

Regular Meeting  
**UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**09/10/12 (3:30 p.m. – 4:35 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. #1719**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called to order with a quorum at 3:30 p.m.

Call for press identification revealed Blake **Findley** present for the *Northern lowan*.

Provost **Gibson** offered comments regarding the status of the Presidential Search Committee formation and also named her selection of members for the Committee for Revising the Job Description for the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs which has been given its charge and will complete its work in a month or so so that a Search Committee can be formed to begin its work by mid-October. She also noted that there is no update on the Budget yet but expects to have one soon. And she publically thanked the faculty working on the Active Scholar Report, noting that the Academic Affairs Council would meet again this week to discuss this Report.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded Senators of the Fall Faculty meeting on Monday, September 17, at 3:30 p.m. in Lang Auditorium. Immediately following at 5:00 in the Commons Ballroom there will be a Board of Regents-sponsored event on the qualities and characteristics of the next UNI President. **Funderburk** also announced that Laura **Terlip** has agreed to continue as Secretary of the Faculty and that he hopes to soon be able to announce a Parliamentarian. Last, he gave an update on the digitization of the Faculty Senate Minutes. This has been completed for 1978 – 2010 and copies of the discs are in the Provost's Office and with Faculty Senate Chair **Peters**. The work is continuing toward getting these digitized Minutes online through ContentDM for public access.

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** announced that he has formed an Ad hoc Committee to Recommend Changes to the Policy Process. Members include Chris **Neuhaus**, Betty **DeBerg**, and Phil **East**. He outlined the 2-point charge and stated that their work should be completed by the end of October. He also noted that he is working to finalize the Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review and hopes to announce the members later this week. Next, **Peters** discussed several issues that will come up when docketing new items today and with one item on today's docket which will need to be re-docketed for September 24<sup>th</sup>. [see full transcript text for details] Next he called for interested faculty who might want to staff a booth at the NISG Voterpalooza event. Betty **DeBerg** volunteered to organize that booth and asked for other Senators or their colleagues to contact her if they would like to take part also. Chair **Peters** then turned the floor over to Senator **Neuhaus** who introduced a visitor, Christopher **Cox**, the new Dean of Library Sciences, who said a few words.

## 2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript approval

Minutes for August 27, 2012, were approved with no additions or corrections.

## 3. Docketed from the Calendar

**1147 1043** Consult regarding enrollment and admission

\*\*Motion to docket out of order at the head of the docket on 9/24/12  
(**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Passed.

**1144 1040** Consultative session on reporting of course grade distributions [due to be discussed today but Registrar **Patton** unable to attend].

\*\*Motion to re-docket 2<sup>nd</sup> on the docket on 09/24/12 (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**).  
Passed.

**1148 1044** Request for Emeritus Status, Timothy E. **O'Connor**

\*\*Motion to docket, regular order (**Bruess/Kirmani**). Passed.

**1149 1045** Request for Emeritus Status, Roger A. **Kueter**

\*\*Motion to docket, regular order (**Edginton/Bruess**). Passed.

**1150 1046** Request for Emeritus Status, Donna J. **Wood**

\*\*Motion to docket, regular order (**DeBerg/Gallagher**). Passed.

**1151 1047** Request for Emeritus Status, Steven L. **Wartick**

\*\*Motion to docket, regular order (**Smith/Hakes**). Passed.

**1152 1048** Consultative session with Associate Provost Craig **Klafter**  
Regarding International Programs

\*\*Motion to docket out of order at the head of the docket for 10/22/12  
(**Kirmani/Bruess**). Passed.

#### 4. Consideration of Docketed Items

**1139 1035** Request for Emeritus Status, Julie C. **Lowell (Bruess/Terlip)**.

\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement  
(**Bruess/Terlip**). Passed.

**1140 1036** Request for Emeritus Status, John T. **Fecik**,  
(**Neuhaus/Gallagher**).

**\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (DeBerg/Neuhaus). Passed.**

**1141 1037** Request for Emeritus Status, Larry P. **Leutzinger**,  
(**East/Kirmani**).

**\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (Kirmani/DeBerg). Passed.**

**1142 1038** Request for Emeritus Status, Kenneth J. **De Nault**,  
(**Terlip/Neuhaus**).

**\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (Neuhaus/Terlip). Passed.**

**1145 1041** Election of members to Senate Budget Committee,  
(**Neuhaus/Kirmani**).

**\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion (Breitbach/Bruess).**

**\*\*Motion to automatically elect 2 nominees elected by their Colleges (Edginton/MacLin). Motion later withdrawn.**

**\*\*Written ballots distributed with instructions to choose 4 members. Those chosen include: Adam **Butler**, John **Burtis**, Hans **Isakson**, and Bill **Callahan**.**

**1146 1042** Selection of members to Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel,  
(**East/Edginton**).

**\*\*Motion to bring to the floor for discussion (Kirmani/Neuhaus).**

**\*\*Motion to submit all nominees listed with the stipulation that none be selected for a committee while serving in an administrative role (Terlip/DeBerg).**

**\*\*Friendly amendment to ask CHAS to submit two additional names from the Fine and Applied Arts area (**Smith**), accepted by **Terlip**.**

**\*\*Vote on amended motion passed.**

## 5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:35 p.m. (**Bruess/Hakes**). Passed.

Next meeting:

09/24/12

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 52 pages, including 6 Addenda.

Regular Meeting  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
September 10, 2012  
Mtg. 1719**

**PRESENT:** Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, KaLeigh **White**

**Absent:** Philip **East**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters:** Call to order. I see that we do have a quorum. [voices continue]

Female voice: A talkative quorum.

**Peters:** A talkative quorum, yes.

**COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

**Peters:** And are there any press in the room? I thought I saw Blake. [clarifying name] And could you do me a favor and spell that for our recorder?

**Findley:** F.i.n.d.l.e.y [from the *Northern Iowan*, student newspaper]

**Peters:** Blake. Thank you very much.

## COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

**Peters:** Provost Gibson?

**Gibson:** Just a few announcements. First, as you probably already know, the Council of Provosts will meet this week along with the Board of Regents. We are expecting that the Board will announce the names of the Presidential Search Committee. I would like for you to know that I was asked to submit 2 names to the Board of Academic Department Heads. I did ask the Department Heads to submit names to me. They submitted—I can't remember—7 or 8 names. I did select 2 of those names for those to the Board, and the Board will select one of those individuals. So we should know more at the Board meeting regarding the Search Committee.

This morning I did give the charge to the Committee for Revising the Job Description for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. I would like to thank all of you who submitted your names to be on that Committee. I had more names than I needed. I did select Jeff [**Funderburk**] and Greg [**Bruess**] to serve on that Committee. I hope this will not be a burdensome Committee, that they will be able to get their work done within a month or so and then we will have the formal Search Committee, and I will come back to the Chair and ask for names to serve on the Search Committee. So I hope that Committee—the Search Committee—will get started by mid-October. We do plan to vet the job description to Academic Affairs Council and also the Faculty Senate.

I don't have a Budget Update. As you know, Ben [**Allen**] was out of town most of last week, and we did not have Cabinet this morning, so I would hope to get a Budget Update to you as soon as possible.

And finally, I just wanted to update you that there is a meeting this week to discuss the Active Scholar Report, and so I do plan to meet with that Committee again, but I want to publically thank the faculty who served on that Committee during the Spring semester.

That's all I have for now.

**Peters:** Thank you, Provost **Gibson**. Chair **Funderburk**?

### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK**

**Funderburk:** First, I want to remind everybody of the Fall Faculty meeting next Monday, September 17, beginning at 3:30. It's in Lang Auditorium. Speakers will include President **Allen**, Provost **Gibson**, Board of Regents Executive Director Bob [Robert] **Donley** and UF President Dan **Power**, as well as Chair **Peters** and myself. Faculty awards will be recognized at that time and also the new faculty members will be introduced. You'll get an Agenda by email shortly on that meeting.

Immediately following the Faculty Meeting, please also attend the Board of Regents-sponsored forum on qualities of the next president for UNI. That meeting starts at 5:00 p.m. in the Ballroom of the Union [sic, actual location Commons Ballroom] at this point.

Also, I am happy to announce that Laura Terlip has agreed to serve once again this year as Secretary of the Faculty. So I appreciate that very much.

I have extended an invitation to one of our colleagues to be the Parliamentarian of the Faculty this year, but I have not yet heard back from them, so I don't want to make that announcement just yet. Or maybe I should; that might..... [laughter all around] Oh, well.

