

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
08/26/13 (3:32 p.m. – 5:03 p.m.)
Mtg. #1737

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

Press were in attendance from the *Northern Iowan*, Linh Ta, and from the *Waterloo Courier*, MacKenzie Elmer.

Provost **Gibson** today welcomed all students, faculty, and staff back to a new academic year. She thanked all faculty who were able to attend the Fall Faculty Workshop, a record number, and encouraged all who attended to fill out their surveys. She also gave some details on her current requests for the FY 15 Budget that she'll submit to the Board of Regents and ideas of initiatives that will be posted for public review prior to the next Board meeting on September 11th [see Addendum 1]. At that Board meeting, she noted that a couple of UNI faculty presentations will take place—one about UNI's 3 Fulbright scholars last year and one on Student Teaching Field Experiences. She ended by noting that she looks forward to continuing her dialogues with the Faculty Senate Chair and Vice-Chair this year on various issues pertaining to Academic Affairs that arise

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** welcomed everyone back. He summarized some recent campus events and announced others, including upcoming "Open Houses" and the beginning formation of the new President's group, likely to be called his "Cabinet." **Funderburk** mentioned the new strategic marketing firm, HRB, and thanked faculty who volunteered to be a part of that initiative. He also reminded everyone of the Fall Faculty Meeting on September 16th with details including the attendance by Dr. Katie Mulholland, President Pro Tem of the Iowa Board of Regents, and of the upcoming installation of President **Ruud** on October 4th with other related

events. He also reminded faculty of the Alumni Association's Tailgate and Panther Fan Rally events prior to football games, suggesting interested faculty volunteer to participate and greet alumni. See full transcript for details on all these announcements.

Chair **Smith** had extensive comments today, his first regular meeting as Senate Chair. After reporting on a recent budget-related meeting between President Ruud and faculty/staff leaders, Chair Smith offered his view of the changing state of American higher education and UNI's position within it. He suggested that increased competition for students was especially threatening to comprehensive universities like UNI and proposed that "UNI's only viable competitive niche in this landscape is to offer high-quality undergraduate education at low public school tuition rates." To do this, Chair Smith argued, we must shift UNI's culture to one of collective responsibility for our educational programs and must insure that all faculty are using their time and considerable talents to produce truly important outputs through their teaching, research, and service activities. After expressing his strong support for shared governance, he proposed that it entails shared responsibility, which itself requires that UNI's faculty, through the Faculty Senate, must act more assertively in initiating and implementing programs and activities that make UNI a better university. Chair Smith concluded by noting personal traits, such as his bias towards informality, and other factors that will affect the performance of his duties, but expressed the hope that, by working together, the Senate would have a productive year of service to the faculty and to UNI.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for June 24, 2013, were approved with no additions or corrections (**Edginton/Kirmani**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1194 1090 Request for Emeritus Status, Glenn T. Nelson

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

1195 1091 Request for Emeritus Status, Thomas M. Barry
Motion to docket in regular order (Nelson/Peters**). Passed.

1196 1092 Request for Emeritus Status, Kevin C. O’Kane
Motion to docket in regular order (O’Kane/Kirmani**). Passed

1197 1093 Academic Affairs Representative on the Advisory Committee
for the Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning
Motion to docket in regular order (Male Senator/Hakes**)

1198 1094 Review Performance and Elect Members to Senate Budget
Committee
**Motion to divide the question: 1. Performance review of the Senate
Budget Committee. 2. Election of new members to the Senate Budget
Committee (**Peters/Terlip**). Passed.
**Motion to review the performance of the Senate Budget Committee in
quasi-committee of the whole on 9/23/13 (**Peters/Terlip**). Passed.
**Motion to elect new members to the Senate Budget Committee in
regular order (**Peters/ Swan**). Failed.

4. New Business

Chair **Smith** covered a number of items under this heading. First, the representation on the Faculty Senate may be out of balance. That will be looked at when the new Fall Faculty Roster is completed soon.

Senators were reminded to have an alternate named for times when they are unable to attend, and it was agreed that only full-semester alternates would be placed on the Only Senators distribution mailing list.

Chair **Smith** sought ideas for guests to come for consultative sessions of interest to Senators. A number of recommendations were given.

And finally reappointments were approved and a couple of new appointments made to a number of Senate standing committees before time ran out for this meeting.

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

None

5. Adjournment

****Motion to adjourn at 5:03 p.m.(Edginton/Hakes). Passed.**

Next meeting:

September 9, 2013

Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 50 pages including 1 Addendum.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
August 26, 2013
Mtg. 1737**

PRESENT: Tilahun **Abebe** (alternate for Michael **Walter**), Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Kim **MacLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip** (25 present)

Absent: Melissa **Heston** , Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz** (3 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:32 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: Ok, I’m going to call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And, as we normally do, call for press identification. (a quiet audience member speaks). Say your name again?

TA: Linh **Ta**, from the *Northern Iowan*.

Smith: Ok, and maybe Sherry [transcriptionist] got it.

Nuss: Can she spell it?

Smith: Could you spell your name?

TA: L-I-N as in nature-H-T as in turtle-A

Nuss: All right. Maybe.

Smith: Ok, well, thank you. [turning to other audience member] And you?

Elmer: I'm MacKenzie **Elmer**, from the *Courier*.

Smith: Yes, MacKenzie, yes. So we do have some press here today.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: I'll ask for comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: Ok, great. Thank you.

Smith: You bet.

Gibson: Well, good afternoon everyone. Glad to see everyone. Glad to see the students walking across campus. It's, you know—during the Summer when there are no students, campus just doesn't look right. So it was great to see the students. Welcome back to all the faculty as they may be reading the Minutes of this meeting. Hope everyone had a relaxing summer, combination of a little work/a little relaxation.

I just have a few points I'd like to make. I want to thank all the Faculty that attended the Fall Faculty Workshop. We had a record number of faculty that attended, and Peter **Seldin** did an excellent job, so I hope all of you that attended found it rewarding. Susan (**Hill**, Director of the Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning) did ask me to ask you to fill out your survey to let her know what you thought went well, what might be improved, and then what topics, you know, she might want to consider for next year.

I know that there is a Budget Committee, and I know probably, Scott [Senator **Peters**] and Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**], you've met with the President [**Ruud**], but I did want you to know the items that I submitted to the FY 15 Appropriation Budget. And we don't know at this point what

will stay in and what the Board [of Regents] might take out, but I just want you to know what items I submitted to the FY 15 Budget.

Number 1 would be faculty requests, and my total Budget request is \$10.5 million. Again, I have no idea how this will all shake out, and, of course, it has to go through the Legislature. But investment in our academic programs through faculty hires.

Number 2 to invest in our clinical space, science labs, other space that we have designated as academic areas. To look at integrating tile classrooms, and Academic Affairs will actually have a presentation coming up in a couple weeks about tile classrooms. Increase student retention through additional advisors and other staff that we need, additional Cornerstone sections, and so on and so forth there. Enhance academic support for veterans. We know that there will be a lot of veterans that will be coming home and enrolling in universities, and we want to make sure that once they are here—they are enrolled at UNI—that we provide the support that they need. Strengthen community college partnerships. Again, we know that a number of our students, a high percentage of our students are transfer students, so, again, we want to continue to look at ways to make that a seamless transition. Expand the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Again, we have only \$50,000 at this point in time designated to that initiative, so we certainly need additional dollars there. And fully implement a Learning Commons and Digital Media Commons. Again, the Provost's Office has earmarked some dollars for the Learning Commons and Digital Media Commons as has the Dean of the Library, but, again, we need additional funding for that area. Just a couple more, enhanced community engagement infrastructure, and lastly expand the scope of faculty and student research scholarship and creativity.

My second area, there are some initiatives that pertain particular to the pre-K-12 goal in our strategic plan, and we also have a request to enhance our IT across campus. There are other initiatives that are a part of the request, as I said. It will be—this will be docketed later this week, and you will have access to see it before the Board meeting which is on the 11th, and at some point, I don't if Scott [**Peters**] or you [indicating the Chair] will make a presentation from your meeting with [President] Bill **Ruud** on the entire Budget. This is only the section for Academic Affairs.

The Board meeting is September 11th. There will be two faculty presentations. The first will—the faculty presentation will be our Fulbright scholars. That will be at the end of the day. As you know, we had 3 Fulbright scholars last year. We will also have a presentation that was requested by the Board from Becky **Hawbaker** [Office of Student Field Experiences] to talk about the clinical experience, and that one will be around 1:30 in the afternoon.

I will continue to meet with Jerry [Chair **Smith**] and Tim [Vice-Chair **Kidd**] before we have Faculty Senate to talk about issues pertaining to Academic Affairs in much the same way we did last year. I look forward to those discussions and look forward to discussions about Academic Affairs issues with the Senate during the entire year. So, thank you very much.

Smith: Thank you, Provost **Gibson**. Are there any questions for the Provost? If not, then I'll ask for comments

Peters: Sorry. Just one quick one. Would we be able to—once that document is finalized and sent to the Board, would we be able to attach your portion of the Budget request to the Minutes so that people can see things that you just talked about?

Gibson: Sure, but

Peters: To have it all in one place for people who are reading the Minutes?

