

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
01/24/11 (3:17 p.m. - 4:47 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. One courtesy announcement from Provost **Gibson** regarding the UNI Museum. No press present. No comments from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**. No comments from Senate Chair **Wurtz**.

2. Minutes approved for:

01/10/11 (**East / Funderburk**)

3. Docketed from the calendar:

967 Emeritus Status Request for Jean Mary Gerrath, Department of Biology, effective 06/10 (**Neuhaus/Unanimous consent**), regular order.

4. Consideration of docketed items:

1066 964 Approve recommendation from the Educational Policy Commission regarding changes to the university policy on attendance and make-up work (Commission Chair: Dr. Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn). Referred to a standing committee.

1067 965 Recommendations for Reorganizations of Academic Units. Returned to ad hoc committee for revision of recommendations.

1068 966 Textbook submission process. Referred to an ad hoc committee.

5. Adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 24, 2011
Mtg. # 1691**

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, James Jurgenson, Michael Licari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Marilyn Shaw, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Absent: Doug Hotek, Laura Terlip

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order 3:17 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** read a brief statement pertaining to the UNI Museum. Reading: "In order to assure the long-term viability of the UNI Museum's artifacts, the University is exploring a more-suitable location. The UNI collection is in danger of extensive damage if it stays in its current building which was not designed as a museum and needs major repairs and renovation too extensive to entertain. The artifacts also require a building with appropriate controls to monitor environmental conditions. The goal is to move the collection to a location that will maintain the collection's identity and continue to provide research, teaching, and outreach opportunities. The Grout Museum Board of Directors in Waterloo is interested in exploring a collaborative plan with UNI to house the collection

and to provide exhibition space. Additional gallery locations will also be sought across campus. A transition team comprised of faculty, staff, students, and community members will be appointed to begin the discussions. During the planning, the Museum will continue to operate as usual, while the building will eventually close, and artifacts will be exhibited on and off campus. The collection will remain under the ownership of the University of Northern Iowa."

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

Chair **Wurtz** had no comments.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The Minutes for 01/10/11 were distributed to senators electronically. Nuss received no additions or corrections prior to the meeting. No senators today had additions or corrections. Motion to approve minutes as distributed (**East/Funderburk**). Passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1069 for Docket #967, Emeritus Status Request, Jean Mary Gerrath, Department of Biology, effective 06/10.

Neuhaus moved to docket in regular order. Discussion involved the misspelling of Gerrath on the Agenda and whether to move this item to the head of the docket. Passed by unanimous consent to docket in regular order.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET 964, A REPLY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMISSION (EPC) (Breitbach / Balong)

Motion made when docketed to receive the reply and act on the recommendations (**DeBerg/East**). Discussion followed. Commission Chair Dr. Gayle **Rhineberger-Dunn** gave a brief overview on the University policy on attendance and make-up work that the Senate passed last April. The EPC had put together a new University Attendance and Make-up Policy. The Senate approved this new policy with Option 2 of the Grievance Policy "with the addition that each of the primaries are given the right to have a second, a support person, with them as they go through the process." When the Commission met to discuss the addition approved by the Senate, they were divided as a group as to whether to add the language and move on or whether to ask the Senate for an explanation as to why there is a belief that additional people are needed in the process when the EPC built in a person for each party, the faculty and the student. Her committee believes that the faculty member has a built-in support person in the form of his/her department head, and the student has an advocate throughout the grievance process in the form of an NISG executive officer. The Commission would like clarification that was not reflected in the Minutes as to why that language was added to the policy that was created.

The other issue that the Commission wants clarified is having the Faculty Senate specify who is in charge of putting these policies together, implementing them, and making sure that they appear. They could not find this policy anywhere on-line. There are a couple of issues. The EPC put the policy together. It was passed by the Senate with an addition. But she had to read the Minutes to know what that addition was. She then had to make that addition but is unsure to whom to send it to be sure that it gets published on-line and in the catalogue and is available for faculty and students. Further, who will make sure that the NISG Executive Office is informed that this is now a requirement that was passed by the Faculty Senate. They need to be made aware that they now have additional job duties.

