the issue of whether we are going to follow the established procedures. It does somewhat perhaps, but it doesn't really get at it, and so I wonder if it's even appropriate to vote on that. Perhaps we should have—and change—and prior to that motion whether we should have a motion—should we—whether we should directly address to—to “suspend the rules,” if these are the rules for—for this particular task, and that allows us to directly address that issue as fac—as Senators or—rather than sort of getting at it from sideways.

Funderburk: That's interesting that as a point of order my feeling is that it is a valid question. I don't see it directly, but I can imagine your opinion might affect your vote on this one.

DeBerg: Point--point of order.

Funderburk: Do we have a second for the call of the question?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Ok, the question has been called and seconded. All those in favor of calling the question, “aye.” (ayes heard around) Opposed? (none heard) Ok, so the motion we are voting on now is whether or not to divide the question, and—and consider this curriculum package by Department. All those in favor, say “aye.” (a few heard) All those opposed? (some more heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Chair ruling is that the motion failed to divide the question. So we are back to the initial motion which is to accept the curriculum package from the College of Business, as I understand it. Comments? Questions?

Neuhaus: Just one comment. And is sort of in general, and I don't know, maybe this is directed to UCC and GCCC. I noticed just kind of counting things up, and it's not a real big gain, but we did gain, I believe, 4 new classes in the College of Business. I haven't been keeping track. Maybe we either gained some more faculty in the College of Business, in which case bravo and that can take care of it. But I'm wondering whether, in general, are we keeping track of the addition of classes without dropping some. Some of the Departments in here did a real nice job on that.

Licari: That is—that is a standard question that the UCC members do ask of Departments when they are bringing packages forward that are adding courses to the catalog is a question about or questions about resources. In this particular case within the College of Business, there were questions along those lines and the response was that they had, in fact, added faculty in those particular areas, and so the UCC felt confident that there would be faculty resources to cover the courses.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: In response to that, the faculty were added in those particular areas or in those particular Departments?

Licari: Well, Departments. Or faculty that could teach those particular courses.

East: Were added in the Department.

Licari: Yes.

East: New—newly added lines.

Licari: Well, I don't know. My sources didn't tell me, but that was the

East: But that's the—that's the legitimate question. If—if we hire somebody new in the Computer Science Department who can teach these

particular courses and wants to teach those courses, then we would be inclined to say, “Yes, please, let’s add those courses.” We have not, however, increased the number of faculty who can teach all of our courses combined. Therefore, the question about were—were faculty added or were they added to the roster of the faculty rather than just to the number of faculty available rather than just the areas in which the faculty teach. You seem not to understand my

Licari: I sh—all I—I don’t understand other than just to say that the answer we were given to those questions were that new faculty had been hired and would teach those courses.

East: So you don’t know that they actually added people to teach, additional faculty in the Department?

Licari: I just said they did.

East: No, you said new faculty were hired who could teach those courses, or faculty were hired who could teach those courses. That doesn’t say that they didn’t—they replaced an existing faculty member with a new faculty member who could teach those courses. New courses means new faculty lines.

Licari: I took it to be that there was a net gain in faculty.

East: But you didn’t ask.

Funderburk: Ok, I’ve got 4 hands. Senator **Gallagher**, Senator **Smith**, Senator **Terlip**, and then Senator **Wurtz**.