Gibson: Right. Although my—this is not itemized, so—but at least you'll get a chance to see what the areas are, and it's—you know, it depends on how much money we get as to where it would eventually go. But, sure, that's no problem. [see Addendum 1]

Smith: Thank you. Any other questions?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: Then, comments from Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Good afternoon everybody. Welcome back. There has been a lot going on on campus, of course, as you probably know with—of course, we had the two Faculty Senate meetings. There were a lot of other meetings that have gone on from leadership, so we're going to see a lot of new initiatives going on this year. One of them you've heard something about. We'll get more details soon on the 5 open houses that will be happening through the year in an effort to enhance our recruiting efforts. Those will have faculty participation, so we'll be hearing about those soon. It's 3 in the Fall and 2 in the Spring. That's the latest count on that.

We also had the first meeting of one of the new groups that the President has formed which I'm guessing this is ultimately becoming what he'll call a "Cabinet" which involves the faculty leadership, the leadership of various staff groups, as well as the student leadership. So we had that, last week?—last week, going over some Budget numbers and Budget request items. So, we'll see a lot of new things going on as we transition to the new President's leadership.

Also, speaking to that, I want to thank those of you who responded to the request for faculty assistance with the new strategic marketing firm, HRB. There are going to be a series of meetings with those faculty who responded which my understanding is the primary mission there is for HRB, the firm, to be kind of bouncing some of their ideas and what their perception of what the University is with faculty for input on that. So, we welcome the opportunity to do that.

I've got a couple of reminders for you as you're setting up your schedule for the semester. Fall Faculty Meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 16th, from 3:30-5:00. That's in Lang Auditorium. Regent Dr. Katie **Mulholland**, who is the President Pro Tem of the Board, a 3-time UNI graduate, and the Superintendent of Schools in the Linn-Mar District, will be there to join us as well as our regular festivities and presentation of faculty awards and, of course, cookies to follow in the hallway. The other date that I put out there earlier is October 4, the formal installation ceremony for President **Ruud**. That's Friday, October 4, beginning at 10:00 a.m. in the Gallagher-Bluedorn Great Hall. Very shortly, as in probably tomorrow, you'll get a request to RSVP if you are interested in marching

and also if you need regalia ordered for you. There will be a very short turn-around time. The last version of that letter I saw was September 6th, so if you want to march and take part, please turn that back in very quickly. It would be nice to have a large turn-out for that. Also, as part of that event, on Thursday, October 3rd, there is a Faculty-Staff Reception event. I think Scott [Senator **Peters**] can probably say the exact time on that, because you're on that subcommittee.

Peters: I think 4:00-5:30.

Funderburk: So that Thursday, October 3rd, there's also then a staff event as well related to that. There's one over the lunch hour for the students as well.

And last, I've had some contact with the Alumni Association about a possible idea. I've heard from faculty a number of times that we need to engage more effectively with our alumni, get them more involved. You may know that the Alumni Association is sponsoring Tailgate and Panther Fan Rally events before the games each time, for football games. In general they have just either—President **Ruud** will be there for the game in Iowa State next week, so I contacted him about whether or not it would be appropriate to have some faculty volunteers take part in that, help greet the alumni. They are very excited about it, so I think if you have any comments, you might start thinking about whether or not you'd be willing to participate in those. There's free food. No cookies. But I think there's hotdogs at least [light laughter around] before the game. And I'll put out a notice, kind of come up with a better idea of how to word things. But if you have any comments or suggestions, please pass them on to me. That's what I have.

Smith: Thank you, Jeff [**Funderburk**].

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: And kind of some comments from me which will be more extensive today than normal, but various reasons for that. Again, I want to repeat the welcoming comments, particularly to new senators. And as part of that, I wanted to introduce you all, in particular the new Senators, to Sherry **Nuss**

who is our transcriptionist but also really now kind of our administrative assistant because we've moved away from what we did last year where we had 5% of a staff person's time. It really wasn't all that effective. We kind of gave that person—she moved on somewhere else, and we didn't replace her, so between Sherry, myself, and secretarial staff in the Provost Office, I think we can get done what needs to be done, and I think it will actually be more efficient because Sherry's very efficient. And I want to introduce for those of you who are new and weren't here this Summer, the other members of the leadership team, starting with Tim **Kidd**, our Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect—he gets to do this next year, looking forward to it--and finally Laura **Terlip**, our Secretary.

I'll begin with some comments relating to a budget meeting that President **Ruud** and Vice-President **Hager** held last Thursday—it was the one Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] and Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] were referring to—with faculty and staff leaders, including Tim [Faculty Senate Vice-Chair **Kidd**], Jeff [**Funderburk**], and myself. There was no updated information provided on current year enrollment projections or budget projections. I assume we're working from the same kind of projections that were relayed to you previously. The planning for enrollment was like for 12,800, which was a drop of about 400-500 from last year.

Gibson: 11,800.

Smith: 11,800, I'm sorry. But from what I've heard, we might do better than that, and if we do better than that, we'll have money that we, you know, hadn't assumed we would have.

The President is trying to get the State Legislature to make permanent the \$10 million extra money that was appropriated for the coming biennium. That's a very high priority for him. He's also going to push for other increases to the State General Fund Allocation, such as the 3.5% increase for inflation. So, my take-away from that is he's pushing very aggressively to try to get more money for UNI, and in doing that, he's using the fact that, "Hey, you recently gave me the job; now give me the resources to do the job."

Relating to that he's pushing the regents to reconsider the allocation formula that's used to divide the State legislative appropriation among the three Regent's universities. There's the feeling that we've kind of got the short end of the stick, much shorter than we should. He's made that case based on the argument that we do a lot more in educating in-state undergraduates. And so if you allocate those State appropriations based on who is teaching in-state undergraduates, we should be getting a lot more than we have been getting. You know, as I think you can imagine, Iowa and Iowa State are going to argue they do a lot of other things, too, besides teaching in-state undergraduates. But at any rate there seems to be some receptivity on the part of the Regents. They've set up a committee headed by David **Miles**, a former Regent, to look at this, report back to them. I wouldn't be surprised if we get a slightly improved allocation. I suspect, though, if it gets like, "Oh, some big changes," Iowa and Iowa State University are going to get up in arms and use their influence to kind of keep from losing a lot of resources. But, can we get more money from the legislature? Can we get a better—a bigger—piece of what actually is allocated? I think there is some positive prospects on both those ends.

Finally, President **Ruud** talked about a number of initiatives that he is pushing or at least exploring that might help us with enrollments and budgets in the long term. The one that he probably talked about the longest involved 2 + 2 programs with community colleges. I know we do some of this already. But he mentioned something that would involve—in fact, he used the example of a welder. Somebody is at a community college learning welding but would like to have the career advantages that come from having a 4-year degree. So, you do your welding stuff at a community college, but you also partner with UNI, take courses here, and end up with a 4-year degree that he feels would be attractive to a number of students. He's talked about having special tuition arrangements with other states. It was mentioned that Illinois—in-state tuition for Illinois is quite high, and if we offered them to come to UNI at their in-state Illinois rate, we'd actually do fairly well with those students financially. So that kind of deal. And he expressed a willingness to decouple UNI tuition from those at Iowa and Iowa State. Now historically we've kept our tuition for undergraduates at pretty much the same place. President **Ruud** has talked about kind of moving away from that. I don't know if he's going to move above them, below them? I personally have some qualms about that. But I think the

important point is everything's on the table for him. He's looking for lots of different ways in which we can kind of solidify and improve our financial position, and that I think—you know, certainly I would applaud that.

Since this is our first regular meeting I also wanted to take some time—and this won't happen again, so indulge me—to offer kind of my “big picture” view of things to give you a sense of where I'm coming from as Chair of the Senate and kind of how I'll approach the coming year and what we're going to do. I have spent some time thinking about this. In fact, I made a presentation on some of this stuff in the Twin Cities earlier in the spring.

To start with, and I'm sure some of you are familiar with this, there's been a lot of talk that higher education in this country is facing a crisis. I don't know if I'd use the word *crisis*, but I think we are facing a period, or entering a period, of considerable turmoil, challenges—increased public and legislative demands for performance and accountability. It's been with us for a while, but it's intensifying if anything else. There's increased competition for students. I think we've seen that here. I think it is a factor in our own enrollment difficulties, and in general, it's a much more competitive environment than we've been used to.

This more demanding environment, I believe, is especially problematic for comprehensive universities like UNI. And the reason is in higher education we basically have two missions/challenges: teaching and research. And comprehensive universities are always trying to do both, and they are always at the risk of kind of “falling between two stools” and not being all that great at either of them. If you're not super great at research, you know, the attention, the monies go to research universities like Iowa and Iowa State. If you're not really great at teaching, students are going to go to great liberal arts colleges like Grinnell and Coe and wherever.

So we arguably—we've got to—if we are trying to balance that, I personally feel that our only plausible successful competitive niche in this landscape is to offer high-quality undergrad education at low public school tuition rates. That isn't to say that we shouldn't support faculty research. We certainly should. And it isn't to say that we shouldn't offer certain graduate programs. Yes, we should, but they have to be offered very selectively and stand on their own legs. But we need to be really good at undergraduate education. I think we're pretty good at undergraduate education,

particularly in some programs, but I'm not convinced that we're really good at undergraduate education across the board. In fact, the program—the general program I'm the most familiar with, the Liberal Arts Core, I think has spots. I think it's got excellence in some spots. But across the board, I don't think it is good enough that we can run up on a flagpole and say, "Hey, we're really great at this."