Last, I have an update from last year's effort to digitize the Minutes of the Faculty Senate. I picked up disc copies of digitized Senate Minutes dating 1978 to 2010 this morning. Many thanks again to William **Maravetz** and Cynthia **Coulter** in the Library and the many students who worked a lot of hours last year and through the summer to get those digitized for us. The work to get these onto ContentDM, which will get it available to us on the website, still continues. So that's not up in place yet. So far I have given



one disc copy to Pat Woelber in the Provost's Office, and you have access to the Minutes should you need them. And then Chair Peters has additional copies should anybody need extra reading to help out with the late nights. [light laughter around] So that's all I have.

### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS**

**Peters:** Thank you. I have a few comments today, not nearly as many as last time.

1) First of all I wanted to announce that I have put together our Ad hoc Committee to Recommend Changes to the Policy Process. It's a small committee. I think that the task of the Committee is pretty clear, and Chris **Neuhaus**, Betty **DeBerg**, and Phil **East** agreed to do that. The charge of the Committee is as follows: I'm asking the Committee to recommend changes to the University's policy-making process that would: (1) assure that changes made by the Policy Review Committee or President's Cabinet are sent back to the recommending body; and (2) provide for notification of and/or comment on policy proposals before final approval by the President's Cabinet. So, as I said, given the level of consensus about this topic expressed at our Retreat, and given the fact that President **Allen** seemed receptive to both ideas at the Retreat, I think this can be done quickly. I've asked the Committee to try to issue its recommendation to the Senate by the end of October. So thank you to Chris, Betty, and Phil for doing that.

2) Secondly, I'm getting very close to finalizing the Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review that will be looking at places where faculty can be more involved in ongoing review of curriculum. I would hope to announce the membership of this Committee by the end of this week to all of you via email and then, assuming that looks ok to all of you, announce it to the broader campus community.

3) A couple notes on our docket. As I emailed you about earlier in the week, Registrar **Patton** let me know late last week that he would be unable

to be at our next meeting on September 24—or at this meeting, rather. So we will need to re-docket that item. If we re-docketed that for the 24<sup>th</sup> and also continued on in our regular order, then for the 24<sup>th</sup> we would have the consult with Registrar **Patton** regarding the public posting of grade distributions and the consult with Vice President **Hogan** regarding enrollment and admission. What I wanted to discuss with you for a couple minutes during my comment period here is whether given the importance of the topic on enrollment, given the announcement last week about how short we fell on enrollment, whether we wanted to reverse the order of those two things or possibly even ask Registrar **Patton** if he might want to reschedule for another date altogether and maybe devote the whole meeting to talking about enrollment. So are there any thoughts on that matter?

**Funderburk:** Question?

**Peters:** Yes.

**Funderburk:** Has Registrar **Patton** delayed posting those grade distributions thus far?

**Peters:** If he's posted them, I'm unaware of it. My understanding is he was not going to do anything until he met with the Senate. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Our faculty in my College were alarmed at all the new clerical work this LeapFrog Program will take for faculty. So—and that's coming right up—another area in which we are starting to do clerical work that used to be done in Gilchrist, so there are some issues that I don't want to delay in

**Peters:** In other words, you would like to talk to Registrar **Patton** about that soon?

**DeBerg:** Yeah, and I do think the enrollment crisis is more urgent, but there are issues at hand for the Registrar types.

**Peters:** With the Registrar. Thank you. Other thoughts on this? Ok. If things—I guess once we get up to the point of needing to re-docket the session with Registrar **Patton**, I guess—I think perhaps we should—my own view is that we should maybe ask—is try to put the consult with Vice President **Hogan** at the head of the order on the 24<sup>th</sup>, given the importance of that issue.

**DeBerg:** I would agree with that. I think that's fair.

**Peters:** Ok. Along those lines, when we meet with Vice President **Hogan**, the topic is sufficiently complicated that I don't expect to be able to have a very productive discussion if we all come in here cold. I've already emailed Vice President **Hogan**. I'm going to be posting the PowerPoint slides that were presented at the Enrollment Summit that was held over the summer. And then what I would also like to do is, I'd like you to send any questions you might have to me, and this is not an attempt to wade through the questions as much as it's an attempt to see if there are common questions that people have that I can pass on to him so that he can be ready with data on those specific topics. So if you have specific things you want him to address, please let me know. I will pass those on to him. He may even be able to make some other data that you don't have regular access to available before the meeting so that our discussion can be more productive. So that's the idea of this. So let me know. I want to try to have a discussion that's as productive as possible in terms of looking at the challenges that the University has and what the faculty's role is in addressing it.

4) One more announcement. NISG has asked whether the faculty would like to have a table at an event they are putting on called Voterpalooza. It's on September 20, from 4-7 p.m. It might be a nice way to interact with students, promote civic involvement. It's a non-partisan event to promote voting and registering for voting. As I said, it's from 4:00-7:00 p.m. I don't know if anyone has any immediate reaction on whether they might like to go. [question from someone as to date] It's on September 20<sup>th</sup>. But we would need to let them know, probably within the next couple of days about that. So if any of you might be interested or know other faculty

members, as well, you think might be interested in interacting with students at that event, let us know, and we'll pass that on to NISG.

**DeBerg:** I would be willing to organize that table.

**Peters:** Ok

**DeBerg:** “Senators say VOTE” or something like that. If anyone else is willing—would like to be there with me, I'd love company, but I'd be willing to organize that.

**Peters:** Ok. Ok, thank you. Thank you very much, Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** It's a good cause.

**Peters:** Finally, for one last comment I'm actually going to turn the floor over to Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** Thank you, Chair **Peters**. It's my great pleasure and with much anticipation to introduce—some of you I think you have maybe seen his picture, if you read the paper, but—Christopher **Cox** from Western Washington [University] is now the UNI Dean of Libraries, and he is here visiting. Chris?

**Cox:** Nice to meet all of you. I just thought I'd just come in and listen in and get a chance to meet you guys. [applause and voices saying “welcome”]

**Peters:** Ok, if there's nothing else in the comments or any questions, then we will proceed to Minutes.

## BUSINESS

### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Peters:** Were there any additions or corrections to the draft of the August 27<sup>th</sup> Minutes? Seeing none, shall we proceed to a vote to approve them? All those in favor of approving the Minutes, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say “no.” [none heard] The Minutes are approved.

### CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1147 for Docket #1043  
Consult regarding enrollment and admission

**Peters:** Consideration of items for docketing. Let’s start with Calendar Item 1147, the consult regarding enrollment and admission with Vice President **Hogan**. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** I move that we docket that at the head of the order for the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September.

**Neuhaus:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus**. Any discussion about that? All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no.” [none heard] Motion passes.

Calendar Item 1144, Docket #1040  
Consultative session on reporting of course grade distributions

**Peters:** Should we go ahead and re-docket the Registrar **Patton** session at this point, or just go in order of the Calendar?

**DeBerg:** Question?

**Peters:** Yes.

**DeBerg:** Have you talked to him about when he's available?

**Peters:** He is available on the 24<sup>th</sup>. I know that for sure, but we haven't talked about the possibility of any other dates. If anyone—I—let's move to

**DeBerg:** I'll try a motion and see if it passes. I move that we docket the consultation with Registrar **Patton** 2<sup>nd</sup> on the docket for the meeting on September 24<sup>th</sup>.

**Peters:** Is there a second to put that up second on the docket for the 24<sup>th</sup>? Senator **Neuhaus**. Any discussion of that?

**DeBerg:** It will be a long meeting. [laughter around]

**Peters:** Ok, let's proceed to a vote then. All in favor of that, please say, "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say "no." [none heard] Motion passes.

Calendar Item 1148 for Docket #1044  
Request for Emeritus Status, Timothy E. O'Connor

**Peters:** Now, back to Calendar Item 1148, Request for Emeritus Status for Timothy **O'Connor**. Yeah, Senator **Bruess**.

**Bruess:** I move that we docket that in regular order for Emeritus Status for Tim **O'Connor**.

**Peters:** Ok, it's been moved in regular order. Is there a second?

**Kirmani:** I second.

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani**. Any discussion? All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no?” [none heard] The motion passes.

Calendar Item 1149 for Docket #1045  
Request for Emeritus Status for Roger A. **Kueter**

**Peters:** Calendar Item 1149, Request for Emeritus Status for Roger **Kueter**.

**Edginton:** So move.

**Peters:** Senator **Edginton** moves that, in regular order? [**Edginton** nods] In regular order. Is that a second, Senator **Bruess**? [**Bruess** nods] Seeing no discussion, all in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no?” [none heard] The motion passes.