Beyond this, in talking as a Commission about these issues, they want to make sure that the issues that are passed by the Faculty Senate are made available and distributed. The EPC in the past (before her time on the Commission) created the Technology Use in the Classroom Policy, and the one member currently on the Commission who also served then cannot find that policy published anywhere. They feel that the work they do needs ultimately to be made available to the University community.

Wurtz clarified that the Senate simply chose Option 2 of 2 options presented rather than adding language. She continued then on the issue of electronics in the classroom stating that the Senate does not have the final, final say on policy. She read from an e-mail she sent to Tim **McKenna**, University Counsel, "I understand you are the Chair of the Policy Review Committee. Can you fill me in on where the policy concerning attendance and make-up work the Senate approved on April 26, 2010, is in the post-Senate approval process. Or, if it isn't in the process at all, then what do we need to do?" **McKenna** replied, "The University's policy review process includes review by the UNI Policy Review Committee before submission to the President and Cabinet. Prior to review by the Policy Review Committee, we want to have the approval of the applicable vice president. Obviously, in this case, that involves the Provost. Ginny Arthur in the Provost's Office told me the policy draft should be reviewed by the AAC (probably no earlier than Jan. 25) before the Provost reviews the policy draft for approval. Ginny will also be reviewing it. I wish I could give you more definite information relating to the time-line, but that is all I have right now." So, **Wurtz** continued, it really is not the Senate who makes the "We're ready to post it on the web page and distribute" decision. It needs to go to the next step.

Both Associate Provost **Arthur** and Provost **Gibson** were present, and **Wurtz** asked if either wished to comment. **Arthur** said that she does not know what happened with the Technology Use Policy because that was something passed through the system before she was here, but it seems to be University Policy since there is a Grievance Policy already existing. So she agrees with **McKenna** that it has to go through the University Policy system which does involve the Provost who looks for recommendations from Department Heads and then to the Policy and Review Committee. Normally, if at any point along the way they have questions or concerns,

then they refer it back to the Senate, the originator of the policy. And she assumes then that the Senate sends it back to EPC.

Wurtz stated that she understands it was Student Government who asked the Senate to pass a policy that there would be no technology used in the classroom, but that shortly after that the University instituted the Emergency Response System where one of the primary means of hearing about emergencies is the cell phone/Blackberry/etc. so the question became "Does a professor want to forbid students from using technology in the classroom when this is their primary means of knowing there's a problem right outside the classroom door?" Discussion considered whether "technology" included cell phones and whether it was the faculty member's choice to decide in each class. **Wurtz** clarified that the policy stated there would be no technology unless the professor gave permission. So the question became whether the Senate wanted to say that professors had the ability to tell students they cannot have use in their classroom. Public Safety has not gotten back to the Senate on the issue. **Arthur** noted that this issue may also be a Divisional policy, so the review process may be slightly different. She is unsure if it was ever reviewed in Academic Affairs. **Wurtz** added that the issue is in limbo right now while they await word from Public Safety as to other methods of notification students might have, such as an alarm system.

Senator **DeBerg** returned the discussion to the recommendations here today. She noted that the 4th paragraph of the information sent to Chair **Wurtz**, and uploaded on the Senate website in this petition, talks about whether the Faculty Senate needs to specify who is in charge of creating the Grievance Committee. She asked, "Don't we elect the Grievance Committee in University elections?" Senator **Balong** noted that this ties into her question, that of Option 1 and Option 2, when the Senate chose Option 2 **Rhineberger-Dunn** referred to some addition the Senate had added on, which lead to the question of how that grievance process was set up and who was needed at the table. **Balong** asked **Rhineberger-Dunn** to explain the original Option 2 and then the revision.