So I think we need to make some improvements in what we do, and in thinking about this, I think that there are—I don't know if I'd call them all "strategies." In some cases, the first one I think is almost like a culture change. I think we need to be less in some ways decentralized to individuals and departments and more of a sense of collective responsibility for the teaching that goes on on this campus. If there are individuals and departments who are not rigorous, who aren't doing a good job of teaching, that reflects on the institution as a whole and it affects all of us. It affects our enrollments. It affects all of us. And so we have to, I believe—I don't think we can just kind of push it out and trust everybody to do a great job. We have to kind of have a community sense of norms and standards that we don't impose heavy-handedly, but we do kind of help people get to appropriate standards so that we can, in fact, achieve excellence in undergraduate education.

I think we also need to, what I would say, "raise the bottom." And what I mean by that is whenever I've heard administrators—the Provost, Presidents, whichever, Regents—talk to the faculty or about the faculty, you hear all sorts of praise. It's almost embarrassing. It's gushing. "You're so great! You work so hard! You're just super!" And that's true for many faculty on this campus, but it certainly isn't true for every faculty on this campus, not even close. There are plenty of faculty on this campus who, you know, like faculty anywhere, don't work all that hard. You get tenured. It's easy to slack off and let go. And I think that we need—and, I mean, I'm sure administrators push this in departments. Great, they should. And I think we as a faculty need to do what we can to try to lift the bottom as well. And so I think that's an important thing.

And that connects to a final point on faculty productivity. It's not enough for us to work hard. I think we also have to work smart in the sense of making sure that our work results in important, significant outputs. I think

this is an issue in two ways—one with research, and I've said this before, and quite frankly now I'm hearing other people agree with me. There's an awful lot of research that's done here and elsewhere that doesn't result in important outputs. It results in papers published in journals that few if anybody reads. And my sense is that society is not going to be much longer willing to pay for that. What they're willing to pay for is research that is valuable, either economically, culturally, theoretically, intellectually, whatever, but it has an impact, and we're not willing to kind of—or we shouldn't be asking society to fund us to do papers just for the sake of publishing. So I think we need to kind of, for ourselves and for our colleagues, try to raise the standards there of what is significant research. And then on the other side, in the terms of service—and I think you've probably seen this as well—lots of our colleagues don't do service, or when they do it's basically sitting on a committee and not doing anything. I think we need to raise the bar, too. We need to make service contributions meaningful and significant. So, I'm hoping that we can do those kinds of things

I agree with the insistence by faculty leaders on shared governance, and what I've seen of President **Ruud** is that he's totally on board with that. This is not a President who, you know, has problems with shared governance. But I feel that shared governance implies shared responsibility. And if we want to be at the table in running this University, governance of this University, we also have to be at the table in taking responsibility for leading this University, for doing things to make it better. So, in my view, and again, you know, this is important only because I'm Chair of the Senate, the Senate should be the leadership arm of the faculty, that itself should be intent on making this University as good as it can be. I believe that the Senate, as a normal course of its business, should be undertaking projects and initiatives, on its own and in collaboration with the administration, to make UNI a better place. We shouldn't just wait for, you know, things to bubble up as moves or motions on the website, etc. We should be actively looking for things we can do to make UNI better. We should do this because we're facing a more challenging competitive environment as a university, and we've got to up our game to succeed, but we should also do it simply because that's part of our professional responsibilities. I know there will be disagreements on what can be done to make this University better, but I hope that there will be broad

agreement among you all that that is part of our role and that we should attempt in whatever way we can to make this University a better place.

Finally, a couple of words, and these are almost in some cases like apologies, relating to my personal style and approach to serving as your chair.

Some of you may have noticed I have a very informal personal style, and that's maybe not so good for this position because it tends to be lots of rules and procedures and Robert's Rules of Order. I understand the importance of the rules, and I will follow them as well as I can. I will rely on the expertise of some of my colleagues here—Scott [Senator **Peters**], Jesse [Senator **Swan**] know this stuff—to help get us through the, you know, procedural morasses as they arise. But my bottom line is to get things done, and hopefully we can do that efficiently, and I know that the point of procedural rules are to ensure that we've got a process that's comprehensive, open, and fair to all parties, and I will make every effort to make sure that that happens, that our process is like that.

Another part of my informality bias is a tendency to use first names. I just said, "Scott." I should have said "Senator **Peters**." I said, "Jesse." I should have said, "Senator **Swan**." I'll probably often use first names, and going along with that, I've got another problem. The first sign of creeping senility in my brain is difficulty in remembering names. I mean, I can remember who was the Milwaukee Braves first baseman in 1957, but I might not remember the name of a colleague that I work with every day. So please forgive me if I forget your name. It isn't that I think you are insignificant. It's just that my brain doesn't always function good with names. [Light laughter around.] Yeah, those things help, Kim [Senator **MacLin** holds up her name tent.]

Another aspect of my informal personal style, and some of you may have noticed this at times, I sometimes use "salty" language. I was pretty good last year, in part because I didn't say a lot. But those of you who were here 4 or 5 years ago, there were times when I would be talking and, you know, this stuff comes out. Happily at that time 4 years ago we weren't doing verbatim transcripts [laughter around], and they didn't get into the thing. That kind of saved me. But now we do verbatim transcripts, and being the Chair, I'm probably going to be talking and some words are going to come

out. I apologize for it. I am wondering how Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] is going to show them up in the transcript. I expect you are going to be seeing some s**t kinds of things in there. We all know what that's referring to [more laughter] Again, I apologize for that. I'm sorry. I sometimes think I've got a filter that cleans it up, but sometimes it doesn't work.

I'm not much of a meeter and greeter type. And, I mean, most of us are kind of introspective as academics, and I'm probably more than others and less socially developed, and I'm not great with social niceties. I mean, I notice, for instance, that when we have a student present, afterwards there's all sorts of gushing praise. I don't do gushing praise very well. [laughter around] And so you're welcome to fill in for me, if I'm not giving enough. We'll have visitors, consultations with people, and gotta say "thank you," and I might remember that. But if I don't, feel free, again, to fill in for my social inadequacies. I do not take that personally at all.

And finally, as some of you know, I have strong feelings about certain topics and issues. Being the Chair denies me a vote, except to resolve a tie, but I am still a member of the Senate and allowed to kind of express my views and present my 2 cents on it. I feel comfortable that I can do that without biasing my treatment or my handling of the process. And that's—you hold me accountable for this. I want to manage the process so everybody gets a fair hearing. My personal view should not bias the treatment. If you feel that's happening, let me know. I'll either correct, or we'll let Tim [Vice-Chair **Kidd**] take over while I've stepped aside and, you know, get into it. But I don't think this will be problematic, but you can expect me to kind of weigh in with my views. I appreciate the fact that you're not going to be influenced by my views simply because I'm the Chair. You'll only be influenced if I make good arguments. And that's the way it should be.

So to conclude, I didn't ask for this position. Two years ago, when it was—we needn't say "offered to me"-- I suspect I was asked to serve as the Senate Chair or Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect because other people who were better qualified resisted more adamantly. [laughter around] I simply wasn't as strong in saying "No" as other people were, and so I ended up doing it. But I am here. I'll do the best job I can, and I'm hoping that with your help we'll have a productive year of service to the faculty and to this University.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: That said. We can get on to some business, the first item of which is approval of the Minutes from our June summer session, June 24, 2013. Those Minutes were distributed to you in draft form by Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist]. Are there any additional corrections or discussion of the Minutes as distributed? [none heard] Then could I have a motion to approve the Minutes?

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Thank you, Chris, Senator **Edginton**. And a second for that? Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. All in favor of approving the Minutes say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Any opposition, "No." [none heard] Minutes are approved.

Smith: Next we go to the Calendar Items for Docketing. Yes, Steve [Senator **O'Kane**].

O'Kane: Yes, Jerry [Chair **Smith**], I wanted to ask if there is an opportunity to have comments about your comments?

Smith: Yes, that's a good point. And let's do that. You've got the opportunity right now.

O'Kane: Oh, I've got to pull one out? [laughter all around] Ok. Ok, I'll pull one out. I like you mentioning service, that we should really be looking for—if I remember right—meaningful and something like "meaningful and fulfilling service." And boy, could I not agree more. However, I hope that you and everyone realize that I think that that service should be recognized and recognized not just on the pat on the back "Atta, boy," way, but for instance that it might factor in one's annual evaluation or merit raise or even perhaps more importantly teaching load. There have been instances where people have been extraordinarily good at providing extremely useful and meaningful service, but because of that perhaps don't publish as often.

And those people have been—had increased teaching loads. This doesn't seem fair.

Smith: That's a good point. Yeah, thank you, Steve [Senator **O'Kane**]. Anybody else? Chris [Senator **Edginton**].