Calendar Item 1150 for Docket #1046  
Request for Emeritus Status for Donna J. **Wood**

**Peters:** Calendar Item 1150, Emeritus Request for Donna J. **Wood**.

**DeBerg:** I move that we docket it in regular order.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**. Is there a second for that motion to docket in regular order? Senator **Gallagher**. [who indicated] Seeing no discussion, all in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say “no.” [none heard] Motion passes.

Calendar Item 1151 for Docket #1047  
Request for Emeritus Status for Steven L. **Wartick**

**Peters:** Calendar Item 1151, Emeritus Status Request for Steven L. **Wartick**.

**Smith:** I will move to docket in regular order.

**Peters:** Vice-Chair **Smith** moves to docket in regular order. Is there a second?

**Hakes:** Second.

**Peters:** Second by Senator **Hakes**. All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no.” [none heard] Motion passes.

Calendar Item 1152 for Docket #1048

Consultative session with Associate Provost Craig **Klafter** Regarding International Programs

**Peters:** And finally, Calendar Item 1152, Consultative session with Associate Provost **Klafter** Regarding International Programs. I have been in touch with Associate Provost **Klafter**, and he is available on October 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**Kirmani:** I move here in regular order.

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani**. He’s available on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**Kirmani:** Oh, ok.

**Peters:** So can I consider that a motion to have him for a consultative session on the 22<sup>nd</sup>? [**Kirmani** nods] Is there anyone to second that? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Sorry. Was there any—I thought I saw a hand up. Was there any exception? No. Ok, let’s do that again, then. This is going to be like the Democratic National Convention. We’ll just keep taking the vote. [laughter all around] All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, “no?” [none heard] Motion passes.



## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1035, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JULIE C. **LOWELL**

**Peters:** Ok, so I asked—I contacted the home departments of people who were up for emeritus status today and asked them if they wished to send any testimonials on behalf of their colleagues. The Chair—the Chair, right? Not the Head, the Chair of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology, Professor [Phyllis] **Baker** is here, and I know that she had something to say on behalf of Julie **Lowell**. And as I'm saying this, I'm realizing that we need a motion to bring it to the floor. Senator **Bruess**.

**Bruess:** I move that we allow Professor **Baker** to speak on behalf of Julie **Lowell**.

**Peters:** Bring the Emeritus Status to the floor [sic, to consider endorsing the request]? Is there a second for that?

**Terlip:** Second.

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Terlip**. Professor **Baker**.

**Baker:** Thank you, Chair **Peters**, Faculty Senators, Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** and others present. I am here to speak with you about Professor Julie **Lowell** and offer statements from members of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology in support of emeritus status for Dr. **Lowell**. Dr. **Lowell** has been a member of our department for 25 years, and I have known her both personally and professionally for 22 of those years. She has been a model citizen and friend. Her contributions to the Department, to the College, to the community, and to the University and her profession are clearly worthy of emeritus status. Recently her work with the University faculty to assure and support faculty governance at UNI epitomizes her hard work for and love of the academy. The future publication of her work with the victims of the 2008 tornado in Parkersburg, Iowa, chronicles the devastating impact of that tornado on the community. Teaching is a passion for Dr. **Lowell** and

her teaching of students in the Liberal Arts Core as well as in archaeology has been a vital contribution to both the students and the curriculum here at the University. Her scholarly work in the area of Southwest archaeology has impacted the field specifically through its questioning of long-held assumptions about the culture of the time.

Dr. **Lowell** continues to contribute to UNI, the community, and her profession. She will maintain an office in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology and all the resultant benefits of emeritus status, if you so choose or vote. It is with a great honor that I support the awarding of Emeritus Professor status for Dr. **Lowell** and offer statements from the faculty in the Department. Chair **Peters** has those statements and will share some comments from them. Thank you.

**Peters:** Thank you, Professor **Baker**. She forwarded on testimonials [see Addendum 1 to these Minutes] by several of Professor **Lowell's** colleagues: Mark **Grey**, who notes her level of demand of students as an instructor, her involvement in developing student outcomes assessment for the program; **Li Jian**, who mentions Professor **Lowell's** work with the tornado in Butler County and the documentary that that's going to result in; Tyler **O'Brien**, who talks about her mentorship of him and other young professors; and also Don **Graf**. I like this phrase from Don **Graf's** email. It says, "She has not retired and disappeared. She instead has much more work to do. She is very passionate about her tornado project." And he ends by saying, "I admire Julie's exceptional work ethic and believe she most definitely deserves emeritus status." And, of course, the emeritus status is something that is rarely in doubt, but I thought it would be nice to take the opportunity to recognize people's contributions. Is there anyone else who wants to speak up regarding Professor **Lowell's** emeritus application?

**Terlip:** I would just also, as a member of the Senate who served when she was Vice-Chair, want to thank her for all her service. And I know she did a lot of work serving the campus community, and she's going to be missed.

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Terlip**. Any others? Seeing no further comments, all those in favor of recommending emeritus status for Julie

**Lowell**, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, “no?” [none heard] Motion passes.

DOCKET #1036, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JOHN T. **FECIK**

**Peters**: Docket item 1036, Emeritus Status Request for Roger [sic, John T.] **Fecik**. [voices clarifying name] Oh, sorry about that. This is largely a—Oh, I’m sorry. I need a motion to bring it to the floor.

**DeBerg**: I move that we that we grant [sic, endorse] the request for emeritus status to John **Fecik**.

**Neuhaus**: I’ll second that.

**Peters**: Moved by Senator DeBerg. Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus**. This is even more of a formality than they usually are, because he has already been granted it [sic, Senate has endorsed it] once, but the dates were incorrect on his paperwork, and we may have—whatever authority we have, apparently we do not have the authority to go back in time and grant people emeritus status to before they will retire, and therefore we have to do it over. We had already decided on this, obviously, but I still solicited information from his home Department, and I did get an email from James **Maxwell** in the Department of Technology [see Addendum 2 to these Minutes] who notes that Professor **Fecik** was instrumental in developing a doctoral program in that Department. [email appended to these Minutes] Any other discussion? All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no.” [none heard] Ok.

DOCKET #1037, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, LARRY P. **LEUTZINGER**

**Peters**: That brings us to emeritus status for Larry **Leutzinger**. We need a motion to bring it up. Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated].

**DeBerg**: Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **DeBerg**. And unfortunately I do not have testimonials, but I know that several people here—I think there are some people here who know Professor **Leutzinger**. Does anyone like to

**Kirmani:** Yeah, I knew Larry very well. He was my colleague. He was an outstanding faculty member in Math Education. He was one of those people who are very difficult to replace. He did a great job for the Department and gave outstanding service to the profession.

**Peters:** Thank you Senator **Kirmani**. Anyone else? Ok. All in favor, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no.” [none heard]

#### DOCKET #1038, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, KENNETH J. **DE NAULT**

**Peters:** And docket item 1038, emeritus status for Ken **De Nault**. I have—I was flooded. It’s really fun actually to read all these testimonials, and without objection I’ll enter them all in the Minutes in their entirety [see Addendum 3 to these Minutes]. But I got an email from an alum Molly **Hanson**, who talks about Professor **De Nault** as a father-figure, actually a grandfather-figure is what she says [laughter all around]. “The epitome”—I’m just reading it—“the epitome of a great professor.” She says that he’s responsible for some of her most precious college memories. The way she described it is, “You thought you’d never remember all the crystal structures that minerals could have. He kept pounding the basics into your head, adding more information, each day going back to review and adding more each day.” Another similar email from Christina **Spielbauer**, an alumnus, and then a long letter of support from Siobahn **Morgan**, and she goes into great detail about his contributions to the Department, which, of course, include that he was one of the founders of the Geology program. Talks about his Summer trips and his Spring trips with students, and, of course, his wolf, Buck. And by her estimate at least in this letter, more than 275,000 people, mainly children, learned about wolves as they traveled around the State and beyond. Any discussion? Senator **DeBerg**?

**DeBerg:** I would like to say a few words about Professor **De Nault**. He began his teaching career in 1973, and was one of, as Scott [**Peters**] mentioned, one of the three founders of the Geology program. His students have gone on to excellent careers in academia, and the petroleum industry, and in the public sector in such places as the National and State Geological Surveys. One of the last program review external visitors said that UNI's geology program is, and I quote, "The best undergraduate geology program in the State." Ken often taught unpaid overloads, something that won't happen under the new—this Master Agreement. He often taught unpaid overloads in a typical semester carrying 14 contact hours or more. He has written computer programs that are still being used today and conducted most of his recent research in collaboration with undergraduates as part of their required work in the Geology B.S. program.

That the administration would close such an excellent program, in a field with plenty of good employment opportunities, is mind-boggling to me. The Senate meeting in which the Provost and the Deans told us, not once but twice, that quality didn't matter in their decisions about program closures seemed like the Twilight Zone to me then, and it seems even worse to me now. Saying that quality doesn't matter is one of the clearest cases of administrative malpractice I have ever heard.