Rhineberger-Dunn clarified that when the EPC was asked to review and potentially revise these policies, in the University Catalogue there was already a grievance process that was specific for attendance and make-up

work that is not the same as the University Grievance Process to follow if you want to dispute a grade or something along those lines. It is a separate process and was specified as a separate process before the EPC took over. In the EPC's process of revising it, they discussed 2 options, and she noted that she brought copies of those along today if anyone wished to see them. The one that was passed, Option 2, basically specifies that the student must contact the faculty member, the faculty member's Department Head, the faculty member's Dean, and the Northern Iowa Student Government Executive Office in writing requesting a review of the instructor's decision within 3 business days of the denial of make-up work. The 2nd step is that the NISG Executive Office will organize a meeting between those bodies, the student, the faculty member, the faculty member's Department Head, and a minimum of 2 tenured faculty members, drawn from a pool of faculty who have previously agreed to serve in this capacity and who come from outside the faculty member's Department, within 2 business days upon receipt of the letter, and this meeting shall take place within 5 business days of the receipt of the appeal letter. The third step was the 3-person committee. The 2 faculty volunteers and the NISG officer would review the cause of the absence and the instructor's reasons for denial and policies regarding attendance and make-up work. They will look at whether the instructor actually specified on the first day of class, which is required in the attendance and make-up policy, what their make-up policy is, and what the attendance policy is, and is it reasonable. This committee will render a final decision within 2 business days regarding whether or not the student will be allowed to make-up the work. This decision is final and binding upon the instructor and the student. Any make-up work or exam must be equivalent in terms of academic demand to the original assignment or exam, although it may differ in form. Also, specific findings of the committee will be strictly confidential and will be reported only to the faculty members deemed to ensure that the committee's decision and facts will be applied in good faith in cases where the student's appeal is granted.

That was the policy that was approved by the Senate, but in the Senate minutes for 04/26/10 it says (reading) "Motion by Senator **Funderburk** to approve the EPC's policy on class attendance and make-up work with Option 2 with the addition that each of the primaries are given the right to have a second, a support person, with them as they go through the process. Second by Senator **Neuhaus**. Motion passed." **Funderburk** now clarified

that after talking with a couple of Department Heads they did not say to him that they considered themselves faculty advocates but that they were there trying to be jurors and moderators. Some faculty, in some cases, were not as comfortable with the Department Heads as we might always hope they would be, especially new faculty. They might prefer to have someone else to help them say what they had to say more clearly. Additionally, the issue of right to privacy is a realistic one, with the possibility of suit, and it is not dealt with there either. Parties involved would need to have a statement that they are not allowed to say anything or something. It was a protection mechanism for both sides. He noted that he had chatted quickly with the NISG President at that time (Adam) who said the student government position is they are there not to advocate for the student as much as also to make sure that both sides were in agreement on how to proceed. So that was the reason for the addition, not the assumption that those two people were on each side. There seemed to be no one there truly in support of either side.

Senator **East** agreed with this reasoning because he has sometimes had department heads he would not consider an advocate for him. Similarly, if the NISG president is to one who helps to decide in the matter, then they should not be considered an advocate for the student but rather an independent juror. And to the privacy issue, campus deals with it all the time saying, "This is private; don't talk about it." It just needs to be made clear that everyone is under those rules. An additional issue, for **East**, is the source of those who will serve. There has been some sort of an academic conduct committee that seems to have gone away, and the Senate has never repopulated that committee, to serve as a pool.

Senator **DeBerg** suggested asking the EPC to recommend means by which the Senate constitutes this group of people, perhaps the Committee on Committees or some subgroup to devise a way by which faculty can be named to this particular process. She wants to avoid the entire Senate having to think about it as a group.

Senator **Neuhaus** said that this group could take care of the faculty side but that NISG must be encouraged to take care of the other side. Who will the student draw upon for support? **DeBerg** suggested that each side bring who they want. Why does there have to be a pool? **Funderburk** agreed

because some of these are emotionally charged, and perhaps the second person would be less connected and could say things more calmly for them. It would seem better to bring someone you already know rather than have a stranger trying to offer support.

Rhineberger-Dunn clarified that the committee of faculty is not chosen by the faculty or the student. It is similar to the University Grievance Policy where members are elected by College Senates to serve. The intent here was similar, plus a NISG officer. If the NISG officer were to add additional people, then EPC would have to consider that and what role then did the NISG officer play on this 3-person committee that reviews the cause of the absence.