Edginton: First, I think it was Joe Adcock who [several voices and laughter overlapping regarding the Milwaukee Braves first baseman in 1957 reference by Chair **Smith**, who agreed] I wanted to make a comment about the nature of a comprehensive university, because I think that definition has got to be made at this institution, and the President has made a point of saying "We are THE comprehensive institution for the State of Iowa" or maybe the region or maybe the nation, who knows? I think there's a real need for us to look very carefully at what the mission of a comprehensive university ought to be and how it ought to be defined in the context our role here in the State of Iowa. I have often heard the comment that we ought to be the State's Public Liberal Arts Institution, and I don't think that's the—I don't want to say, "I don't think it's important to have a strong liberal arts program," but I think it's equally important to have very strong professional education programs, that those two elements complement one another, and that's what makes us a comprehensive university. So I would like to see a, you know, a more in-depth conversation around what constitutes a definition of a comprehensive institution, and I'd like to bring the President back in here to get his perception. I'd like to have the Provost's perception of that also.

Smith: And I think when we have an opportunity we'll get back to that down the road. Thank you. Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yes, thank you, Jerry [Chair **Smith**]. Now, you were supposed to offer comments, not a speech. [light laughter around] But anyway, I appreciated most of what you said. I think we certainly do need a dialogue on this campus on how to improve _____, and I will support any efforts that you take in that direction. I mean, in the direction of the dialogue, not in the direction of _____ [laughter all around].

Smith: Anyone else? Yes, Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Just so I—if—I didn't want to interrupt that discussion since I have a procedural question for you, Mr. Chair. So, first, thank you for agreeing to the service, because this is very important service, service that you've indicated people do resist vehemently taking on, but it is very important, and I do mean an earnest thank you for agreeing to do it. So, as we move through the business, every Chair does it differently, and that's why I asked because this is the first meeting. When we come now to Calendar, and I'm thinking about our Bylaws Article 7.7, there are many normal suggested motions to make in relationship to these items. The practice in the past, recent past, has been to ignore all of those, and mostly just docket everything, and then discuss everything once it's docketed. And so I'm curious if that's your preferred method to proceed as well, or to try to engage our Bylaws this year, in this case 7.7, and exercise the letter and spirit of those provisions?

Smith: And how would that change things? How do you see things changing?

Swan: In practical terms, it would be most discussion and debate would happen at the Calendar stage.

Smith: So we would, on these items, Calendar Items for Docketing, we would be discussing it now?

Swan: In order to determine which of the suggested motions to make, would we suggest after debating it to send it back to the submitted or, "Oh, we've debated it, we've got the information, it's ready to go as docketed"? That's the first one, and then in 2 weeks just pass it without much debate, unless the faculty-at-large found problems that we didn't find in the first discussion. Again, we haven't been doing that? We have just been ignoring 7.7 and moving directly to the docketing stage and having all discussion there leading to rejection sometimes of proposals that might have been approved had they been dealt with as the Bylaws might well be seen to envision.

Smith: Again, even when I look at Robert's Rules of Order, I don't see a lot of the docketing thing even talked about there. But my personal

understanding of the docket, the point of docketing, was to kind of set it up and let the general faculty know “Here’s what’s coming down, and if you’re interested, that’s what’s going to be discussed at the meeting.” So, it gives that 2-week time period to kind of get engaged. But what, if I understand you correctly, Jesse [Senator **Swan**], what you’re suggesting is that at the docketing stage we could also use that as a way of making sure that this particular item is ready to be acted on, and if it isn’t, send it back, get more information. We should maybe be more evaluative at the Docketing stage.

Swan: At the Calendar stage.

Smith: I’m sorry, at the Calendar stage.

Swan: As our Bylaws provide.

Smith: And that sounds to me like a good thing to do so that, as you’d suggest, that we don’t docket items and then when we take them up, we say, “Oh, gee, we wish we had more information on this.” We’d take care of that at the front end.

Swan: And that’s one of the suggested motions in our Bylaws at the Calendar stage, to request more information before we go on to docket it. In the past, we’ve been docketing it and then say we don’t have enough information, we reject it, and then demand a new submission with a new Calendar Item with the further information.

Smith: Ok. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: Just so everybody knows what we’re talking here, that section of the Bylaws specify that the Senate has several options when faced with a motion for a Calendar Item for docketing. You can basically docket it in regular order or out of regular order in various forms. You can refer to a standing committee or an administrative officer or an ad hoc committee. Then, or, and these are what Senator **Swan**’s talking about, you can return to the petitioner with a request for a more specific proposal; you can return to the petitioner with a request for additional information; or you can return to the petitioner because of a decision simply because that it’s—you choose not to docket it at this time.

Swan: Or (10) some other procedural process. [simultaneous words from Senator **Peters** unclear] So there are 10 suggested motions, or 9 suggested motions and a 10th that covers any procedure, such as tabling it.

Smith: So, would we be honoring the spirit of your suggestion

Peters: I still have the floor in regards to this.

Smith: I'm sorry.

Peters: Thank you. So, as Chair, what got tricky about this for me was the point at which discussion about whether to docket something became a discussion about whether to pass something, right? So what is—that's the tricky part. And I don't know what the right answer is there. You—most of you were here last year. You know the way I handled it. I preferred to docket it. But certainly at any time something is brought up for docketing someone can say, "You know what? I don't think there's enough information here. And I would argue that in order for us to even act on this we need this specific information from the petitioner." Or—now we do refer things to committees with some frequency, but it strikes me that that's one of our jobs, everyone around the table. It's not only the Chair's job. It's everyone-around-the-table's job to look at the petition as it comes in and say, "Does it look like there's enough stuff for us to even debate it?" And if there's not, then we ask for more information

Smith: And would it satisfy the spirit of your suggestion, Jesse [Senator **Swan**], if we, in fact, collectively, and me, in particular, would be more evaluative of items as they come up for docketing and perhaps suggest "Send this back."? Would that?

Swan: I think so, yes. But also then the people who make the proposal should be here Calendar stage because sometimes it could be just a simple answer to a relatively simple question that clarified, "Oh, we can pass this in 2 weeks," or "It looks like it can't be." Whereas if I don't have that answer, I have to wait until it's docketed, and then get the answer to "Oh, well, that's not a good enough answer."

Smith: So, if we get something that I think is kind of troublesome, I might advise the person to come here at the Calendar stage to be able to answer those questions. Susan **Hill** was actually here before, and I said, “Oh, no big deal, because this is going to be docketed.”

Swan: I do actually have a question about that proposal.

Smith: [overlapping **Swan**] That’s right. That’s right, so if I could do it over again, I would say, “Yes, stay around, because there might be some questions.”

Swan: But the practice has been not to be here until it’s in the Docket, and that’s why I don’t want to certainly hold that up even though I do have a significant question about that.

Smith: Scott [Senator **Peters**], do you have something else?

Peters: I was just going to add very briefly that just as you may make a recommendation to us to docket it in regular order, you could also make a recommendation to us that “I think this lacks information, and here’s what I think we should do with it” or whatever.

Smith: Yeah. Yeah.

Swan: That’s a very good point.

Smith: Yeah. Jeff [Senator **Funderburk**]?

Funderburk: Ok. From a practical standpoint, 2 years ago I think I was doing the same as Scott [then Chair and Chair **Peters** last year], continually docketing, because one of the problems is actually sometimes the late nature of when you get the information for asking for a docketing. And, if we stayed at a 2-week schedule, it can push things back pretty far, or if we need to wait to get everything so we can talk about it already Calendar. I’m not opposed to it. I’m just saying, if so, then we’re going to have to push people submitting petitions have all the information ready in a timely fashion so everybody in this room can read it before Calendar time,

because I'm not always convinced that Senators in the past had everything read at Calendar.

Smith: So there may be issues that have an urgency, and I think we're going to have some, actually, some time urgency, where while it would be nice to make sure that at the Calendar stage we got everything, we're just going to have to kind of run it through and hope we get that in time.

Swan: That would be the exception, yeah.

Smith: Jesse [Senator **Swan**], thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1194 Request for Emeritus Status, Glenn T. **Nelson**

Smith: Then we've got some calendar items for docketing, starting with Calendar Item 1194 which would be docketed as 1089 [sic, 1090], a request for emeritus status for Glenn T. **Nelson**. I would appreciate a motion to docket this in regular order.

Kirmani: I move.

Smith: Senator **Kirmani**. Do we have a second? Senator **Terlip** [who indicated]. Any discussion? All in favor say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Motion carries.

Calendar Item 1195 Request for Emeritus Status, Thomas M. **Barry**

Smith: Calendar Item 1195 which will be docket number 1190 [sic, 1091] a request for emeritus status for Thomas M. **Barry**. I would like a motion to docket this, again in regular order. Senator **Nelson** [who indicated]. A second? Senator **Peters** [who indicated]. Any discussion? All in favor please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard]

Calendar Item 1196 Request for Emeritus Status, Kevin C. O’Kane

Smith: And Calendar Item number 1196 for docket number 1191 [sic 1092] request for emeritus status for Kevin C. **O’Kane**.

O’Kane [Steven, Senator]: So move. Gotta do it. [laughter all around]

Smith: Move to docket in regular order? I thought you’d want to do that [more light laughter around]. Do we have a second? Second by Senator **Kirmani**. Any discussion? All in favor say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] That, too, is done.

Smith: Calendar Item 1197 for docket number 1192 [sic 1093].

O’Kane: Mr. Chairman (?), point of order.

Smith: Yes.

O’Kane: Going back to what Jesse [Senator **Swan**] had said earlier. If I recall—I was on the Senate several years back—it would have been today that somebody would’ve said something edifying about these people. Is that correct?