But even if you grant the Administration the use of graduation rates as the criteria for program closures, even this criterion was misused in a remarkably ham-handed way. In the end only about half of the "low-completion" majors, minors, and programs were targeted. Seventy other undergraduate majors, minors, and emphases with fewer than 10 graduates on average per year over the last 5 years were completely spared. And I have a list of them with me. [Handout passed around; see Addendum 4.] These 70 majors, minors, and emphases were NOT interfered with with any way by the Administration. We have yet to receive a rationale from the Administration about why not quite 70 undergraduate programs were rushed through the BOR for closure and/or suspension, and why these 70 on the list were not. And by the way, I don't think any of them should have been closed in this way. I'm not arguing that they should have been closed, too. I may not agree with administrative decisions, but

any administration has the responsibility to share fully and transparently its rationale for such drastic, and seemingly unfair, measures. Since, obviously, the average of 10 grads per year for 5 years was not the REAL criterion used, what WAS? What unspoken model for our University is being operationalized by this Administration? We have a right to know and to be able to respond to it. What secret plan for UNI is out there?

**Peters:** Senator—Senator **DeBerg**. Could you direct your comments more toward the

**DeBerg:** I will.

**Peters:** the motion on the floor which are the recommendation [sic, endorsement] of emeritus status for Ken **De Nault**?

**DeBerg:** Ok. Ken **De Nault** was one of the 23 tenured faculty in a handful of Departments who were threatened with layoff if they didn't resign or retire. Ken resigned so his colleagues with less seniority would not have to do so. That UNI's Administration would treat a handful of our respected, senior colleagues, with decade after decade of excellent and faithful service like this, is in my mind beneath contempt. Not only was Ken—I'm still on topic—summoned to a last-minute mandatory meeting, at which Dean **Haack**, Provost **Gibson**, and President **Allen** told him he was not needed or wanted, but so was his long-time colleague in Geology, Jim **Walters**; Reinhold **Bubser** and Flavia **Vernuscu**, in Languages & Literatures; Dale **Olson** in Physics; James **Robinson**, Martie **Reineke**, Bill **Clohesy**, and me in Philosophy & World Religions.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**, could we stay on the topic of his—for his--what he deserves, emeritus status application?

**DeBerg:** Ok. Yeah. Ok. Yes.

**Neuhaus:** I'd like to say one more thing toward Ken's

**DeBerg:** I want to say one more thing about Ken. Ken had a long career here of teaching Liberal Arts Core sections, and yet he wasn't—he was told he wasn't needed, and all of the Liberal Arts Core Category Reviews since I have been on that Committee say that one of the weaknesses in each of our Categories is that we don't have enough tenured faculty teaching in the Liberal Arts Core. And the University was driving out tenured faculty at the same time that the Liberal Arts Core Program Reviews—Ken led one of them by the way—asked that more tenured faculty been used in the Liberal Arts Core.

**Peters:** Other comments regarding Senator [sic, Professor] **De Nault's** application for emeritus status? Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** As someone who spends some quality time looking through the archives of the Senate, going back through the 90's and the 80's, which have not been readily available before, Ken **De Nault** spent a lot of time on this group here. He did an incredible amount of service for this group. He served as a faculty secretary for quite a few years on that and really served in all sorts of committees as well. It was almost astounding how often his name would crop up through all sorts of different positions on there. So a lot of those maybe went somewhat unsung, but it was clear he really put his shoulder to the wheel on this and did a great service to this University through this group but, I think, also through a lot of other campus organizations as well.

**Peters:** Thank you.

**DeBerg:** I would like to note that Ken and some of the other people who left this May were not even given receptions or farewells. I mean, I think that's especially sad. Phil **Mauceri** and Ginny **Arthur** got theirs but not some of our faculty who were driven off campus. I think that's really a sad day in our University.

**Peters:** Are there any other comments? All in favor of recommending [sic, endorsing] Ken **De Nault** for emeritus status, please say, "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say "no." [none heard] The motion carries.

[transcriptionist **Nuss** advises Chair **Peters** that no motion was ever made] There was never a motion made? Of course. [voices debating what to do] Ok, apparently we started discussion without a motion. Can I have a motion please to grant [sic, endorse] Professor **De Nault** [for] emeritus status? [voices joking and laughing along with **DeBerg**] Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated] Second?

**Terlip:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Moved by Senator **Neuhaus**; seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Let's do the vote again. All in favor, please say, "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "no." [none heard] The motion passes. Thank you, Sherry [**Nuss**], for bringing my attention to that, and hopefully I'll get better at this as we go on through the year.

#### DOCKET #1041, ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

**Peters:** All right. That brings us to election of members to the Senate Budget Committee. I need a motion to bring it to the floor, please.

**Breitbach:** I'll move.

**Peters:** Senator **Breitbach**. Seconded by Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. We have nominees. I guess the question would be how do we go—do we want to go about this? Do we want to discuss specific nominees in Open Session? Do we want to proceed to Executive Session? [male voice asking number on committee] There are four faculty members and then plus one Senator.

**Breitbach:** Could I ask for a clarification?

**Peters:** Senator **Breitbach**.

**Breitbach:** A clarification on the fact that some of them were elected by their College last Spring.



**Peters:** So as you'll recall, we were a little bit late getting the recommendations about committee restructuring done. By the time the Senate had finished with that, Colleges had already held their elections. So these are people who—there were 2 people who were on the current list of nominees—who were selected by their Colleges to serve on the pre-existing, the previous version of the Committee. Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** I would propose that those people who were elected by their Colleges be definitely included by the Senate.

**Peters:** That wasn't phrased as a motion. Is that just a suggestion during debate or is that a motion?

**Kirmani:** Well, I can make a motion.

**Terlip:** We already have a motion on the floor, so I hate to play parliamentarian, but

**Peters:** That's a point, a good point. So, I guess what I'm asking is are we just—there was—are we just doing this in Open Session? Should I go ahead and put the nominees up on the screen. [voices in the affirmative; list of nominees was projected and can be found as Addendum 5 to these Minutes] Ok. So we have to select 4. I have put an asterisk there for the people who were selected by their Colleges through election. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, my only comment on this list of nominees, which I think is a really good list, is that Chris **Martin** is a Department Head, and as much as I respect Chris and I trust him on the Budget by the way, I think that we should eliminate Department Heads, because they are considered "administrators," and look only at full-time faculty colleagues. That's my only comment.

**Edginton:** I also feel that we need

**Peters:** Senator **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** we need a cross-section of individuals that represent each of the Colleges as best as we can.

**Peters:** Other comments? Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** Yeah, I would add that this Committee is set up basically to keep the Senate informed of the financial condition of the University and to kind of act as a bridge between the Senate and the Administration, and so in that regard it's important, and this may be different from the previous Committee, but it's important, I think, that this Committee be—consist of people who we can trust as honest brokers, who we can take their word, we can—they can understand financial statements, they know where things stand, and they are going to present a non-partisan view of the situation rather than having an ax to grind. I think that's very important and may be relevant in the case of some of these nominees.

**Peters:** Senator **MacLin**.

**MacLin:** I would just like to echo what Syed [**Kirmani**] said, that I think that Adam **Butler** and Russ **Campbell** should be put forward for certain, in my opinion, because they were elected by their College faculty members.

**Peters:** Any other comments? We have ballots, so could just proceed to a vote and have everybody vote for 4, if everyone's done discussing. Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** One other relevant factor, if we're going to add a Senate Senator to this Committee, and we're concerned, as Senator **Edginton** said, with broad base, maybe we ought to do the Senator first, and then knowing what College or where that Senator is from, it might influence how we would vote on the remaining members. So you have to have one person on. We can establish that person. That might have an impact on where we go with the 4.

**Peters:** No one had jumped forward and volunteered to be the Senator.

**Bruess:** [raising his hand] No, I'm not volunteering. [laughter all around] You know, I think I brought it up. What were we going to do with 3-year rotating terms on the Senator? So would that have to be a first-year Senator? Or would a Senator be allowed to go beyond the end of the Senate term? Or get re-elected to a 2<sup>nd</sup> 3-year term?

**Peters:** I did not face this specifically from the charge, and I don't have the charge in front of me, so I can't remember how we did—I think the Senator might be selected annually, but I cannot remember for sure. Senator **Gallagher**.