Balong was glad to have this clarification. There are the support people, the people that bring the initial meeting, and then the committee that actually reviews the situation. She guesses that the question at hand of importance within the policy is who will be the 3-person committee or how would that be brought together in a timely manner. **Rhineberger-Dunn** replied that one of the reasons the EPC revised the grievance process related to this policy was because it was an admission that such grievances need immediate attention. It cannot wait until the end of the semester if the student is asking to take an exam, especially an exam early in the semester. This is why the grievance process is quick. A pool of faculty is needed to pull from immediately. They would not meet regularly as do the other University grievance committees. **East** agreed. **DeBerg** wondered since the other grievance committees are elected why this one cannot be also. We can call an immediate election this year, or we can slide by and have an election for the beginning of next year, she said.

Wurtz reminded everyone that Vice Chair **Lowell** has been working with the committees' process to bring some order to it all. **Lowell** said she did have that information but not in the papers she brought today. She has determined that most of the Senate committees have been meeting and functioning and doing well. The Budget Committee is up and functioning again, also, with Frank **Thompson** in charge of that.

Funderburk suggested that rather than creating yet another committee or yet another pool is there a reason members of the existing Grievance Committee cannot serve as this pool? **DeBerg** asked how many are on that

committee. **Lowell** replied that she has that information just not here today. They agreed there are at least 5, one from each College, and maybe some others.

Wurtz questioned whether senators believe it would be in their best interest to do a quick review of the policy and maybe ask for some fine tuning and some filling in of gaps before it goes through the AAC? **Neuhaus** said, no, he thinks only a couple things need slight tweeks. Maybe everyone at a grievance signs something so they know it is private. Maybe the Grievance Committee just takes this on as another part of their job. And the getting the word out needs to be pushed. He thinks this covers most of the EPC's concerns. **Rhineberger-Dunn** agreed this takes care of the immediate concerns but perhaps in the future as the EPC chair changes there might be something that outlines for a committee what the process is. If they cannot find the policy, where do they look and whom do they contact so they do not have to come back to the Senate? **Wurtz** made reference to the flow chart that she has senators looking at currently, which if approved will be placed on the Senate webpage. This will make the procedures a little more accessible. **Rhineberger-Dunn** noted that when she took over Chair of the EPC, nothing was turned over to her, and she would hope that most committees do not operate that way.

East stated that he does not get the sense that the Senate wants to revise anything. He thinks these are all implementation details about how this moves forward and how it gets implemented ultimately and that that just needs to be specified as per this conversation and that those involved will make sure that the seconds will agree to privacy or they will decide to revise things slightly.

DeBerg spoke to amend the current motion 1) in that the Faculty Senate assign attendance and make-up work grievances to the current elected Grievance Committee, and 2) that in the grievance process each party gets to bring another person of his/her choosing, student and faculty. **Wurtz** questioned the meaning of the amendment, and **Rhineberger-Dunn** translated it as possibly meaning that if a student has a grievance that they contact all those people. The NISG officer then contacts the existing Grievance Committee at the University level and says they need 2 people who can meet on this date to work with this student and with this faculty

member. **DeBerg** agreed and that with regard to the privacy issue that each person in the meeting get to bring his/her own advocate or second person of their choosing. **East** pointed out that that part was already there, so **DeBerg** revised her amendment to just the first part. **Funderburk** seconded this revised amendment. **Wurtz** opened the floor for debate on the merits of this amendment, but **East** asked for a point of order. He thinks this just substitutes for the original motion, and if this passes, they are done. He would "amend by substitution." **DeBerg** agreed. **Balong** wondered if they wanted to add about signing for confidentiality. Does that need to be in the policy or is that just good practice? If it needs to be done, do they need to direct someone to create that document? **Wurtz** felt the group was moving into making policy and preferred that they vote on the amended motion, and then she would entertain a motion from the floor to have a group bring in writing a proposal for a new policy. This would not change the meaning of what has been discussed. It would just be clearer about the process.

Several senators discussed the current motion, amendment, amendment to the amendment, amendment to be substituted for the motion, non-motion motion, etc. Ultimately, **DeBerg** moved to call the question on her motion to assign it to the current Grievance Committee. **Soneson** 2nd. Passed. **DeBerg** said her amendment precisely is: "To assign attendance and make-up work grievances to the current Grievance Committee." Vote passed.