Swan: And then next time we would just approve it.

O’Kane: Yes.

Swan: That’s right.

Smith: Would you actually prefer it that way? I mean

Swan: Well, it doesn’t mean—but for these things we could do it in the docket, too. But, no, you’re right. That would be the point.

Smith: I see.

Swan: Because we might want to choose to send it to a committee. I mean, if there’s a problem case with an emeritus faculty, we might not

want to—or we might want some more justification. And that has happened. Many years ago that did happen.

Smith: I kind of liked having some space on these so that I can give the Department Heads a chance to come up with a statement. And, you know, I've done that now, and they have 2 weeks to do that, so it's nice to have the 2-week space for these. Typically, we don't have much controversy with these, so....

Calendar Item 1197 Academic Affairs Representative on the Advisory Committee for the Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Smith: The next one is 1197 which would be docketed as 11—now, I'm all screwed up here—1092 [sic, 1093], yeah. Academic Affairs representative on the Advisory Committee for the Center of Excellence in Teaching and Learning. This is put forward by Susan **Hill** who was recently appointed Director of the Center. She's asking that the ex-officio Academic Affairs rep. on the Advisory Committee be the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, which would be Nancy **Lippins** [here today], in lieu of the current rep. who is the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, Mike [**Licari**, also here]. And, you know, you'll—if you see anything—and Susan [**Hill**] will be here next week to talk about it, but the basic argument is she basically feels this comes under Nancy's purview more than under Mike's. So, again, I'd like a motion to docket this in regular order.

Male Senator: So move.

Smith: Moved. Second? David? [who indicated] Senator **Hakes**. Any discussion of this? Senator.

Swan: And so just to register it so that the proposer can know when she comes back next time, it seems to me that teaching and learning are academic matters and that Academic Affairs is the appropriate place for Academic Affairs representation, so I want more information about why Faculty Affairs contract matters benefits us. Or I should say why that's a better place for academic representation in teaching and learning. I don't see it, so I want—I need to see it much more. Also, in her proposal she writes that it's just because she, in her administrative position,

administratively reports, or for the job, reports to the Faculty Affairs Associate Provost. That's something different from an academic advice on how best to teach and how best to encourage learning. So, the rationale that's provided in the proposal isn't persuasive to me, and so I want to understand more. And secondly, the person you report to necessarily, I don't see why administratively report to, why that's valuable to have that person making administrative decisions about your performance on an advisory academic teaching/learning advisory committee, especially replacing Academic Affairs representation. And then lastly just a matter of function, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, I may be wrong about this, but it's typically can appoint a representative, a deputy for him or her, in this case him, he could appoint the person of the Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs for the present time. That may not be possible. Maybe it does have to be Academic Affairs Associate Provost because the proposer does write some need to say "or his or her appointee." So those are the points that they're now in the Minutes. We could communicate that to Director **Hill**, and maybe she'll be able to direct those for next time.

Smith: Very good. I'll make a point of transmitting those to her and bringing her attention to the Minutes. Any other comments on this? So, it's been moved and seconded to docket this in regular order. Any more discussion? All in favor say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] It is docketed.

Calendar Item 1198 Review Performance and Elect Members to Senate Budget Committee

Smith: And finally calendar item 1198 for docket number 1093 [sic, 1094], a petition to review the performance of and elect members to the Senate Budget Committee. Now, some background on this, we're going to be talking about some other committee appointments down the road, but this one stood out in part because last year it was treated as a Calendar Item and docketed and had that full procedure, and I wanted to do the same procedure here. We've got—we need to reappoint somebody who is a faculty representative. We've got faculty representatives—this Committee; we just set this up—whose term has expired and that person actually has agreed to be reappointed, but we also need a representative for this

Committee from the Senate. We have the Senate appoint—representative on this Committee whose term has expired and who does not wish to be reappointed, so we do have to have another Senate appointee here. And also because with this Committee I've heard from various places some concerns about the functioning of the Committee, it's role. There has— with the change in Administration arguably a new President who is very transparent, I think there's some value in us kind of thinking about the role of this Committee and having it think about that. So I was—I put this on—as a Calendar Item for docketing because I wanted to give some special attention to this.

O'Kane: Does the Senate member have to be appointed? Or can we appoint someone outside?

Smith: We appoint the Senate member.

O'Kane: It must be a Senator?

Smith: Yes.

Swan: It does have to be a sitting Senator? We can't appoint a faculty member at large? That's the question.

Smith: It has been a sitting Senator, and let me see if I can find [searching papers]

Peters: I think the language is—sorry.

Smith: Oh, no. Please do.

Peters: I think the language is “from among the Senators,” but I don't have a computer with me, and I'm not sure I can find a hard copy.

Terlip: My recollection is that they were on the Senate to—because we need a liaison to the Committee, so that was the most expedient. (?) But

Smith: Here's the language, “The committee shall consist of 4 members elected by the Senate after a campus-wide solicitation of nominees, and 1

member appointed by the Senate Chair. Members shall serve rotating 3-year terms.” Now, I think there is a real advantage to us to have the appointed member be from the Senate, and that’s what we’ve done most recently. So I would hope—I guess I get to appoint somebody, but I’m going to appoint based on your input and advice, but I hope we’d have somebody who would volunteer to serve from the Senate, and that would be the person that I would appoint to it. Chris [Senator **Edginton**].

Edginton: I want to make a couple of comments to that. Assuming that our next Senate meeting is September the 9th,

Smith: Yes.

Edginton: then I won’t be here.

Smith: Oh, ok.

Edginton: And I was the Senate member on the Budget Committee, and Jerry [Chair **Smith**] called me and asked me whether I wanted to be reappointed, I said “No.” And the reason was is because the Committee was very dysfunctional. And it did not meet except for the first time when I called the group together and we elected a Chair, and then beyond that we had a number of defections, individuals resigned. We had no—the information that was presented to the Senate last year was not a product of Committee work. It was the product of, you know, one individual’s recommendations that came forward. So, I think Jerry [Chair **Smith**]’s right. I think we have to look at this Committee very carefully to determine the function and scope, the charge of that group, to make sure that they’re wired into the process. I mean, we—you know, the Provost has already made recommendations, and the Faculty Senate has not had an opportunity to be involved in that process. So, other than Jerry [Chair **Smith**] and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] and others’ activities. So, I mean, somehow that process needs to be looked at very carefully, and the mission of that Committee needs to be looked at, because it was just a very dysfunctional group.

Smith: Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**].

Funderburk: I want to follow-up with Senator **Edginton**. That has been the history of that group—those of you who are here for a while—because that was the scenario that was going on in our previous Budget Committee. So part of the reason for the appointment by the Chair was to have somebody directly in this room to find out what’s happening on the Committee, so we can learn whether or not the Committee report was a product of a single person or not. So I would encourage if we can at least—if we choose to continue this, it will be a Senator so somebody’s in the room that during meetings we can ask what’s going on.

Smith: Should we then—Senator **Swan**.

Swan: And so I read your submission online and listened to you here. It sounds as if you—and this sounds like a good idea to me—want us to consult amongst ourselves about this in something, in a quasi-committee of the whole. And so I could make a motion that we make that at the September 9th meeting for 20 minutes. We, as a quasi-committee of the whole, we would then share that part. We would just act as a committee, and any proposal we made, that would go to calendaring to then be docketed and passed. We would act as a committee. And that’s the way we could talk about anything, as a committee of the whole, is that it sounds like you want this Body to talk about the Budget Committee.

Smith: I do, and I’m wondering, do we have to go into a quasi-committee of the whole in order to talk about things? Could we just talk about them in the way we’re talking about them now?

Swan: I guess in New Business, yeah that maybe.

Smith: But we have got it as a Docket—as an Item. If we bring this up next meeting as, you know, ok, now it’s a Docket Item to be considered, what you’re suggesting is to really talk about it, then we should go to quasi-committee of the whole to do that.

Swan: And the reason that—as the benefit of that, right, is that we work things out, and then instead of just passing it immediately, we then publicize it to our colleagues as this is now what we’re going to pass in probably 4 weeks.

Smith: See, what in 2 weeks we could still appoint or, you know, new members to the Committee. We could take care of that part. But the actual discussion then kind of if we were to recharge it, we should maybe treat that as a separate item and break that out.

Swan: I'm glad you mentioned that, because I think that is the 2 things. We probably should appoint, elect and appoint now, in New Business or in Continuing Business or something, but this other stuff that we don't know anything about, we need to discuss.

Edginton: We talk about reappointing individuals to this Committee. I think I need to share with you those people who were active and those people who were not, because if you're making a decision about reappointing a person from a College who never showed up for a meeting or came to one meeting, it seems to me that person's participation is called into question. And I think you need to be very careful about that. So, you know, I don't think you should reappoint today. I mean, there's

Smith: No, we won't reappoint today.

Edginton: There's a need for further conversation and discussion.