**Gallagher:** Maybe I missed something, but is there any way to kind of background these individuals that I'm not really familiar with to kind of—what would be their credentials for serving in this capacity? Do they have expertise that anyone would like to speak to? Or

**Terlip:** I could speak to John **Burtis**.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** He's a former Department Head from my Department, so he has worked with budgets. He's one of the most—the brightest people I have ever met in my life. He coached college debate for years and is very familiar with combing institutional documents for budgetary kinds of issues. As a researcher, he's one of those people who I would say could give any of the librarians a run for their money in government documents, so I would definitely put him up there as

**Peters:** Is there any Senator who wants to step forward and volunteer to be the Senate member of this Committee?

**Dolgener:** I nominate Chris **Edginton**.

**Peters:** Ok. We're—yes.

**Funderburk:** Just a note, in the original charge that was passed, it says the Senate Chair will appoint this Senator, in the event we have 3 or 4 people contending.

**Peters:** Oh? Ok. Well, if we only have one volunteer, that makes the appointment process pretty simple. Let's go ahead and proceed to a vote. I will follow-up with Senator **Edginton** and see if he's interested in the job. If he's not, I will pester some of the rest of you about that. And I apologize for overlooking that detail. Are there any other points of discussion regarding the nominees? Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** Yeah, I would like to say a few words on behalf of Hans **Isakson**, who, as many of you know, has done a considerable amount of research on the University's financial situation. He certainly understands that—the statements, the finances very well. So I think in that respect he is highly qualified for the position.

**Edginton:** And I would like to speak on behalf of Bill **Callahan**. His primary responsibilities during the time that he was in an administrative role serving as Associate Dean of the College of Education, and that involved primarily managing the budget. It was a very complex budget to deal with given the reductions that were going on over the time that he was in that position that I think he has a tremendous grasp of the University Budget and the nuances that go along with the budgeting process.

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Edginton**. Any other comments? Ok, let's go ahead—oh, I'm sorry, Senator **MacLin**.

**MacLin:** I have a quick remark about Adam **Butler**. He's well-versed in the University Budget. He's kept us in the Psychology Department informed throughout the years and communicates his findings very clearly, often graphically so that people can understand what's going on.

**Peters:** Senator **Edginton**, or are you looking to recognize Senator **Edginton**?

**Edginton:** Well, I want to go back to the original comment that was made by Senator **MacLin** regarding the Senate's moving those names forward. I really think that we ought to separate out the issue and determine whether or not we want to acknowledge the recommendations that those Senates are making. And then affirm or not affirm that before we go to the vote on the rest of these individuals. I'd like to see us affirm that we are going to acknowledge the recommendations made by the College Senates to us for the first two.

**Peters:** So are you moving to consider them separately in some way?

**Edginton:** I think so. I mean, I will make a motion that we elect **Butler** and **Campbell** upon the recommendation of the College Senates of those two units.

**MacLin:** Second.

**Peters:** Ok, there's a motion on the floor, seconded by Senator **MacLin**. Discussion about that motion? I view the original motion to bring this off the docket, by the way, as simply a motion to discuss the nominees, so in my view any motion from here is in order. Yes, Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** So I understood that Professor **Butler** and Professor **Campbell** were elected by their two Colleges in the Spring, so they are not being recommended by their College Senates. Is that correct?

**Peters:** They were elected—their Colleges held their standard elections. At that time, we, the Senate, had not yet redesigned the Senate Budget Committee, so they were still electing people for the old Budget Committee, where each College elected somebody, and so they made themselves available for election. They were elected by their Colleges as a whole.

**Swan:** Very good. That's what I thought, so they were elected by Senate—and so from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences, which I suspect

is different from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, I do not remember that election, and I do not feel comfortable endorsing someone from that election for this process, even if I want to support that person. I just—as a matter of course, just because it went through that election in the spring in that—in the case of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences, I don't feel comfortable saying that that was fine. I think in Social and Behavioral Sciences the election is remembered and endorsed by lots and lots of faculty, and so to the motion I would endorse the CSBS one, if that delegation reports that it was a full election, the faculty clearly wants that person. But in CHAS I don't remember it, and I don't remember any competition. We have other competition here, and so I'm announcing that. I guess I have to vote "no" for the motion, unless it's altered in some way.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I'm making a comment with no prejudice whatsoever about the people involved, but I'd like to go back to what the original charge for this new Committee is. "Committee shall consist of 4 members elected by the Senate after a campus-wide solicitation of nominees." There's no instructions as to how the nominees were to be solicited around campus nor any insinuation that all Colleges would in fact be represented. So I only pass that along for what it's worth.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, Laura [**Terlip**] and I are two other CHAS faculty members, and we don't remember this election either. So I just wanted Jesse [**Swan**] to know that our memories are yours.

**Terlip:** And at best it would have been under the old description. There would not have been anything communicated about a new committee, and I suspect Russ [**Campbell**] would have volunteered and ran unopposed since we don't know about the election. I mean, that's the only way I can see it happening.

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Terlip**. Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** Just an observation. You know, we've got College of Education and College of Business Administration, and they've got some folks there. If you really want balance on this, you know, if we're going to give the top two candidates a shoo-in because they come in endorsed, are we going to penalize some of the other folks on it. It's possible we could end up with a sort of all CHAS group. That might be good for CHAS, but I don't know if it's good for the University. But it's just something to keep in mind. We've got two of the Colleges cinched down if we go this route, but the other two are not.

**Peters:** Thank you. Senator **MaLin**

**MaLin:** Just to provide another point of information. In our College [CSBS] the election was quite public and, in fact, we were very well aware that likely the Budget Committee would change, so he knew what he [**Butler**] was getting into, and people who participated in that election were aware of that as well.

**Peters:** Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** I don't have a problem with the Senators individually taking into account the results of the elections, but I don't agree with the motion that we should automatically endorse them since those elections were not held specifically for this and they are really—it's not the way the thing was set up to have those elections appoint people to this body. It was to a predecessor committee that had to some extent—in some respects a different charge. So, yeah, fine, if you want to factor into your judgment on 4 the 2 that had votes from their Senate, that's fine. Whether in fact those votes were widely advertised or not, but I don't think we should automatically say, "Oh, yeah, those two are on." I don't agree with that.

**Peters:** Senator **Edginton** and then Senator **DeBerg**.

**Edginton:** With privy to the information that was just offered, I would withdraw the motion.

**MacLin:** I withdraw my second. [voices saying “Ok” and light laughter]

**DeBerg:** Well, then I don’t have to call the question. [more laughter around]

**Peters:** Ok. Are there any—is there any further discussion about the nominees? I’ll see if I can get the computer to be more reliable [projected connection failing frequently last 5 minutes] while we distribute ballots. Seeing no other comments, ok. Let’s distribute ballots and then perhaps Vice Chair **Smith**, if you and Secretary **Edginton** can count the ballots. Everybody should vote for 4. So once the voting is done, we’ll probably take about 5 minutes recess [for the counting]. [Recess 4:20 p.m.]

**Peters:** [meeting resumed 4:25 p.m.] Senator **Smith** has the results.

**Smith:** The 4 members that were elected are: Adam **Butler**, Hans **Isakson**, John **Burtis**, and Bill **Callahan**.

**Peters:** All right. Thank you, Senators, and thanks to all of those who put their names in for nomination. I will round out the Committee with a Senator, and we’ll try to get that Committee up and running as quickly as possible.

DOCKET #1042, SELECTION OF MEMBERS TO FACULTY ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PANEL

**Peters:** The next item on the Agenda is Calendar Item 1146, Docket # 1042, Selection of members to the Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel. Can I have a motion to bring that up for discussion off the docket? Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated].

**Neuhaus:** And I second.



**Peters:** And a second from Senator **Neuhaus**. Thank you. Ok, the same question here. Is there any desire at all, as I look around at you, is there any desire to move to Executive Session, or should we just go ahead and put them up on the screen? [no indication Executive Session desired; complete list of nominees can be found as Addendum 6 to these Minutes] Ok. I will note at the outset that one of the objections that Senator **DeBerg** raised to the Budget nominees is also present here, not an objection to the person himself but to the fact that one of the nominees here is a Department Head, and, in fact, I received the College of Business Administration's nominees just this afternoon and think—am I correct about this?—is Mary **Christ**, is she

**Smith:** She's Acting Department Head.

**Peters:** She's an Acting Department Head. [voice clarifying "interim" rather than "acting"] So Professor **Christ** is an Interim Department Head, then. [voices clarifying] So it's a very, very temporary thing? Ok. [request for larger projected font] Yeah, I need to figure out a way to get this up on the screen a little bigger [and works to enlarge font and still project on one page]. So that would be, for the record, it would appear that there are two Department Heads who have been nominated, Chris **Martin** who is the Interim Department Head and then Professor **Christ** who is merely—who is Interim Department Head but is there for a set amount of time and will not be Department Head after this semester, is that correct? [voices agreeing] Ok. Discussion? Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I don't believe a Department Head should be on this list, but I would not be opposed to having us word something in such a way that as long as someone was in an active administrative role they could not serve on a panel. So they could remain on a list, and then if somebody was no longer interim they could be used at a later date.