Gallagher: I think it gets a little more complicated than that. For example, someone may have been teaching in the graduate program and come back to their Department to teach. I think there are—there are more complicated explanations for why there is a—there are available faculty. And—and since I don’t know what those are, I just wanted to—to propose that that could be more than just a one-to-one simple equation.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah. Relating to some of the additions in terms of courses and programs in the College of Business Administration, this is funded in large part by the differential tuition practice that was approved by the University, and it was approved and is supported by Business students specifically for the idea that we would be doing the kinds of things, in fact adding the kinds of courses and programs that are included in this proposal. So the funding for these--in one case, we have added a new faculty person to teach Leadership. We've searched for a person to teach Project Management. Haven't found somebody. Potentially that could be funded, but that is specifically supported by differential tuition money that was set aside—was intended to be used for this kind of purpose.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I just wanted to highlight an issue in looking at some of this with respect to the consults, because when I looked at this I went, "What does Leadership Studies have to say about this?" And that's not reflected anywhere, so I talked to Gerri Perreault. Her office is next to mine, and she was fine, but it was—she still doesn't know what you all are doing. She was only consulted informally, and I think it's real important we strengthen those Campus connections. It's not that she's opposed to it, but she really doesn't know completely what all the new leadership stuff in Management is going to mean, if there could be things you could do together with her that would save everybody money. And so some things are still falling through the cracks in this process, which is why I think we need to discuss it here.

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

Wurtz: My comments are no longer needed.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **East**.

East: I—I—I disagree that those funds were for hiring new faculty lines. My recollection is that they were to pay the differentiated faculty that Business Administration people require. At least that's my recollection of this—of the discussion.

Funderburk: Any more questions or comments? I see there are College representatives here as well, and let me state once again the floor is open for any concerned party. Senator **East**.

East: I have a question about how having people auditing or taking classes in—who--who are auditing or taking the course ungraded how that affects the learning environment for the other students?

Funderburk: Very interesting question, but I have no answers.

East: Or I have a question, was that question addressed by the Curriculum Committee?

Licari: A student taking—I'm—I'm—forgive me as I flip through the Minutes here.

East: In the Accounting package, the first course, the reason that this particular request is being asked is because having students—"We don't want students taking this course ungraded because it adversely affects the learning environment for the other students." Was that question by the Curriculum Committee or anyone on the Curriculum Committee?

Wartick (visitor): I—no one has asked me that question until now. I'm happy to say something about it. One or—the truth is that one or two students taking the class for ungraded credit doesn't affect the learning environment at all. Our problem in these upper level Accounting electives and CPA Review classes is once we get a critical mass of students who are taking it for no credit or auditing it significantly changes the environment in the classroom. It changes the level of participation, and it changes the level of perceived effort, and—and that's the reason why we limit (?) those classes.

Funderburk: Just for the purpose of the Minutes, can you identify yourself?

Wartick (visitor): Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Marty Wartick. I'm the Department Head in Accounting.

Funderburk: Thank you. And for the comments. Questions? Comments? Are you running out of steam already for this College? We have 11 minutes left in our meeting. It would be possible to vote on one of these perhaps. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I'd like to call the question on the College of Business Administration's Curriculum Packet.

Peters: Second.

Funderburk: Question has been called and seconded. That was **Peters** with the second. All those in favor of calling the question, signify by saying "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (one heard) Abstentions? None. All those in favor of approving the College of Business Curriculum Package, please say, "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries. Ok, depending on the wordiness, we have 10 minutes left. Do we take up the College of—let me see if I can find—I have some old fashioned paper. I can read it here.

DOCKET #1007, CONSIDERATION OF CURRICULUM PACKAGES, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (**BOODY/ROBERTS-DOBIE**)

Funderburk: Ok, Calendar Item 1109, Docket #1007, Consideration for Curriculum Packages from College of Education. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Point of order. Can we go into adjournment and then pick-up the same discussion the next time we meet, or do we have to finish an item of business in order to adjourn?

Funderburk: We can adjourn at any time I can convince anybody to make that motion. (light laughter) Are there any motions on the floor?

Gallagher: Well, I just—people have come here, and I—I think it’s rather unthinking, not very thoughtful, to drag it out.

DeBerg: Well, then I move that we adopt the curriculum package from the College of Education.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg** motion. Second?

Gallagher: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher** second on that. So, discussion?