Wurtz now stated the amended motion is to accept the report and to take the action requested in the form of assigning to the Grievance Committee. Vote passed. **Funderburk** asked where this now went other than in Senate Minutes. **Wurtz** stated that it next goes to the Review Committee saying the Senate has added to it. **Funderburk** asked who actually incorporates the change into the document? **Lowell** volunteered to inform the Grievance Committee. **Rhineberger-Dunn** suggested that NISG also be informed.

DOCKET 965, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC UNITS (DeBerg/Bruess)

Bruess gave background that last Fall the Senate asked that an ad hoc committee take a look at recommendations for means by which decisions about academic reorganizing of units be a bit more transparent. Their ad

hoc committee, comprised also of Senators **DeBerg, Roth**, met a couple of times going over possible procedures. The current document (available to senators on the website prior to the meeting and now projected on the screen) lists those recommendations. They ask the Senate to comment on the different sections. **Soneson** asked **Bruess** to read the specific motion made: "The ad hoc committee designated by the Senate to draft recommendations for future academic reorganization moves that the University Faculty Senate adopt the following recommendations and forward them to the President, the Provost, Deans, and Department Heads." He noted that the recommendations are divided into 4 sections: A. Proper Consultation, B. Budgetary Rationale, C. Definition of a New Academic Unit, and D. Legitimate Academic Leadership for New Academic Units. The appendices are for informational assistance.

Provost **Gibson** chose to speak first. She noted that she understands these to be recommendations to the President and Provost ideally, and the senators agreed. So, she continued, they are not binding; they are simply recommendations. In Section D, titled Legitimate Academic Leadership in New Academic Units, she stated that to use the word "legitimate" is inappropriate and somewhat condescending. She would hope that a President and a Provost would not put someone in a position who is not legitimate. She is not quite sure what is meant by that. Second, there is a process in place, through Compliance, for waivers of searches, so it is not that there are not other options. There are other options. If you look at what happened prior to her arrival on campus, there were many, many appointments made that were termed "interim." (End of Side A, Tape 1 of 1) If you look at the College of Education, **Gibson** continued, all of the administrative positions of that College are interim and were appointed interim. She is not sure if the waiver policy was used at that point in time, she doubts it, but there is a waiver policy. There are also procedures in place for the members of committees for faculty, for department heads, and for deans. Those procedures are already in place, so some of this is redundant. Lastly, whereas this statement is a recommendation, several places the word "must" is used, and that seems to her to be an inconsistency--to say on one hand that these are recommendations but on the other hand certain things "must happen." So, she would like Section D to have the word "legitimate" deleted, and that all acknowledge that there is already a policy in place through compliance and equity for a waiver of

searches--a policy that all can find on-line--and the composition of committees and the term of what "must" happen seems to be a little too direct. Those are her major issues in this statement.

Wurtz asked for an informal amendment from the ad hoc committee members present, if they are comfortable with those suggestions. **DeBerg** and **Bruess** declined, saying they would like to hear more input from the rest of the Senate first. **East** agreed that those words caught his attention also, perhaps sounding a little pejorative. However, he thinks that most of what was included were reasonable things to be addressed. He did not see anything on how committees are to be formed, though, so he would like more on that. He also wondered about the definition of "new academic unit." It is not clear that that covers everything that needs to be covered. Reorganization could be more than the merging of two academic units. It could be the elimination of a department, or a college might come under this that would not have anything to do with this definition of reorganization. The definition used feels strange, too, because of the two colleges merged, one of them does not fall under that definition--the definition of 50% or more change. The smaller of the two did have 50% or more change, but the larger did not. So this definition works for a merger, but it does not work for creation of new colleges, creation of or elimination of departments or programs or colleges which he assumes the committee would want such a procedure to address.