**Peters:** They would be in the pool.

**Terlip:** But as long as they were actively in an administrative role, they couldn't serve as a peer reviewer. Is that—if that's amenable. I don't know

if that needs a motion or what we need to do to make that happen.  
Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** How many have to get it?

**Peters:** We could have as many as we want. There is no set limit. Ballpark, we were thinking that 20 or so would be a good number to have, because when you start thinking about in the event that an allegation is made against somebody, you've got to look at whether people have relationships with the—you know, close relationships with the person who is accused. Do they have any expertise to investigate a particular topic? So, we thought that would be a good number at least to start with. It should be noted that the procedures do allow the Integrity Officer who is a member of Office of Sponsored Programs—and Anita **Gordon** is sitting here from Sponsored Programs—the procedures do allow the Integrity Officer to select people who aren't in the pool, if necessary, as well. But these would be the first people that you would go to in the event of an allegation. Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I would like to note that I see a hole in there immediately which we have no one up there that's from the Fine or Applied Arts, and I recall a great thing I had to read in grad. school which was a farcical accusation against Mozart for plagiarism for having taken things, so there are many times where there's quite a bit of difference in what would happen if I had an Applied Arts or research-based problem as opposed to others.

**Hakes:** When the Committee has being formed, they can go beyond this list?

**Peters:** They can, yes.

**Hakes:** And that may have to happen.

**Peters:** Yes.

**Funderburk:** I think the note is, from my understanding, is who we pick will get training for that, so there will be a training battery for these people and whoever is picked outside might not have said training.

**Peters:** The other option would be that we could—the Senate could ask CHAS to submit more names that fills a hole within the pool as well.  
Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** We've probably already said this, but how many folks do we have in total coming forward?

**Peters:** You know what, I never counted them up.

**Smith:** I think it's 24, if you take out Chris **Martin**. [several Senators counting list on projected screen] And that's before the management people, so it's 28. [voices clarifying 28 or 29]

**Peters:** 29, ok. Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** I'm—I'm—ok, I'm more than tempted, I'm going to make a motion that we just approve them all. That's pretty close to 20.

**Peters:** We did have the issue raised by Senator **Terlip** about the Department Head issue.

**Neuhaus:** All but one. [voices clarifying whether one or two]

**Peters:** Let's go ahead and get that as a motion then.

**Terlip:** We have to make sure that whoever appoints them follows that rule.

**Gallagher:** Are you making a motion?

**Peters:** Let's go ahead. Can we get that phrased in the order of a motion?  
That

**Terlip:** We have a motion on the floor, so I'm not sure

**Peters:** But it wasn't seconded. It actually wasn't seconded. Senator **Neuhaus's** motion was not seconded.

**Terlip:** Oh, ok. Well, I would move that members of the pool only be allowed to serve on a panel if they are not concurrently in an active administrative role. So, for example, in this case, Chris **Martin** or Mary **Christ's** names could be there, but since they are this semester actively Department Heads, they couldn't be chosen.

**Peters:** Ok. The motion from Senator **Terlip** is that we would forward names along with the instructions that, though all of these people are in the pool, they should not be chosen if they are in—if they are currently serving in an administrative capacity.

**Terlip:** Correct.

**Peters:** Is there a second?

**DeBerg:** Second.

**Neuhaus:** Possibly, Laura [**Terlip**], did you mean all these?

**Terlip:** I mean everybody. I was just using them as examples of those from this list that I've seen.

**Neuhaus:** Was your motion including all of those that had come forward with the exception that you stated?

**Terlip:** All of these? [indicating projected list]

**Neuhaus:** Yes, all of these.

**Terlip:** Yes. Yes.

**Neuhaus:** Ok.

**Peters:** The motion is to support all of the names with the note that the Senate's view of the policy is that they should not be selected—they shall not be selected for inclusion on a committee if they are currently serving in an administrative capacity. Is there a second?

**DeBerg:** Second. I seconded before.

**Peters:** Ok, thank you, Senator **DeBerg**. I apologize.

**DeBerg:** I don't mind doing it again.

**Peters:** Is there more discussion? Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I'm not able to make motions in here, but I would suggest it would be possible that as part of that to ask CHAS to submit two additional names specifically from Fine and Applied Arts to include in that group.

**Smith:** I'll offer as a friendly amendment to that motion that we ask CHAS to submit the names of two faculty from Fine Arts, and they would also be included in the pool.

**Peters:** [to **Terlip**] Do you accept that? [she nods] Senator **Terlip** accepts. So the motion on the table is now to submit all of these names with the provision about not currently serving as in an administrative capacity and then we shall ask CHAS to submit at least two more names to serve in the pool who are concentrating in the Fine Arts.

**Swan:** So just to clarify--so the effect of passing this motion is that the two who are somehow administrators right now can go through whatever training is being offered. I just wanted to put that in there that that is the understanding.

**Peters:** Correct. Yes.

**Swan:** Very good.

**Peters:** I don't think I see any more discussion. All in favor of the motion as amended, please say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All opposed? [none heard] The motion carries.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Peters:** And that's our last item of business for today. So, can we have a motion to adjourn? Senator **Bruess**.

**Bruess:** Move to adjourn.

**Hakes:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Hakes**. All in favor? [ayes heard all around] All opposed? [none heard] Thank you. I'll see you in 2 weeks. [4:35 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:  
Date: 09/24/12  
Oak Room, Maucker Union  
3:30 p.m.

Addendum 1 of 6

## **Testimonials of Colleagues for Professor Julie Lowell**

Dr. Peters and Faculty Senate members,

I am grateful for the opportunity to support Dr. Julie Lowell's application for Emeritus Status at University of Northern Iowa. I have known and worked with Dr. Lowell for more than 22 years. Throughout that time, Dr. Lowell proved herself to be a fine colleague who always carried more than her share of teaching and service duties in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology. She worked tirelessly on her teaching. She developed a well-earned reputation among colleagues and students as being a fair but demanding instructor who insisted on the highest academic standards in students' written assignments and examinations. Dr. Lowell was also a devoted provider of service to the department, college and university. She took on a number of challenging assignments, including development of the Anthropology Student Outcomes process and membership on many department, college and university committees. She understood, more than many of our colleagues, the role of service and faculty governance in assuring the institutions long-term viability. Dr. Lowell also made significant contributions to the field of Southwestern United States archaeology. Some of her published research questioned some long-standing assumptions in the field and I know her archaeology colleagues are grateful for her provocations!

I trust that you and my other colleagues on the UNI Faculty Senate will agree with me that Dr. Julie has been one of UNI's finest faculty members and well worthy of Emeritus Status.

Respectfully Submitted, August 30, 2012,  
Mark A. Grey, Ph.D.  
Professor of Anthropology

Dear Dr. Peters and UNI Faculty Senate Committee Members,

I am writing this e-mail to you to express my strongest support for granting Dr. Julie Lowell emeritus status. I understand that you only need short testimonials from the faculty members of our department and I will be brief.\

Based on my observation, I think that Dr. Lowell was a highly dedicated teacher, devoted researcher, and enthusiastic service provider. She had a thorough knowledge of archaeology and she used her knowledge to the best effect in the classroom. In the past

decades, she made profound impacts on our students and her classes were always greatly appreciated by our students. On numerous occasions in the past years, I heard many students from different disciplines at UNI make highly positive comments on her teaching. It seemed to me that she consistently had a strong passion for teaching and her classes were usually ranked among the best on UNI campus.

In terms of scholarship, Dr. Lowell throughout her career has been a highly productive scholar. In addition to her high-quality publications in the past years, she continued to be a highly active researcher even today. One most recent example of her research was her Butler County Tornado Project. Soon after the EF-5 Tornado struck Butler County in 2008, Dr. Lowell, along with Dr. Jay Lees, Professor of History at UNI, began their fieldwork, videotaping interviews with survivors and first responders. So far, they have interviewed more than 120 individuals. Their research will provide a highly valuable documentary film concerning the Tornado disaster in Parkersburg, Butler County, Iowa.

In the past decades, Dr. Lowell provided valuable services to anthropology, academia, the general public, UNI and local communities. She has always been an excellent mentor not only for our students but also for the junior faculty members in our department. I remember that she actively provided much guidance for me for my professional development in terms of teaching, research, and publication. I believe that our junior faculty members benefited from her support, guidance, and friendship enormously.