Smith: Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: I just want to make you aware that any Budget discussion you make, this Committee may be considering two or three Budgets at the same time. In other words, what we just turned in was the—was our RFY 15 appropriation request, right? We won't know anything about that request until, of course, the Legislature meets, and then they make a decision. So, out of our request, the Legislature, let's say they give us all of that money, then decisions---so that Committee, I can envision that Committee meeting again to decide, "Ok, well, this is really what we're going to do with some of those dollars." Or if the Legislature doesn't give us all of that money, that Committee would need to have those discussions as well. But then at the same time, we've got to jump ahead and start thinking about FY 16, during FY 14, you see? So there's a lot going on, and I don't think we've ever sort of caught up with where we are so that we're

thinking about this year's Budget, the next year's Budget, and even the following year's Budget. So there's a lot for the Budget Committee to do. Thank you.

Smith: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I was really echoing what Senator **Edginton** said. If we're thinking in any way, shape, or form about changing expectations for the Committee or what they're going to be doing, then I think we need to have that discussion first, and then put out a call for nominations or whatever we need to do, because somebody may not want to do it, if we change what the Committee is. So

Smith: So, then we're a bit ahead of ourselves in the sense that I haven't had a motion to docket this in regular order.

Swan: Well, can I—can I—but that's what we're doing, you see? That's what we're discussing, to decide what's the best motion for the proposal in the Calendar. We might say, "Get it out of the Calendar," and move to get it out of the Calendar.

Smith: Good point.

Swan: That's what we're doing; we're discussing it to figure it out.

Smith: Scott [Chair **Peters**].

Peters: I might suggest that we move to divide the question and that we move to, following Senator **Swan**'s suggestion, we move to review the performance of the Senate Budget Committee in committee of the whole. I'm not sure about the time constraint so just—maybe just leave it open in terms of time to consider. Move to discuss it in committee of the whole. And then perhaps for the moment table the election of members, so if people are amenable to that, I can make those motions. [heads nod] Ok, so I move to divide the Calendar Item 1198 into two separate motions, the first being to review the performance of the Senate Budget Committee, and the second being to elect members to the Senate Budget Committee.

Terlip: Second.

Swan: And was part of the review to do that in a quasi-committee of the whole? You had indicated

Peters: Sorry, yes. In quasi-committee of the whole, yes, thank you.

Smith: It has been moved and seconded to review the performance of the Senate Budget Committee in quasi-committee of the whole is one action or activity, and on the other to elect new members of that Committee. Moved and seconded. Any discussion? Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Can that conversation be deferred until I'm here?

Swan: Yes, by putting a time on it. So right now it's docketed in regular order, and now we could change that to docketed

Terlip: Well, right now we're just voting on dividing the question. We are not

Swan: On just dividing the question, you're right, Laura [Senator **Terlip**]. That's true.

Smith: Would you [to Senator **Edginton**] be here the meeting after next?

Edginton: No. [laughter all around]

Swan: He'll be here again in the spring. [more laughter]

Edginton: Well, unfortunately, I'm just gone for a day. It just happens to be that Monday of the 9th, back on the 10th.

Smith: Perhaps we can talk, and I can kind of convey what you're saying.

Edginton: [agreeing during **Smith's** turn at talk] Yeah, I'm willing to provide something in writing, you know, to the Senate, but I'd rather have that conversation with you. We had a little _____.

Smith: Is that comfortable to people? And any more discussion of our move to divide? Then all in favor of dividing the question again into 2 parts: one having to do with the performance review of this Committee and the other having to deal with potentially electing new members of the Committee—all in favor say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] That’s passed. I’m going to have to think about how I’m going to deal with that. [light laughter around]

O’Kane: I think I just voted for the second committee being to not nominate the people to be on the committee. Is that correct?

Smith: There will be a—my understanding is we will end up with a Calendar Item or a docketed item that is going to then address those nominations that will be.

O’Kane: Because it seems to me that the charge or mission of that really needs to be clarified, I think.

Smith: Yeah, and that—what I would propose to do is this—do this review and discussion first and then add membership as Senator **Terlip** pointed out. We’ve got to get—make sure that we don’t put people on unless they know what it’s going to be all about. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I move to docket the first motion, the review of the performance of the Senate Budget Committee in committee of the whole. I move to docket that in regular order.

Smith: Ok, move. Do we have a second?

Terlip: Second.

Swan: Could you repeat? I’m sorry.

Smith: Senator **Peters** to docket the review of the performance of this Committee in regular order [several voices adding “in committee of the whole”], and to address that in the committee of the whole.

Swan: And not at the head of the docket? [several voices “in regular order”]. In regular order, ok.

Smith: That was seconded. Any discussion?

Edginton: Well, I’ve just checked the calendar. I’ll be here on the 23rd, so if you can defer it one meeting, ok?, which would take it out of regular order, then I can be here.

Smith: Senator **Peters**, would you be comfortable with that?

Peters: That’s fine with me at this time.

Swan: Is it fine with you in our timeline?

Smith: It’s fine with me. I don’t have anything else. We are going to have some other things coming up that we’ll be talking about down the road, but I don’t know at this point that we’ve got things set for that meeting that would give us scheduling problems, so I’m comfortable holding off on that until then at this point.

Funderburk: Can I? Just an issue of mechanics. You know, we’ve been working a lot for 2 or 3 years to try to straighten out committees, and I’m not opposed to doing this at all, but it just strikes me that it would be appropriate to perhaps go ahead and get the people in place on the Committee and then to have a discussion. If we wait a whole month to discuss this Committee, and we still haven’t started elections, before you know it, the semester is gone and the Committee has been shorthanded by 2. And I think that’s probably looking back how some of our committees have fallen apart through the years this way. So I would only ask everybody to think about that. If—I mean, right now it’s a standing committee that has a set of procedures, and they need two members. It would strike me appropriately to put the members in place, and then, if the Senate chooses to reconsider the existence of that Committee, that’s a separate topic. I’m just throwing this out there. As we’re starting to look at this timeline, it’s getting further and further out there.

Smith: I understand that, but I quite frankly suspect that this Committee is unlikely to meet and do much over the next month in any event. That's just

Funderburk: Which is sad. (?)

Peters: On the point where the second motion coming up of electing the Budget Committee members and so someone could move to docket that motion in regular order.

Smith: Yes.

Terlip: And do it next week.

Smith: But I've got to finish up this one that's on

Peters: Right.

Swan: So, what's before us is to put it on the 26th [voices clarifying 23rd] in regular—well, it's not regular order.

Smith: I've been thinking maybe, yes, now to move it now to the 26th. Are you comfortable with that Senator **Peters**. [voices again clarifying 23rd]

Peters: The 23rd, I think, is the date. Yes.

Smith: Yes, the 2nd meeting in September. So, and our second is comfortable with that, so it's moved to and seconded to docket this important consideration by the Senate on the 23rd of September, our second September meeting. Any further discussion of that? All in favor say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Now, back to the second motion that—part of the divided question had to do with the election of members to this Committee. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I will move to docket that in regular order.

Smith: Do we have a second for that?

Peters: And then I'll explain why, if there is a second.

Swan: Well, I'll second it.

Peters: We can have a quick discussion here about Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**]'s point about whether we want to even try to get that Committee to meet. If the motion fails, it doesn't get docketed, and we can always put it back on the calendar later, if we want to.

Swan: So, even though I seconded it, I have a question. If regular order means it—when is it going to come up?

Smith: It would come up at our next meeting.

Peters: It means it would come up at the next meeting, so pursuant like

Swan: Like right away, or...? At the head of the docket?

Smith: Well, it will be following the 4 other things that we've covered which are pretty quick.

Swan: Oh, ok. So these are the only things that are going to be on the docket, right?

Smith: Unless something else comes up.

Swan: And you don't anticipate more New Business? All right, then like that. Ok. So we should be able to get to it, ok

Peters: So this way if—Chair **Funderburk**'s point about the Committee having people in place for the Committee and people identified for the Committee early on, we could do that if we docket it in regular order. If there is a decision to defer the questions about the personnel of the Committee until after the Senate has made some decisions about the structure of the Committee, then just vote "no" on this and the motion to docket it fails. We can always put it back on the calendar, reappointing people pursuant to our discussion on the 23rd.

Smith: Well, am I correct in saying that if we brought it up at docket in regular order—we brought it up, and we decided to defer, we could simply table the vote on the membership until we've resolved the issues of Committee structure, etc.? But there are ways of dealing with it. So, any other discussion of the motion then to docket the election of new members of this Committee in regular order?

Edginton: I just think you're taking the cart before the horse if you vote "yes" to docket this item in terms of the election of new members to the Committee, because if we're going to restructure the Committee, we need to be able to tell those individuals what their charge is going to be, what the function of the Committee is going to be. So, I think that we should vote it down.

Smith: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, we may not restructure the Committee. It may have been a matter of functioning, and so our debate/discussions/deliberation might discover that the structure is fine, just something about the functioning last year, you know, can change, and the 2 new members that we elect actually might contribute to the improvement of the functioning of it, if we would discover that. The second point—but first I have a question. So, we have to elect one person and you have to appoint one person, is that right?

Smith: Yes.

Swan: So, I think there's distribution—or no, maybe there's not—of who the person is we need to elect, that it doesn't need to come from a specific College.

Smith: That's true.

Swan: Do we know which College needs to be solicited right now.

Peters: It actually—I'm sorry.

Smith: Yes, Scott [Senator **Peters**].

Peters: It actually does not need to come from a specific College.

Smith: Right.

Swan: It does not need to?