DeBerg replied that they were trying to think of when does a current department, even though it retains its name, change enough in personnel so that the leader chosen was not consulted on by at least half of the new personnel who came in. At which point is there new critical mass in a department that should deserve some say in the administrative leader of that department. This particular part was intended only for mergers. All the rest would fit for all other organizational changes. **East** disagreed and gave the example of Computer Science and Industrial Technology. **DeBerg** suggested that perhaps the 50% may need to be changed. It was chosen as an arbitrary number at which point an academic unit, even if it keeps the name, is really a different unit. It could be 30% or 60%, she said. But she wants it recognized that keeping a name does not necessarily mean that the academic unit is not new, and it should have something to say about its administrative leadership. That was the point. Fifty per cent of the current

would mean one-third of the merged unit. Yes, it is arbitrary, but they needed some point at which to say this is a new academic unit that deserves to be consulted on who its administrative leader is. **East** maintained that 50% is a bad number, and it has nothing to do with the elimination of programs, only with the merger, and when this talks about reorganization of academic units it needs to consider the elimination of some also.

Balong, referring to parts B and C, would like to see as a recommendation the discussion not use a number but emphasize the essence that all in the new unit be consulted. To quantify will only be tricky.

Provost **Gibson** recalled how the discussion started last year as based on the need for communication and asked if others recalled it as such. She thinks that part A gets at the essence of what she recalls, that there needs to be consultation and discussion, and there is a list of groups that need to be consulted. This is the essence of what was discussed.

DeBerg said that her memory of what brought this to the Senate was the CHAFA Senate's motion that the Faculty Senate come up with recommendations regarding the reorganization of academic units. The Senate's response was to set up an ad hoc committee who would develop recommendations for academic reorganization.

Senator **VanWormer** asked if the Senate might be able to vote on each item separately, to divide the question. This motion died for lack of a second.

Funderburk asked to make a friendly amendment to delete the word "legitimate" and to replace the word "must" with "should" throughout. In his quick reading he saw no place that that would not convey the thought. **DeBerg** said that the committee would accept that as a friendly amendment so no need to vote on it. **Sonson** stated that "should" and "shall" are logically the same as "must." There really is no difference. They are normative. He is not sure that the friendly amendment really does anything in terms of addressing the need to keep this as a recommendation rather than a stipulation. **DeBerg** acknowledged that the Senate does not have the power to stipulate, so no matter what is written, it would not be a stipulation. The role of the Senate here is only advisory. **Neuhaus**

suggested that, with that in mind, maybe all the shalls and shoulds and woulds and musts could simply be "recommend that" in keeping with the document as a set of recommendations. In the spirit of the moment perhaps the more aggressive language took over, but the commands could be rephrased as suggestions in keeping with the recommendation aspect of the document.

Wurtz asked if everyone is comfortable to say that the motion in front of the body has now been amended to remove the word "legitimate" and to replace "must" and "shall" with appropriate language to reflect recommendation. **DeBerg** suggested that those words just be deleted because the verb "be" stands on its own, or just add "that" at the beginning of the sentences where they appear.

Wurtz noted that it seems all are in agreement on what this document needs to be. The body is debating the merits of the amendment. **East** asked what happens if they pass this? Do they communicate it to the Provost, and she communicates it to the President, and they.....? This is not University policy, he added. Does it not end up beyond that? Is it just the Senate recommendation? **DeBerg** pointed out that part A lists who the recommendations go to. And **Wurtz** noted that it is one of the responsibilities of the Senate to provide consultation. The Senate does not have to wait to be asked. They can offer recommendations.

Balong noted that she is still not sure about part D. She still has some issue with quantifying the "six new academic units." She is not sure they need to be that specific when what they want is communication when change occurs.

Provost **Gibson** spoke to that point. She finds some of this document a little insulting. If she needs to take 2 years or 3 years or 5 years to find someone, then that is what she will do, she said. She does not think it is necessary for this recommendation to say to the Provost that she can take up to 2 years to search. She already knows that. She can take as much time as she wants or feels that she needs. She would like to see a cleaner document to say here are the recommendations. She finds parts of it just not necessary.