I believe that Dr. Lowell deserves recognition for her long, effective, and meritorious service to UNI and to the profession of anthropology with the title Emeritus Professor. I strongly recommend Dr. Lowell to you and the committee for your consideration for recognition as Professor Emeritus.

Very sincerely

Li Jian (Lee)

To whom it may concern

I am writing this letter in support of Dr. Julie Lowell's application for emeritus status here at UNI. I wholeheartedly support this and would like to say a few words to support my opinion.

Julie has been both a mentor, colleague and a friend since I arrived here almost 10 years ago. She showed me the ropes and guided me through my first few years. I am indebted to the service she provided in this manner.



Additionally, she has been a valuable asset to our anthropology program by offering classes in archaeology and advising interested students and majors.

She has always offered keen insight into departmental issues and debates.

Her anthropological research has always been superb and well received. Her archaeological studies have contributed to a larger knowledge of the prehispanic American southwest. Furthermore, her recent project about the Parkersburg tornado and how the subsequent social dilemma affected the community is nearing completion. I, as well as many other of my colleagues, look forward to seeing this wonderful research.

I see only a positive benefit in maintaining Dr. Lowell's presence in the Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology Department at UNI. She will continue her research, and act as a valued mentor and colleague.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely

Dr. Tyler O'Brien

Dear Dr. Peters,

I am writing this brief statement in support of Julie Lowell being granted emeritus status. In my opinion, Julie was one of UNI's top professors. Since she and I are both archaeologists we shared many of the same students, and I can say that students coming from her archaeology classes into mine were not only very well-versed in the discipline, but they were also enthusiastic about her teaching. I also know that she is an exceptional researcher, having published in *American Antiquity*, the leading journal in our field in addition to other publications. While Julie was working in our department, she also shouldered a lot of responsibility, taking the lead on many large projects like Student Outcomes Assessment. I consider Julie to be one of the best academics I have had the pleasure to know. Perhaps most importantly, in the decision to grant emeritus status, please note that it is my opinion, that like all true scholars, she is never done working. She has not retired and disappeared, but instead has much more work to do. In particular, she is passionate about her Tornado project, a unique scholarly endeavor that I think is of great importance to UNI in that it is an exemplary case of how the university can be of value to local communities and Iowa at large. So, in short, I admire Julie's exceptional work ethic and believe she most definitely deserves emeritus status.

Thank you,  
Don Gaff,  
Assistant Professor of Anthropology

Addendum 2 of 6

## **Testimonial for John T. Fecik**

Hello Scott,

As requested I have prepared a brief presentation of Dr. Fecik for his Professor Emeritus status.

Dr. John Fecik came to the University of Northern Iowa in 1982 to serve as Department Head and Professor for the Department of Industrial Technology. He stepped down to become a member of the faculty after serving as Head for 5 years. Dr. Fecik started his phased retirement in August 2007 and fully retired in May 2012.

During his tenure in the Department of Industrial Technology, Dr. Fecik was instrumental in developing the doctoral program. He lists this among his greatest accomplishments. Dr. Fecik also worked on research interests in the area of technology enhancement, innovation and assessment as well as instructional technology and methodology, content standards, benchmarks and authentic assessments in technical subject areas.

Dr. Fecik's knowledge and devotion will be greatly missed by both students and faculty as he pursues a life of leisure. We are thankful for the time he served in the Department of Industrial Technology (n/k/a Technology).

Sincerely,  
James Maxwell, Ph.D.

Department of Technology

## Addendum 3 of 6

### Testimonials for Kenneth J. De Nault

Dr. Scott Peters,

I'm sorry if this is late. I only just found out today. This is in regards to the consideration of Dr. DeNault for emeritus status.

I am a former student of Dr. DeNault and I would like to impress how important of an impact he has made on my life. Dr. DeNault is a fantastic professor because he not only teaches his students the material but also teaches us how to learn and think for ourselves. He doesn't just give us the answers to everything and expect us to memorize it but instead he gives us the general ideas and concepts that we need to know and allows us to make our own deductions. He always set high standards for all of his students and we all worked hard to live up to his expectations. He also was very helpful whenever any student had a question either in class or if they went to his office with questions. I feel like challenging professors like Dr. DeNault are the reason that I am currently a graduate student, because they taught me to work hard and were supportive of the students they taught.

Thank you for your time!

Christina Spielbauer

To Whom It May Concern:

Greetings and well wishes on behalf of myself and the UNI Earth Science Alumni. I am writing to you today to request "Emeritus Status" for my former professor, mentor, and grandfather figure; Dr. Kenneth De Nault. Dr. De Nault is the epitome of a great professor in that he uses the basic principles of education and amazing scientific fact to blow your mind and then push you to work harder and achieve more than you ever thought possible of yourself. My experiences with Dr. De Nault are some of my most precious college memories and no one has ever gotten me to work harder than that man did. When you thought you would never remember all the crystal structures that minerals could have, he kept pounding the basics into your head, adding more information each day, and going back to review on the following day and add more. When you thought that an A grade in a class that had a name you could barely pronounce was impossible, he showed you that it was not only possible but expected. Most importantly, Dr. De Nault saw a greatness in me that I didn't see myself. He encouraged me to be serious in my studies and to approach learning with curiosity and experimentation. These are things that I try to encourage in every student and every classroom that I visit as a Naturalist. I can never thank him enough for believing in me and therefor helping me believe in myself. It is because of great professors that we become great students and emerge great citizens. He taught us to question the world around us and form knowledgeable conclusions. He taught us how to investigate and solve problems in a unique way. He

pushed his students, commanded their respect, and still made time to Skype with his grand daughters.

Dr. Kenneth De Nault is a great man and a wonderful professor. Please consider him for Emeritus status in his retirement from UNI. It is with a heavy heart that I see our beloved department being dismantled. I only wish the best for the former teachers and students who were a part of something truly great. The UNI Earth Science/Geology Department was a rare gem in what can seem like a giant cave. Small class sizes, field experiences and some of the most interesting and well traveled professors I have ever met to this day inspired us around every corner. They deserve the best from us as they gave us the best of themselves.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.  
Best regards,

Molly L. Hanson  
Naturalist, Madison County Conservation Board

Dr. C. Scott Peters  
Faculty Senate Chair  
University of Northern Iowa

September 6, 2012

Dear Dr. Peters,

I would like to strongly recommend Dr. Kenneth J. De Nault for Emeritus Status at the University of Northern Iowa. Ken De Nault was one of the three founders of the Geology Program at the University of Northern Iowa, along with Emeritus Professor Wayne I. Anderson, and James C. Walters, a program which was evaluated by the external reviewers for the 2012 Academic Program Review as "...the ideal model of teacher-scholars by their dedication to teaching, research, and involving their students in collaborative research." Dr. De Nault was an integral part of this quality program which was prematurely closed in spring 2012.

Ken De Nault's career at UNI began in the fall of 1973, immediately following his Ph. D. studies in geology at Stanford University. For 39 years he taught students in a variety of courses including the General Education/Liberal Arts Core course of *Physical Geology*, and the advanced geology courses including *Systematic Mineralogy*, *Crystallography*, *Structural Geology*, *Optical Mineralogy and Petrology*, *Continental Drift*, *Volcanology*, *Earthquakes and Tsunamis*, *Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology* and the Capstone course *Environment, Technology and Society*. The geology courses were critical for the success of our students, many of whom have gone on to excellent careers in academia,

the petroleum industry and in the public sector. Ken held his students to high expectations, and although they may have complained about the difficult work load at the time, they would later appreciate how well those high standards prepared them for later success in life. The students were also not aware of the time an effort Dr. De Nault spent preparing for and teaching these laboratory intensive courses. In a typical semester he would have 14 contact hours or more. In the spring 2012 semester, Ken had two upper level geology courses and an Honors Seminar course for a total of 16 contact hours.

Dr. De Nault's research ran a gamut of topics including uranium deposits, volcanic features on other planets, and the uses of computers to teach students geology. The computer programs he first wrote in the 1980's are still used by the students he teaches today in his *Crystallography* course. Most of his recent research has been done in collaboration with undergraduates as part of their required work in the Geology B.S. program, and has been presented by the students at conferences such as the Iowa Space Grant Consortium, the Iowa Academy of Science and the Geological Society of America. Ken has also taken the time to assist non-geology majors learn about crystallography or mineral analysis, and has had students from Chemistry, Technology and the Environmental Science programs in special courses designed to meet their needs for research or learning about the specialized lab equipment.