Peters: It does not. By chance, at the end of last—this is something that actually just didn't quite get done at the end of last year. I did solicit, and I sent—I forwarded Jerry [Chair **Smith**] the email where I solicited campus wide for volunteers to be appointed to the Senate Committee by the Senate—the Budget Committee by the Senate. I got no replies except for the one incumbent as it were, but then we get back to the types of things that Senator **Edginton** is raising about the functioning of the Committee last year. But he did indicate that he would be willing to serve again.

Smith: Yes, and I confirmed that as well.

Swan: So that means we have one person for the elected position.

Smith: Yes.

Swan: And so then the other one you want—you would appoint from amongst the Senators.

Smith: I would prefer to appoint from the Senate, yes.

Swan: And so if we pass this, we're saying that we're basically ready to do that, and so if we don't—if we want more people to run or something, then we're also saying "We're ready to go get the more people or that other person for us to vote for." I'm mentioning that because I don't think—I don't think I'm going to go out and get another person. I hate it (?), so I'm not sure that we—listening to Senator **Edginton**, I'm not sure we are ready to vote for it, even though it's my eat (?). But I agree with Chair **Funderburk** that it needs to be in place, and we do have someone who is going to be nominated. You can get one of us to be the Senator, probably, so we could do that business, right? So—but those are the issues, at least as I see them, and as I'm trying to weigh them.

Smith: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Based on what I'm hearing, it strikes me that the way to consider doing this might be for the Senate to vote to suspend the activities or suspend that Committee pending a discussion, which you could suspend it pending a discussion, so if it was going to come up for a discussion immediately following that as to whether or not we're going to select new members, I'd be worried about that. Ok, this is all registered, and because it just kind of, well, we just didn't appoint anybody, and we don't have it in the record why that Committee ran out of members all of a sudden, which is the case of at least one Committee I saw where everybody had aged out on the Senate and for some reason it'd never appointed anyone but couldn't find anything in the Minutes. So that might be another thing the Senate could consider is if you find these concerns that grate (?) for the Committee, then just suspend it pending a review.

Smith: I guess that would make more sense to me if I felt this Committee was going to be busy doing stuff unnecessarily. I don't think that's the case. This Committee won't be doing much, but they will be waiting maybe for instructions from us, which is kind of what happened last year, I thought. We kind of waited for Scott [then-Chair **Peters**] or somebody to say, "Hey, we now want you to do this." So, the motion—I'm sorry. Ok [to **Swan**].

Swan: Ok, but I was going to, if you recognized me, and so I was going to call the question.

Smith: Ok, so the motion as I understand it—I'm supposed to understand it [light laughter all around]—the motion on the table is to docket in regular order a proposal to elect new members to this Committee. And so we called the question, so we've got to vote on calling the question. All in favor of calling the question say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] So the question is called. And so now we're prepared to vote on the motion on the floor which is to docket in regular order this proposal to elect or appoint new members to this Committee. All in favor of docketing that in regular order, say, "Aye." [some ayes heard] Opposed, "No." [some no's heard] Let's try again, and this time raise hands. All in favor, raise your hand [Chair **Smith** counting aloud to 7] And all opposed?

[Chair **Smith** again counting aloud to 10] So the motion does not carry. So we have to consider then what to do with this. Should we—is the proposal then to docket it down the road? Table? To wait on the—Jesse [Senator **Swan**].

Swan: We could just let it go. We've handled it, and we are going to do a discussion of this Committee, unless someone does want to do something with this, then this would be the time for a motion, and that's what you were asking.

Smith: So what we can do is simply wait on appointing. We're not going to appoint anybody until we resolve what this Committee does and at that point then we'll bring up again the appointments. Are people generally comfortable with that? [heads nod] Ok. Good. That's what we'll do. Ok, so I think that takes care of our Calendar Items.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Now, the new business. We don't have anything on our Docket to handle right now at the start of the year, but we've got what? [looking at the time.] Fifteen stinking minutes to work on. [laughter all around and joking about that's what adjournment is for] So inefficient. A couple of points that I need to get through, and I'm not going to get to some of the things that I wanted to, but we can get through some of the things here.

I mentioned some of this in the preview email that I sent out, but there are a couple of other things that I neglected to mention, one of which has to do with college representation on the Senate. This was brought to our attention, actually Scott [Senator **Peters**]'s attention and mine in the Spring. As you know, each College gets a Senate rep. for every 30 members of the faculty, tenure/tenure-track faculty, and so at some point in time, we say, "How many members of the faculty are there?" That determines how many Senate reps and how many voting, you know, people are voted into position. Unfortunately we had a problem last year in which we, as a result of the count and changes in numbers of faculty, we actually elected 1 more Senate Senator than a particular College is authorized to have, and indeed, as it turns out that extra Senator is in the College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences. So, the way it was decided to deal with this was not to throw

somebody off [voices joking about this], but rather next Spring when it comes up again there are two—at least two—open positions, 2 terms that will expire next Spring, and there will be only one of those positions that will be made available. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I don't know, maybe Faculty Chair **Funderburk** might have this point, but if you'll look at it again, we've had more new hires, and it prob—I mean, you're supposed to, on that Committee, look at what's reasonable to expect, and so you should be able to see already right now with the new hires that it might be in balance. Perhaps not. Chair **Funderburk** has something to say.

Smith: [vocally agreeing throughout **Swan's** turn at talk]

Funderburk: Yes, I was about to say a similar thing because that's supposed to be based on the Fall Faculty Roster. The Fall Faculty Roster we've elected the right number of people. The Spring Faculty Roster it changed. [voices sorting out the possibility all is ok] So we're working on the Fall Faculty Roster now. I talked to Alisa [**Weeks** in the Provost's Office] about it last week, and we should—I think we've got a deadline of October 1 or something like that for having that finalized for the official.

Smith: Ok, so it may turn out to be a problem or may not. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: And Senators may also recall that it was further complicated by the fact that we didn't hold elections properly 2 Springs ago, and so we had to have special elections last Fall to expand the Senate consistent with that Constitutional Amendment, so that also further complicated the count, I think, in terms of what Fall semester you went off of, what number you used.

Smith: Ok. One more reminder. I think this is in our Bylaws, but Senators are asked/required/whatever to provide names of alternates. Some of you have done that. I just want to encourage you to do that.

And one issue that kind of came up and should the alternates be on our distribution list? Sherry [**Nuss**, Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant], yeah, I don't know. I mean, we've got the Senate ONLY list, which is only

Senators. And then we've got a larger list that includes administrators and others. My sense is that in the case, for instance, of Senator **Abebe** who's substituting for somebody—for Michael **Walter** who's going to be gone all semester—yeah, that should be on both lists. But in the case of an alternate who might sit in on a meeting now and then for somebody because you happen to be gone, I'm not sure that we would want that name on the distribution list. What do you think? [heads nodding] On board with that? [voices agreeing] Good.

And also the thing that I didn't talk about was our plans and preferences regarding consultations with faculty, administrators, and other parties who will be coming here. I neglected to mention that. We had a number of consultative sessions last year, most of which proved to be valuable, so I wanted to get some advice from the Senate kind of at the front end here so that I could start making arrangements for these consultative sessions. So who might we want to meet with, say, in the coming semester and, say, during the coming year? And a couple have already been suggested. For instance, it's been suggested that we have a consultative session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** regarding the continuous improvement legislation, an issue that's come up, and I'm sure some of you have heard about and particularly with its impacts on faculty. How do you feel about that? Are you onboard with that? [some nods and some vocal 'yes's] Ok, so we'll make arrangements for that, and I'll try to get that done as soon as possible. I just want to find a time when I'm sure that both can be here, and we'll get them onboard.

President **Ruud** has expressed his willingness to meet with the Senate—in fact, I'm sure he would like to. I think we would like to do that, maybe not next month, give it some time to get the enrollment numbers finalized, see further down how budget things go, but are you comfortable with meeting and having a consultative session with President **Ruud**, say, sometime in October or shortly thereafter? [nods and vocal agreement] On board with that? Any discussion?

And a third that has come up is the possibility of meeting with Bruce **Rastetter**, who is the President of the Board of Regents. When he was appointed President of the Board in June at the meeting in Iowa City, we talked with him, and he expressed an interest in meeting with faculty from

UNI. They are, of course, going to have the Regents' meeting here in September, which would be an opportune time, maybe not opportune for a visit at one of our normal meetings, but potentially we could have a special meeting of the Senate with President **Rastetter** and potentially other Regents. Would you be interested in doing that? Do you want me to try to set something up for the Senate to meet with Regents? [vocal 'yes's and nods] Ok, I'll work on that.

Then after that we get some other—and I should say, I know the last 2 years Scott [Senator **Peters**] and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] both have done an awful lot to kind of build the relationship between UNI's faculty and the Senate and the Regents, and it just wasn't done before, but it's really done now. You know, I'm sure I won't be as good as they are, but we'll try to keep some of that going, because I think it is valuable.

Some other possible consultations: I think we can make a case for having a consultative session with Deedee **Heisted**, the Director of the Liberal Arts Core. We normally do meet with her at various points. Should I get her onboard, say, sometime this semester for a consultative session. [nods and vocal agreement] Ok.

Any others that you would recommend? Senator **O'Kane**.

O'Kane: Is it possible to have some kind of legislative session?

Smith: So, a meeting with the Legislature.

O'Kane: Perhaps the people that represent us, this district?

Smith: I can check into it and see if we can get someone.

Peters: This would be a good year to do it, because it's not an election year.

Smith: To get who?

Peters: It would be a good year to do it because it's not an election year.

Smith: Just because it's not an election year, yeah.

Peters: But it has to be done in the Fall, because they'll be at the Capital starting in January.

Smith: Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: Thank you, Chair. Last year when we had the Athletic Director here, I thought he sidestepped the issue of concussions and how we're responding to them with football. And I would like to see him come back with a full report on numbers of concussions, what our athletic program is doing to protect football players, because that's all in the news. There's a new documentary about that come out. I think we should be ahead of the curve on this one. So, not just a general Athletic Director presentation. A presentation more specifically focused on that issue in football.

Smith: Would you want to restrict it to that issue, or just make that

Strauss: I'd want to restrict it to that issue.

Smith: Ok. How do the rest of you feel about that? Yes, Todd [Senator **Evans**].

Evans: Well, you know, that's not—I'm not sure Troy [Athletic Director **Dannen**] would be the expert to comment on that. I don't know if you'd want Don **Bishop**, the Athletic Trainer, to report on that? It might be more of a Sports Medicine issue.

Strauss: I'm sorry. Whatever team is required to come in with Troy [**Dannen**], I think would be appropriate.

Smith: And so then if we let him know that we want to talk about concussions and he should bring in whoever he thinks would be authoritative and help us evaluate.

Strauss: I think that's really good. That's what I would support, yeah.

Evans: And not just football, all of the sports, soccer, because it's prevalent in soccer as well.

Strauss: Women's soccer in particular, yeah. That's a good point. Anything having to do with major concussions that have to do with varsity sports and how we—what the rate of concussions are and how we recognize them, how we treat them. I thought that the Athletic Director kind of sidestepped and said, "Well, they—they all sign forms that releases the University." And I'm not sure that holds water anymore.

Smith: Ok. Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: When we had the consultation with President **Ruud** this summer, we talked about building a relationship across the campus with Intercollegiate Athletics, and he suggested that we hold one of our meetings, and if we are going to ask them to do a consultation, perhaps we should hold that Senate meeting over in the Alumni Suite in McLeod Arena. [voices commenting, unintelligible] It was the President's recommendation. [laughter around]

Kidd: I had another comment.

Smith: Yes, Senator [Vice-Chair] **Kidd**.

Kidd: I guess I'd also like to talk—if the Director is going to be here, I mean, obviously for concussions, maybe we could have a sports trainer, but if the Director's going to be here, I'd like to talk about the financial impact of the Athletic Program on the General Fund. I think it's an important consideration, and I know they've done some modeling of, you know, impacts of going to Division IA, impacts of going to Division II, Division III, and I'd like to see some updated information on that. So if he's going to be here, I'd like to talk about that.

Smith: So, do we generally agree we would like to meet with Director **Danner**, and a meeting that would focus in part on concussions but also be open to discussion of other issues—budgetary issues related to Athletics? And I can look into the possibility of holding that there. That might call for a special meeting, I'm not sure. But I can look into that possibility.

Kidd: Ok.

Smith: Any other suggestions about possible consultations? We're running out of time very quickly. The last thing I wanted to get through, and hopefully I can do it, is talking about our committees, and just run through.

We've got a number of incumbents who have agreed to serve another term, starting with the Senate Speaker Series Fund Committee, and our current representatives on that are Melinda **Boyd** and Tim **Kidd**, both of whom have agreed to serve another term. Any other objections or other nominees? [none heard] Then I can take it that they are approved by acclamation.

The Intercollegiate Academic Fund Committee, I'm not sure what it does, but Laura **Terlip** has agreed to serve another term. Is that a one-year term? [she nodded] Yeah. Any objections or other nominees to Laura on that? [none heard] I can take that as approved by acclamation.

The Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee, Senate Rep. on Faculty Committee in Advisory to the Intercollegiate Athletics Program, 3-year term, Forrest **Dolgener** is currently our representative and has agreed to serve another term. Any objections or other nominees there? [none heard] Then I will take that as approved by acclamation.

The Advisory Committee for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, we know what that does. Kim **MaLin** has agreed to serve another 3-year term. Any objections or other nominees for that Committee? [none heard] I will take that as approved by acclamation.

University Writing Committee reports to the Senate etc. etc., we've got a vacant position there. I don't know if we'd get—I presume we asked people, just never got somebody. We've got a position for appointment by the Senate. Is there anybody who would agree to serve on that Committee? I think it's important. I'll come back to this, and I'd like you to think about it. I'd have to see if we can go off the Senate to get somebody to serve for us, but I would like to have a Senator if we can get it, and we

apparently didn't last year, so that one, I guess, unless somebody jumps up is going to be kind of in limbo.

The Liberal Arts Core Committee oversees the LAC, meets twice a month, actually going to be more frequently for the next month or so. I've already gotten the thing. I am the incumbent on that. Of course, I'm not going to serve another term because of all this stuff, but happily we've had a volunteer to replace me and that being Senator **Swan**. Are there any add

Edginton: Is there an opportunity to nominate?

Smith: What's that?

Edginton: Is there an opportunity to nominate?

Smith: There is. Any objections or other nominees?

Edginton: Not that I object to Senator **Swan**, but I would like to nominate Todd **Evans** to serve on that Committee.

Smith: Ok, so we've got

Swan: I certainly would withdraw my volunteer, if Todd [Senator **Evans**] wants to do it. I would prefer that. I would be voting for him if we had an election.

Smith: Ok. Well, I'll take that then as allowing—basically now we have one nominee, which is Todd **Evans**. Any other nominees for that position then? [none heard] Any objections? [none heard] I'll take that as approved then, approving Todd **Evans** as our rep. on the Liberal Arts Core Committee by acclamation.

A couple of others—are you going to bug me if I go over here a couple of minutes? [none heard] Public Arts Committee, we've been asked by Steve **Carignan** to appoint a member of the faculty to serve a 3-year term on this Committee. Doesn't have to be a Senator. Can be a member of the faculty. Apparently, it doesn't—apparently, as Steve explained to me, there was a bit of history with this. Once upon a time Jerry **Soneson** served. He

dropped off. Steve would be happy to have him back, but we do need a member of the faculty. So if anybody wants to self-nominate or want to suggest somebody else. If not, I can talk to Jerry **Soneson** and see if he'd be willing to serve again, but if you've got ideas or suggestions of people that you know that would be willing, get them to me, and we'll get back to this. This will be Continuing Business for us.

The Student Conduct Committee. It is not the Academic Appeals Court.

Swan: I nominate Jenny **Cooley** [Senator] for Public Art.

Smith: Ok, Senator **Cooley**, are you comfortable with that?

Cooley: Sure.

Smith: Great. I will take that. Any objections to that? Then you've got it.

The Student Conduct Committee is not the Academic Appeals Court but a body that adjudicates student conduct hearings on cases that might involve suspension or expulsion, these kind of things. Board membership is very broad—student, staff, faculty—all of which are appointed by the President, but the Senate nominates 4 members. We've got 2 that are there. We've got 2 that we have to replace, and happily we have had a volunteer. Gretchen **Gould**, our new Senator from the Library, has agreed to serve on this Committee. Is there anybody else that would be willing to serve?

Strauss: Are you replacing me, because I've been on that Committee forever. [voices overlapping and indistinguishable mostly]

Smith: I'll have to look if you are one of the replacements or the people coming off.

Strauss: [more talk but overlapping]

Smith: Would you be willing to go back on if you're one of the people coming off? [agreeing but words hard to separate—several background voices] Ok, I'll check into that.

We've talked about the Senate Budget Committee, and we'll deal with that down the road. Are there any other items that we want to talk about? I didn't get to a bunch of stuff, but that's ok.

ADJOURNMENT (5:03 p.m.)

Smith: Are we comfortable moving to adjourn? [voices agreeing]

Edginton: So move.

Smith: We've got a move from—motion from Chris [Senator **Edginton**]. We got a second from

Hakes: Yes.

Smith: David [Senator **Hakes**]. All in favor, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] We're adjourned. Thank you.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next regular meeting:
September 9, 2013
Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows is 1 Addendum to these Minutes

FY 15 Goals from Provost **Gibson**

Enhance undergraduate education and student success

- Invest in currently successful programs (Communicative Disorders, Music, Special Education, all STEM areas, Health, Physical Education & Leisure Services, Accounting, Social Work, Mental Health Counseling, and Industrial Technology), some of which are already operating at capacity.
- Invest in new academic programs that meet Iowa's existing and emerging workforce needs.
- Upgrade outdated clinical and science laboratories.
- Integrate active learning through development of additional TILE (Transform, Interact, Learn, Engage) classrooms.
- Increase student retention and improve graduation rates by adding sections of the Cornerstone Course.
- Enhance academic support services for veterans.
- Strengthen Community College partnerships to improve program alignment and seamless transfer.
- Implement best practices for assessment of learning outcomes using the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning.
- Fully implement a Learning Commons and a Digital Media Commons in the library.
- Expand student and faculty involvement in community-connected learning and research activity that improves student learning and meets community needs.
- Expand the scope of faculty and student research, scholarship and creative activity .