Edginton: Yeah, I would like to bring a point up in the—in the proposal to change the name of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Leisure Services. It’s a process question. I—it’s not that I’m personally opposed to this, but I think there’s been a due process violation here that needs to be looked at carefully. Sometime last Fall there was a request made by the—not last Fall, but the previous Fall—by the former Director of the School to propose names to change the School of HPELS. Subsequently, there was a listing of 4 names and a straw ballot taken. Fifty-one people voted. We only have 35 voting faculty members in the School of HPELS, and (light laughter) and—and there was—there was (voices talking over each other) I don’t know, but there wasn’t a secret ballot that took place. Subsequent to that, there was an e-mail, I can share that with you, like indicating that we would have a final vote at a March faculty meeting that was supposed to take place on March 9th, but then an e-mail went out on March 8th indicating “we will not be voting at tomorrow’s meeting.” On April 25th, an e-mail was sent by Dr. **Mattison** to the faculty indicating that Ginny **Arthur** agreed that the Provost would not likely approve a name change, which is fine, and **Ginny** said we thought we should submit the paperwork and try our best. I agreed--thought that the Provost would deny the request. At that point we invited her to talk to faculty. On May 28th, she wrote—

Mattison wrote an e-mail to the faculty indicating “the School of HPELS name change; the curriculum form has been submitted to the COE faculty as a part of the curricular package. The description and rationale for the name change can be found...” and so on and so forth. I’m not opposed to the name change, but I am opposed to the fact that due process was not followed here, and it’s 2 things in particular: 1) that the voting faculty members were not identified; and 2) that there wasn’t a secret ballot in the process so that the faculty could vote their conscience. I would hope that the—that that portion of the curricular package would be removed and would be tabled until that process can be effected.

Funderburk: Senator **East** and then Senator **Smith**. Did I see your hand up, or was it just some other motion?

East: Now I forgot. Sorry.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I wanted to know, Professor **Edginton**, if this came up at the curric—at the UCC, and if so, what was discussion and.....?

Edginton: I don’t know the answer to that question because, you know, during all those—that period of time, I was absent because of my teaching schedule, wasn’t able to go to any of those meetings. And really just have recently—I didn’t know this was going forward until Dr. **Dolgener** mentioned it in a meeting that the process was being moved forward, and I was actually quite stunned, because that vote had not taken place. And I—I just don’t know how you can move something forward with 51 people voting and only having 35 voting faculty members, and that’s if we count Pat **Gaedelmann** in that total. So, I think there’s been an error in the process that needs to be rectified. I don’t think anything’s going to change, but I think it needs to be rectified.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I think initially no one probably knew what the process was for changing the name and that the thought was that it was—it wasn't part of the curriculum package per se but it went to upper Administration. And then once it was determined that it was part of the curriculum package, it was put into the curriculum package through the College and through the appropriate channels, and I don't think there was any objection at the College level, apparently, in the Curriculum Committee, or any concerns from the faculty of HPELS. And I know, speaking for my particular division, we don't have any concerns with a name change, and, you know, I agree that maybe strict procedure wasn't followed, and it was entered into the package late, but I think the result is going to be the same.

Funderburk: Questions? Comments? Or any response from UCC?

Licari: Well, I will say that, you know, if—if there is a—a feeling that you would like to separate the—the name change out from the rest of the curriculum package, you know, that's—that's possible. They don't need to be hand-in-hand. There is enough of a separate system for the name change so that they don't have to go on to the Board necessarily together. So if you feel that you wanted to—or if the Senate, sorry, felt that it wanted to allow—allow that to take place, it—it wouldn't derail the rest of the College of Education curriculum packet.

Funderburk: Senator **East**.

East: Yeah. That was the point. That—that it can only be taken—can only be divided from the rest of the package if—if the Senate so desires.

Funderburk: This is the now 4-minute warning, so everybody understands (light laughter around) that we either need to get really rapid or have a motion to extend. Senator **East**. Or table it.