Perhaps the most eagerly awaited course that Ken taught was the *Spring Trip or Field Studies* course. These courses involved extensive preparation before the trip and a fully immersive experience during the trip – unlike other trips where students were passive tourists, Ken's trips were completely "hands-on". Students made observations, obtained samples, and were required to pack and keep the tents clean. Ken also kept the trips affordable, which was one of the reasons they would be camping in northern New Mexico in March, and occasionally wake up to 6-inches of new snow. New Mexico and Wyoming were favorite destinations, but more elaborate trips also took place, usually to a locale with volcanoes. Students were able to walk across the relatively warm lava of Hawaii's volcanoes, pick up sulfur rocks that had been expelled from the volcanoes of southern Italy, and ride horseback across the moai strewn hills of Rapa Nui (Easter Island). While these trips were primarily centered upon geology, there was always a strong historical, cultural and/or anthropological aspect to the course. Students not only scaled up Mt. Etna, but they also were able to walk down the streets of Pompeii and tour the St. Peter's Basilica. The geology of New Mexico was only the background to the Pueblo peoples ancestral home at Chaco Canyon. Each of these trips were opportunities for a true liberal arts education for UNI students.

Dr. De Nault's dedication to his students and their learning is also reflected in his dedication to various community activities. From 1997 to 2007 Ken was honored to have as his traveling companion a wolf named Buck, which his daughter brought to his attention during her veterinarian studies. Buck had been abused for years previously to his coming under Ken's care, and during the time they were together Ken took Buck to many schools, youth programs, care centers and community events to educate people

about wolves. More than 275,000 people, mainly children, learned about wolves as they traveled around the state and beyond. Ken was particularly keen to have Buck available for presentations to abused children, and would often talk about how those presentations had a positive impact on youngsters who had also experienced harsh childhoods.

In recent years the Waterloo Community Playhouse and the Blackhawk Children's Theatre have been aided by Ken's management skills, as a member of the Board of Directors and as the Treasurer, and his acting skills. He has appeared in numerous productions and actively promotes their shows. He was also instrumental in helping the theatre recover from the 2008 floods, for which he was presented with the Mayors Volunteer awards from Cedar Falls, Waterloo and Evansdale Mayors, as well as the Governor's Rebuild Iowa Award in 2010. He has also received awards for his volunteer work from the Community of Cedar Falls and the Salvation Army several times over the past few years.

During the past 39 years Dr. De Nault was able to travel to every continent of the earth, often to obtain information, and pictures of geologic features, particularly volcanoes and bring that back to the classroom or to presentations to community groups. When he talked about Mount Kilimanjaro, it wasn't using a picture provided by the textbook publisher, but his own images that he had obtained while hiking up the slopes. The pictures of gorillas in Rwanda were not downloaded from the internet, but obtained while he was a few feet from them. His personal experiences in Antarctica, the Galapagos Islands or Mongolia provided meaningful context to his lectures and public presentations. Each year his talks were a memorable experience for current Earth Science Educators who attended the department's annual Up-date Conference. Ken's active nature also expanded into race car driving, at which he has excelled, winning the regional championship 7 years in a row.

The closure of the geology program has resulted in the premature retirement of a truly remarkable man, who worked tirelessly to provide students with an exceptional educational experience. While some were more concerned about the quantity of students impacted by faculty in programs across campus, I can honestly say that the quality of the classroom, laboratory, research mentorship and field trip experience that Dr. Kenneth De Nault had upon students at this institution is truly immeasurable.

Sincerely,

Dr. Siobahn Morgan  
Colleague of Dr. Kenneth De Nault  
Head, Department of Earth Science

Addendum 4 of 6

**Undergraduate Programs with Low Graduations Rates That Were Not Closed, Suspended, or Restructured.** (Data assembled by Betty DeBerg from “A Report by the UNI Office of Institutional Research and the Office of the Registrar – January 2012,” which was distributed to the Senate spring semester, 2012.)

Undergraduate Programs with graduation rates under ten that were **not** closed, suspended, or restructured

College of Business Administration

Real estate-Business minor	6.4	average # of graduates per year
over five years		
Real estate minor	3.8	
Chemistry-Marketing major	2.2	
Business teaching major	4.2	

College of Education

Physical Ed-Elem. Teaching minor	0.2	
Special ed-teaching:instruct. Strategist I:5-12	1.2	
Special ed-teaching:instruct strategist II	0.0	
Health ed-teaching minor	3.8	
Health promotion minor	3.2	
Leisure, youth & human svcs minor	6.0	

College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences

Art:studio B.F.A.	6.4	
Art minor	8.6	
Political communication major	5.0	
Comm studies (liberal arts) minor	8.0	
English minor	5.6	
English-teaching minor	0.4	
Philosophy minor	1.8	
Religion minor	6.4	
Music composition-theory major	0.6	
Music performance major	4.4	
Jazz studies minor	2.6	
Music minor	7.2	
Biology major (B.S.)	5.4	
Biology-teaching major	4.0	
Biology minor	6.4	

Biology-teaching	0.4	
Biochemistry major (B.S.)	4.8	
Chemistry major (B.S.)		3.0
Biochemistry major (B.A.)	1.2	
Chemistry major (B.A.)		3.6
Chemistry-teaching major	1.2	
Chemistry-teaching minor	0.4	
Computer science major (B.S.)		5.4
Networking & system admin major (B.S.)	0.8	
Computer science minor	1.2	
Earth science major	7.4	
Earth science-teaching major	4.4	
Earth science minor	1.8	
Earth science-teaching minor	0.8	
Technology ed-teaching		9.0
Electrical & electronics tech minor	0.4	
Graphic technology minor	0.0	
Manufacturing tech design minor	0.0	
Technology ed & training-teaching minor	0.0	
Technology management minor		6.6
Mathematics major	6.0	
Mathematics minor	5.4	
Mathematics-teaching minor	1.2	
Statistics & actuarial science minor	3.2	
Nanoscience & nanotechnology minor		0.0
Physics minor	1.0	
All science teaching major (B.A.)		5.0
Middle-jr high science teaching major		1.4
Basic science (K-8)-teaching minor	6.0	

#### College of Social & Behavioral Sciences

Geographic information science major (B.S.)		0.8
Geography-liberal arts minor	3.0	
History minor	8.8	
International affairs-liberal arts minor		9.2
Political science-liberal arts minor	8.2	
Anthropology minor	4.8	
Gerontology major (B.A.)	7.6	
Family studies minor	3.8	
Gerontology minor	3.6	
Textiles & Apparel minor	3.4	
Social science-teaching major-plan A-specialist		5.8



Interdisciplinary

International business minor	1.6	
International business minor (non-bus majors)		0.2
Military science minor		1.0

Addendum 5 of 6

### **Nominees for Budget Committee**

Committee consists of 4 faculty members elected by Senate, plus one senator. Three year rotating terms.

Faculty nominees:

Adam Butler (CSBS--Psych)\*

Russ Campbell (CHAS--Math)\*

Joe Gorton (CSBS--Soc/Anth/Crim)

Hans Isakson (CBA--Econ)

Chris Martin (CHAS--Communications)

John Burtis (CHAS--Communications)

Bill Callahan (CoE--Special Ed)

\* Elected by college to serve on previous incarnation of committee

Addendum 6 of 6

**Academic Misconduct Panel Membership**

Approved by University Faculty Senate September 10, 2012

NOTE: Members of the panel are not eligible to be selected to an inquiry or investigation committee while they are serving in an administrative capacity. Also, CHAS will be asked to submit two additional names from the Fine and Applied Arts area.

**CSBS:**

Dennis Dahms (Geography)  
Lou Fenech (History)  
Cathy DeSoto (Psychology)  
Helen Harton (Psychology)  
Mitch Strauss (School of Applied Human Sciences)  
Kris Mack (Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology)

**CHAS:**

Chris Martin (Communications)  
Dawn DelCarlo (Chemistry)  
Cate Palczewski (Communications)  
Kirk Manfredi (Chemistry)  
Doug Shaw (Math)  
Francis Degnin (Philosophy and World Religions)  
Jeff Elbert (Chemistry)

**CoE:**

Elena Joram (Ed Psych)  
Ping Gao (Curriculum & Instruction)  
Bill Callahan (Special Education)  
Lynn Countryman (Office of Student Field Experiences)  
Rod Dieser (HPELS)  
Suzanne Freedman (Ed Psych)  
Tony Gabriel (Ed Psych)  
Robin Lund (HPELS)  
Charles McNulty (Ed. Leadership & Postsecondary Ed)  
Audrey Rule (Curriculum & Instruction)

Jennifer Waldron (HPELS)

Windee Weiss (HPELS)

**CBA**

Mary Christ (Accounting)

Mike Klassen (Marketing)

Gerald Smith (Accounting)

Bulent Uyar (Economics)

Kenneth McCormick (Economics)