Vice Chair **Lowell** asked a question about what is meant by "reorganization"? In her College, CSBS, they were just informed that Military Science will be moved into that College. As far as she knows, there was no consultation. The CSBS College Senate was not consulted. It may be or may not be a good thing to do, but it was just presented as what will occur. She thinks it came as a total surprise to everyone in her College, including their senators. This is the kind of thing all are talking about. For issues like that, there should be consultation with faculty. Discussion among Faculty Senate members included whether the current recommendations would cover just such a change. Definitions of some of the terms are in question by some as well as some specifics which may be leaving out other possibilities. **East** concluded he would therefore vote against the recommendations in their current form and encouraged others to do the same. **Soneson** added that he is troubled about the news that Military Science will move into CSBS because there is a question as to whether it is a legitimate academic unit, and the move would seem to legitimize its academic character. Others agreed that they are unhappy with this news and the fact that no consultation seems to have occurred.

Smith proposed that this current discussion might be seen as just a review of the document, a collective editing with ideas offered. The ad hoc committee can take these ideas and re-do this and return with a new motion that is streamlined and has the language that all would be more comfortable with which addresses some of the concerns raised by the Provost. He then made the motion to refer the document back to the committee, and **Soneson** seconded, saying he would like to see the budgetary rationale developed a little bit more. Vote called and passed. The Chair encouraged senators to let the committee know their thoughts on how best to revise the document.

DOCKET 966, TEXTBOOK SUBMISSION PROCESS (Soneson/Neuhaus)

Soneson clarified the motion: That the Senate shall determine the best way to implement at UNI the provision of college textbook information in course schedules.

Soneson explained that the reasoning has to do with the fact that the timing of the submission of textbook information has something to do with

the quality of instruction in at least 2 ways. First of all, if book lists are to be turned in at the same time as the schedule, then it is difficult to change things later and choose a new book which may surface well after the date of schedule submission. It would not be fair to students who may go to Amazon and buy the book they were told they ought to buy and then be told, "Oh, I'm sorry. We've changed textbooks." So a faculty member might be required to teach from a less-than-up-to-date textbook. Secondly, when faculty teach a new course and are required to teach the same course the following semester, they may be asked to turn in a textbook list only 3-4 weeks into that first semester, before they have had enough time to evaluate the quality of the textbook. Because these things affect the quality of instruction, it seems that this would fall under the purview of the Faculty Senate to determine, rather than the Dean of Students or a Vice President of Student Affairs.

East noted that he understands the problem but does not understand the action being requested today. He is in favor of the Senate making this determination, making a recommendation, but how do they do that? The motion does not address that.

Provost **Gibson** said that the Registrar and the Dean of Students came to an AAC meeting and discussed this change. It is part of the new Student Information System (SIS). The Deans asked some very relevant questions. So it might be helpful to have the Registrar and/or the Dean of Students or someone working directly with the SIS system come and answer some of the questions the senators are posing. She thinks there is a way to do some of the things the senators are asking, but she is not knowledgeable enough to say how that can be done. She remembers that some of those same questions came up when they met with AAC. **Soneson** acknowledged the Provost's point but said it does not look as though there is any room for adjustment. Phil **Patton**, the Registrar, has said that in fact legally faculty do not have to turn in information until perhaps the day before classes begin. He suggested that they submit "TBA" (to be determined), and that when a professor determines the textbook(s), submit the information. But Terry **Hogan** phrased it in a way that did not look as though there was room for that. **Funderburk** noted that a new Fall 2011 course which will be team-taught by 3 people has a deadline right now of submitting the textbook(s)

they will use, and that is a very hard thing to do this early. He thinks it is generally a bad idea to try to make everything done conform to a new software package purchased.

DeBerg suggested that the Senate pass this motion, in general, agreeing that the Senate will take this up, and then make a motion similar to the one done for Academic Reorganization, to ask an ad hoc committee from the Senate to talk with the Registrar, talk to others, and return with a policy recommendation in regard to textbook submission. She called the question on the general motion before the Senate, "that the Senate shall determine the best way to implement at UNI provision of college textbook information in course schedules." (male) seconded. Vote to call the question passed. Vote on the original motion passed, with 1 abstention.