East: I have a question of the Curriculum Chair. Were there any issues or concerns or unresolved conflicts or consultation efforts or any—anything unresolved from the Curriculum Committee in this package?

Licari: No, not that I recall. The—you know, there didn't seem to be any, you know, issues that Departments were having or anything that the College Senate passed on that was not resolved in their minds. So, when we got it, it was a consensus packet.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I do have one question. There is a lot of overlap with Media that—with Communication Studies, and that went ok? All that overlap between the College of Ed.'s new emphasis on electronic media and all that Communication Studies has already staked out?

Licari: No, there were—weren't—I don't recall that there were any questions, and, of course, April **Chatham-Carpenter** is on the UCC, and so if she had seen something that was a question there, should would have addressed it.

DeBerg: Yeah, ok. Thank you. Yeah.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: But you also need to remember that at that time we had no Acting Department Head. We had a Department Head of the Committee, and so I would like more time to discuss this, rather than to just go with it pro formally. I noticed there was also an outstanding consultation from Marketing on one of the—I mean, there are several that maybe they've been resolved, but I—I'm not sure on requesting further consultation, so.....

Funderburk: Ok. We have 2 minutes left in timing. We've got a couple of options. I'll just point them out. We can table this 'til the following meeting. We can rush it to a vote. Or we can extend our meeting. Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I want to make a motion to remove the name change, to separate it from the curricular package for the School of HPELS until we can

take it back to the appropriate voting procedures, and I don't think it will take very long. It can be done very quickly.

Funderburk: A motion to separate the name. Do we have a second?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **DeBerg**. Comments or discussion about that? All those in favor of separating the name change out from this package, say "aye." (ayes heard around) All those opposed? (some heard) At least 2. Abstentions? (none heard) Ok. One abstention? Ok. One abstention. So, the motion to separate is passed. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I move that we table discussion on the rest of the package 'til the next meeting.

Funderburk: Motion to table until the next meeting. Do we have a second?

DeBerg: Second. I'm sorry.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**--get his name in there a few more times.

DeBerg: That's ok.

Funderburk: Comments or questions about that? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I don't know. It looks like a lot of—I don't know how many folks came from over there, but they came and sat through the rest of it here. I—I—I'm not going to support that, because I think that we owe them at least a little bit more time since they took the trouble of coming down here to hear us do some thinking on this.

Funderburk: Ok. One minute. Senator **East**.

East: Never mind.

Funderburk: Senator **East** never mind.

DeBerg: Is the move to adjourn debatable? I don't think it is?

Funderburk: No, but we have an active motion on the floor at the moment.

East: It just got passed, didn't it?

DeBerg: Oh, was the move to table debatable? I'm sorry.

Funderburk: Yes.

DeBerg: It is.

Funderburk: I think it is. Any other comments about tabling? (none heard) All those in favor of tabling this until the next meeting, please say "aye." (ayes heard around) All those opposed? (some heard) Uh, ok. All those in favor, we're going to do roll call again. Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Aye.

Dolgener: Opposed.

Funderburk: Actually, let's not do this. Let's just do a hand count. Let's do it again. All those in favor, hands. (voices asking if this hand vote is for who's in favor of tabling until next time; voices verifying) In favor of tabling. In favor of tabling. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. All those opposed? One, two, three, four, five. And abstentions, just because we like to do that. Ok. Motion passes to table. Senator **East**.

East: I have a statement for the—for the Minutes. All those—nobody will see it. If you don't know, curriculum process happens this way. You—you get to come part of the time, and unless we—we do indeed just rubber

stamp everything, you can probably count on not knowing exactly when you're going to get things discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: DeBerg.

DeBerg: I move to adjourn.

Funderburk: Motion, my favorite motion. And

East: Second.

Funderburk: And Vice-Chair **Breitbach** second. All those in favor? (ayes heard around) Thank you very much. It passed. (5:00 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:
January 23, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.