DeBerg moved to appoint an ad hoc committee of 3 members to develop specific recommendations on the Senate's determination of textbook information in course schedules. Second by **Soneson**. Discussion included Provost **Gibson** asking for clarity on the schedule. Is this 2 issues or 1? This is 1 issue to appoint an ad hoc committee of 3 to draft recommendations for the Senate to consider for including textbook information in course schedules, replied **DeBerg** who emphasized, based on her experience with one ad hoc committee, that she feels it was a good way to move through complicated and detailed information. She thinks it is a good plan. **Soneson** agreed that this is better than trying to formulate policy here among all senators.

Wurtz questioned for the viability of the motion and whether 3 senators had interest in serving on this ad hoc committee? **Funderburk** agreed to serve but feels the committee needs someone with computer expertise included. **Gibson** agreed that it is SIS-related. **East** said he would be happy to serve but added that this is a policy decision and it would not matter what the technology involves. While the group sought a 3rd volunteer, **Gibson** asked again if the strategy might be to have those involved come to speak with the Senate to answer questions they might have and then see if a committee is needed? Senators suggested the ad hoc committee instead meet with those individuals. **Gallagher** recommended that if the ad hoc

committee is approved that they do meet with other relevant groups who have dealt with the situation. That would be part of their charge.

Gibson again suggested they invite these parties to talk with the full Senate. **Funderburk** questioned who besides **Patton** might they invite? **DeBerg** suggested **Hogan**, the person who was interpreting the directive. She also stated that she would prefer the Senate be getting business done and not be information-gathering sessions that an ad hoc committee might do.

Soneson wondered if the Senate really needed to come up with recommendations. Maybe the Registrar could just interpret the software limitations and state what **Hogan** has directed. Maybe it all could be resolved very quickly. An ad hoc committee could determine that right away and bring it to the Senate. **Gallagher** suggested a friendly amendment that the ad hoc committee simply inquire into this. Discussion included that recommendations need an inquiry and perhaps the recommendation might be that nothing can change.

Wurtz summarized that the discussion currently is on the merits of choosing to use an ad hoc committee with the understanding that the ad hoc committee would talk with people, gather information, and return with policy, which might be that nothing needs to be done.

Neuhaus suggested that some of the 3 ad hoc committee members could be outside the Senate. Harry **Brod**, who submitted the petition, is very interested in this issue, and it makes sense to invite his participation. The Senate could vote if 1 or 2 senators show interest, and others could then be found. **DeBerg** accepted that as a friendly amendment to her motion.....that the ad hoc committee be "3 faculty members."

Wurtz summarized for the vote that the current motion is to form an ad hoc committee of 3 faculty members to gather information and to return saying there is a need for or no need for a policy, and, if needed, then offer specific recommendations. Motion passed as so described. **East** asked that the committee pass its comments/recommendations to the senators electronically and informally before presenting formally to the Senate,

because this might lessen the discussion needed during Senate meetings. **Wurtz** agreed with this plan.

The Chair opened the floor to 30-second maximum comments of anything anyone felt needed to come to the Senate's attention but not for any action or business today. **Neuhaus** noted that last Spring the issue of archival material arose. The Library is interested in working with the Senate on this issue but not for free. There is currently a stalemate. He thinks it would be a really good idea to have access to these archives, including policies and other things. The Senate is good to go from here forward, but at some point senators need to look into the archival situation. **Wurtz** agreed to explore what the Senate can afford to do in terms of archiving.

DeBerg said that the LAC Committee is interested in the Faculty Senate and the LAC Committee receiving data from the Registrar and/or Admissions on how many students per year UNI admits below the Regents' Admission Index. How many UNI admits below that index and why we do that. Brief discussion included the possibility that that data exists and that the LAC Committee might just request it and perhaps pass it along to the Senate.

Breitbach expressed curiosity as to the student loan debt of UNI graduates after 4 years. Discussion included that the President has made financial literacy discussions a goal.

The Chair noted that as time allows at the end of meetings she would like to implement a brief time for senators to share what is on their minds. She encouraged also using the webpage and the e-mail distribution list, for the more everyone communicates the better.

Breitbach asked for 10 seconds to say that she also would like to see senators allowed to complete their presentations during Senate meetings. It seems they are sometimes cut off before finishing, and this bothers her.

The business for the day being accomplished, following a motion, the chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate