

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
09/27/10 (3:15 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.)

Summary of main points

This summary is organized into a coherent order, which is not that of the actual meeting, a full transcript of which follows this summary

1. Minutes in draft form from the 09/13/10 meeting were approved (**Smith / East**) Full minutes to be approved when they are prepared

2. Courtesy announcements from Senate Chair **Wurtz (Gibson and Jurgenson)** had no comments; press not present)

3. The following item was docketed from the calendar:

952 Emeritus status request, Clifford L. **Highnam**, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, effective December 2009, regular order (**Neuhaus / Terlip**)

4. Informal Consideration Items

4.A. Appointment of Facilities Planning Committee members from the Senate

4.B. Direct the Vice Chair of the Senate, rather than the Chair of the Senate, to communicate with the Faculty Committees, such as the LACC, and Faculty Senate Committees, such as the Budget Committee

5. Quasi-Committee of the Whole Items (these recommendations are to be calendared and docketed for formal adoption)

5.A. From a Committee on Committees memo of 18 January 2010, in response to pressing solicitations from the Chair of the Senate, the Quasi-Committee of the Whole recommends that **the Graduate**

Curriculum Committee make annual, formal report to the Faculty Senate

5.B. From a Committee on Committees memo of 18 January 2010, in response to pressing solicitations from the Chair of the Senate, the Quasi-Committee of the Whole recommends that the **Advisory Committee for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching** be renamed the ***Committee for the Enhancement of Teaching***

6. Docketed items:

946 Emeritus status request, Maribelle **Betterton**, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, effective 05/10, regular order (**Funderburk / Van Wormer**) **passed**

947 Emeritus status request, Jeannie **Steele**, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, effective 06/10, regular order (**Smith / Soneson**) **passed**

948 Receive Category 5 Review submitted by Liberal Arts Core Committee (**Smith / Soneson**) **passed**

949 Receive Category 2A Review submitted by Liberal Arts Core Committee (**Soneson / Funderburk**) **passed**

950 Receive 2008-2009 Liberal Arts Core Annual Report Review submitted by the Liberal Arts Core Committee (**Deberg / Terlip**) **passed**

951 Approve Motion from Senators **DeBerg** and **Terlip** on forming an ad hoc committee to draft recommendations regarding future administrative changes within academic units, moved to the head of the docket for the next meeting **Held until next meeting**

Adjournment

**FULL MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
09/27/10
1685**

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Betty DeBerg, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, James Jurgenson, Michael Lacari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Jerry Soneson, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

ABSENT: Gregory Bruess, Forrest Dolgener, Marilyn Shaw, Jerry Smith

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Wurtz noted that the senators received electronically the brief, draft minutes of the 09/13/10 meeting. After having had a chance to review them, **Wurtz** asked for any additions and corrections. **DeBerg** was recognized, asking who made the motion to extend the 09/13/10 meeting by 5 minutes. **East** noted it was he. **Funderburk** was recognized and commented that under the Provost Comments it is more correct to say "President of United Faculty" rather than "Chair." Also, under the comments from **Wurtz** it says that the government structure is "attached," but it does not seem to be. **Wurtz** explained that she put the content at the end and will delete the word attached. This format uses less memory. **DeBerg** asked about the venn diagrams she would like to have attached and had understood that those might be attached. Either attach them or delete the wording. **Wurtz** agreed to adding those diagrams to the minutes but not as a PowerPoint because of the space issue. She will attach it in another form and will leave the word "attached." **Funderburk** also questioned the wording that **Wurtz** would serve as a "talking head for the Master Agreement." He remembered something different than "for the Master Agreement" and wanted clarification. **Wurtz** replied that in terms

of representing information that it would not be any of it her information. That it would simply be a representation verbatim. **Funderburk** thought that she had meant she would be a talking head for the Senate or for the point. **Wurtz** clarified that, no, she was not to present any information from the Master Agreement other than verbatim from the Master Agreement. Call for any other additions, deletions, or corrections. Hearing none, the Chair asked for a motion to approve these minutes. Senator **Funderburk** so moved. Second by Senator **Neuhaus**. Vote called. Passed.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press were in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON

Provost Gibson had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JURGENSON

Faculty Chair Jurgenson had no comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR WURTZ

Wurtz had an update from the Board of Regents meeting. It was exactly what they had anticipated. She quoted verbatim from the Master Agreement as shown on the slides at the last Faculty Senate meeting and which are added at the end of those minutes for 09/13/10. There were no questions directed to her. The Board seemed to understand that they cannot ask for any discussion of the contract other than in negotiations, so it was merely a presentation of the contents. There were questions for UI and ISU. They were more a matter of the detail on how their processes

were applied. This was considered an interim report. The Board will ask for the final report. The Iowa State representative pushed for postponing the final report until April, partially reasoning that UNI needs to successfully make it through contract negotiations before talking about anything in a meaningful manner. Board members seemed to agree. So the Senate will return to this in the spring.

Update on the Senate webpage: it almost went live last week. Chair Wurtz has a renewed respect for how incredibly complex the system is for a working webpage from her sessions with the staff of the Production House.

Wurtz explained that in getting out the Agenda for this meeting she pushed to do so early and, in her haste, sent it to the incorrect mailing list. She had meant to send it just to the Senate as it had all of the editing comments. She takes full responsibility for the error and was happy to only hear from 2 people as to its inappropriateness of the several hundred who received it. She promised to pay more attention in the future.

Wurtz asked the status of hiring clerical assistance. **Gibson** noted that a temp agency has offered candidates, one of whom is a former UNI employee, so someone should be in place soon. **Wurtz** mentioned a whole new appreciation for former secretary Dena and the myriad details which she took care of in her 10 years of service that made things run smoothly.

Wurtz gave update on the Faculty Senate office. One has been procured in Baker. The computer needs some technical work. Not everything has been moved in, and already someone else is wanting the same space. She has agreed to possibly moving if another space can be found with the criteria of accessibility (not an interior office) and location (on central campus). Morris **Mikkelsen** sent an e-mail that this request has been put on the Facilities Planning and Advisory list, saying they will be looking to see what they can find for a Faculty Senate office.

Soneson was recognized who asked where the office is located. **Wurtz** explained that it is a lovely corner office with windows on two sides, Baker 174. **Soneson** said it used to be the Humanities office, and **Wurtz** noted that the Holocaust and Genocide group hopes to have the space, which would be ideal for them and that the Faculty Senate can be flexible if another appropriate space can be found.

Wurtz updated on the posting by the Senate for a parliamentarian. She has received no response, either by phone or by e-mail. Victoria **DeFrancisco** has said she will poll graduate students coming out of Forensics programs to see if any have interest. **Soneson** noted that a nomination had been made. **Wurtz** replied that, yes, she has a nomination but no application. To apply, an individual need only contact her via phone or e-mail expressing interest and stating qualifications. The notice has been posted, and she is waiting to hear of interest. **Wurtz** noted that although a parliamentarian has not yet been hired, the Senate will now follow Robert's Rules of Order as best possible.

BUSINESS

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1054 for Docket #952, an Emeritus Status Request from Clifford L. **Highnam**, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, to be effective December 2009.

Neuhaus moved to docket this request in regular order. 2nd by **Terlip**.
Vote called. Passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Returning to an item of discussion from the last meeting, **DeBerg** has found she is unable to serve on the Facilities Planning Advisory

Committee due to a time conflict with their meeting time. Call for another volunteer to serve once a month, Thursday afternoons, on this fun committee. No volunteers came forward. **Wurtz** stated that the Senate could reply that they wished to respectfully decline to send a second delegate. Discussion involved noting that many teach on Thursday afternoons and a wondering of which specific Thursdays might be involved, with the offering of perhaps the 3rd Thursday at 3:00 or 3:30 p.m. until 5:00. **Gibson** noted that it is very important to have academic representation on that committee. **Soneson** agreed and said he was willing to serve the one-year remainder of the open position

Wurtz recognized Emma Hashman who stated that the next meeting of the Facilities Planning Advisory Board is 10/07/10 at 3:30 p.m. **Wurtz** noted that she would forward the names of both **Breitbach**, who volunteered last meeting, and **Soneson**.

Moving on, **Wurtz** spoke of going back through last year's activity (opens Excel document for projection). There are several calendar items which went back to committee and never were docketed. Rules may need to be suspended to fix these, but she would like a motion to docket this. **East** moved docket it at the head of the order. It was seconded, no discussion, motion passed.

Wurtz next asked for a motion to suspend the rules to take care of emeritus status first. **Breitbach** so moved. 2nd by **Hotek**. Passed.

DOCKET 946, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, BETTERTON

Wurtz stated the presence of the Emeritus Status Request from Maribelle **Betterton**, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, effective 5/31/10. Call for a motion to endorse that request. **Neuhaus** so moved. **DeBerg** seconded. **Wurtz** read from the request form for Assistant Professor **Betterton**: "I had 20 or more years of credible service in higher education." She was also required to list the institutions and the dates of employment. The College Senate included a statement verifying that 10

years of meritorious service had been included. This form shows the signature of the College Senate Chair saying that, yes, she has at least 10 years of meritorious service. The Department Head also signed it, as well as the Dean of the College.

East spoke in favor of emeritus status for Maribelle **Betterton**. She served admirably at the Lab School for a number of years and taught one of his daughters and survived that, so she deserves emeritus status (laughter). Passed with two abstentions.

DOCKET 947, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, STEELE

Moving to Docketed Item 947, Emeritus Status Request for Jeannie **Steele**. **Neuhaus** moved to approve this Emeritus Status Request. **Hotek** seconded. **Neuhaus** was given the floor to speak first as to the merits of this request. He stated that he did not come prepared but that he does know Jeannie **Steele** rather well. He worked with her for a number of years in Eastern Europe where she was quite active in developing educational programs in areas where they were lacking. She worked well with colleagues from a number of different locations within the College, and he feels she represented some of the best that we have to offer here at UNI. **Lowell** (?) agreed with the perception that **Steele** was a consummate educator. No further discussion; motion passed with one abstention.

DOCKET XXX, CONSULTATIVE SESSION, COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE'S REPORT

Melissa **Beall** began by reminding the Senate that she sent everyone an updated version of the Committee on Committees Report as she had it. She did not replace Beverly **Kopper**'s name with her own name once, apparently missing it on find-and-replace. Another error is located on page 4 where Barbara **Cutter** should read Diedra Heistad . Those are the only two corrections other than that Gayle Pohl does serve as the Graduate Representative to the Faculty Strategic Planning Committee,

again on page 4, and her term is up next year. This is her third term on that committee. Those listed in color indicate that there are two elections yet to be held. One is the non-voting member for the Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council, and she has just one nominee for that. The other is the non-voting member of the Faculty Senate where she thinks she has someone who will let her know yet this week whether he will do that, and then she will run the elections through UNI On-line.

Wurtz projected a file and apologized for not getting it done in time to send it to others. She explained that she used the webpage and the report received to show the committees now listed, to whom they report, when they report, the title of the committee, and the description of the charge. She has noted recommended changes from the memo in red and in blue, and her own questions she has highlighted in yellow. She hopes this listing will help while the speaker goes through her report. **Beall** continued by noting that she did not have student member names. She talked with Emma Hashman who will provide her with the names of student members because the temporary Chair of the Educational Policies Commission emailed asking for the names of the student members, and she has never received those. Five committees have student members. All student positions are filled, and Emma will forward to her those names so that it will be included. **Beall** did talk with Dewayne **Purdy** in Marketing and Public Relations, and he said he would make the changes of updating and removing those committees that no longer exist as noted on last year's report. She asked for questions about the recommendations.

Wurtz at this point temporarily suspended Robert's Rules of Order, asking for a conversation instead with **Beall** about the issues. **Lowell** asked for the status of the Budget Committee because there is a request to make it active again. **Beall** replied that that committee has not met for many years, and the Committee on Committees recommended that the Faculty Senate Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committees be collapsed, because they were both set up for certain circumstances by Provosts who wanted input from faculty and then have languished since. She noted that Frank **Thompson** last year attempted to have the University Budget

Committee meet but failed to have anyone respond. **Lowell** noted that current discussion asks that those two committees be separated again. **Beall** stated that they are now separate. **Lowell** continued by saying that the Senate is considering reactivating the Budget Committee on the recommendation of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. **Terlip** interjected that she feels the request was to change the committee's charge because the previous charge was not effective, so keep the committee but provide it with a new charge. **Lowell** agreed and stated that this request from CSBS cannot be ignored. **Beall** said that now is the time to take care of this and that she will do as they ask--will put it in writing.

Wurtz reinstated Robert's and asked for a motion to approve the recommendations received from the Committee on Committees in the January 18 memo. The Chair recognized the Provost who wished to make a point of order. **Gibson** noted she felt confusion. She asked if these committees in the report are the committees of the Faculty Senate? She felt confusion between looking at the two items presented--the report and the projected summary. **Beall** clarified that the report she sent to everyone is identified as *Committees That Report Directly to Faculty Senate* and *Committees That Do Not Report Directly to Faculty Senate or Are Not Required to Report to Faculty Senate* but where elections are held. She has combined those for convenience. **Terlip** noted that the Senate has two documents before them. One deals with accepting the Committee's report on membership. The second document from December is the Committee on Committee's suggestions for how it should re-do committees. She moved to divide the question and moved that the Senate accept the membership report that **Beall** sent forward for 2010-2011. 2nd by **Funderburk**. The Chair called for discussion on the merits of receiving the report. Hearing none, vote was called. Passed. The Chair thanked **Beall** and her committee for their hard work on the report.

The Chair noted that the Committee on Committees has brought the Senate recommendations asked for. She called for a motion to make the recommended changes, noting that this does not indicate a blanket

acceptance but that it gives the opportunity to discuss them recommendation by recommendation and address what the Senate would like to do with the Report. **Wurtz** recognized **Terlip** who stated that if the Senate is in the process of having to restructure faculty governance given the merger of two colleges, then the Senate will be looking at committee membership across the board. She appreciates these recommendations but, if they are going to pass all the changes in committee structure, then it needs to be a much larger issue so it will not have to be re-visited in the near future.

The Chair asked again for a motion to follow the recommendations from the Committee and a second so that discussion of the merits of the recommendations can take place. **Soneson** moved that the Senate receive the recommendations of the Committee on Committees. **Terlip** seconded to receive the recommendations. The Chair called for discussion on the merits of receiving the recommendations of the Committee on Committees. **East** clarified that that simply meant getting the report. The Chair agreed. **Soneson** agreed with **Terlip** that with the coming reconsideration of committees as the result of the combining of two colleges that any work done now on committee restructure may simply have to be re-visited. It might save a lot of time and problems if the Senate simply received the recommendations, and hold them, and then bring them out again when it is time to think comprehensively about committees.

Provost **Gibson** questioned whether the current discussion distinguishes between committees that submit a report to the Faculty Senate versus Faculty Senate committees. Or is there no difference? **Beall**, who reminded the Senate that she, with co-chair Carol **Cooper** prior to her retirement, had had to reconstruct things by going back years to find out which committees had elected faculty representation who report to the Faculty Senate, and that is shown on the first 4 pages, plus the University Writing Committee. Those are the ones that the Committee on Committees has asked to go to the college faculty senates to obtain replacements where they are due. In the past, she has highlighted the

committee, the position, and the person, and has told the college faculty senate chair and the departmental or college secretary that these are the people they need to replace. These first committees are the committees that report to the Faculty Senate. The others do not necessarily report to the Faculty Senate, although the Senate may have input, from what she has heard. They may report what they are doing only.

Associate Provost **Licari** clarified that the question is that, from among those committees that are listed as being required to report to the Faculty Senate, in that subset of committees there is a subset of committees that are indeed the Senate's own committees basically. For example, University Faculty Senate Budget Committee is a subcommittee of the Senate, whereas the Liberal Arts Core Committee is not. That is the question, and it must be made very clear what is a subcommittee of the Senate or what is not. Because simply reporting to the Senate is not the substance here. The substance is whether or not they are of the Senate, essentially, or whether at the end of the year are simply required to file a report to the Senate. That means, for example, the Liberal Arts Core Committee might not want to meet in front of the Senate or be interested in changing their actions. But the Faculty Senate Budget Committee expressly is designed to formulate Faculty Senate positions on the University Budget.

Jurgenson questioned the validity of what **Licari** just said. He asked, "Is not the curriculum the purview of the faculty?" **Licari** agreed but noted that the Liberal Arts Core Committee is not a Faculty Senate subcommittee. **Jurgenson** asked, "Then whose is it?" **Licari** stated that it is a faculty-elected committee. **DeBerg** noted that the Liberal Arts Core Committee reports to the Faculty Senate and that it cannot do anything unless the Senate votes on any of its motions. Therefore, she has a hard time understanding why the Liberal Arts Core Committee is not a Senate committee, even if it is through the Curriculum Committee.

Funderburk asked who created the Liberal Arts Core Committee? **Beall** stated she had no idea, perhaps the Faculty Senate, but likely she would

have to go back 25 years or so. **Neuhaus** suggested that probably some of this needs to await eventual digitization unless somebody has more time than he does. The digitization of a number of records will eventually happen, but he is unsure whether Faculty Senate records will or will not. Records do go back a ways, and collective memories are not always reliable, but perhaps, too, there is a statute of limitations. Current practice is sometimes the best choice when things are done under certain assumptions; otherwise, if answers to some questions are even there, they are buried pretty deep. Even choosing what years to review and doing it manually is a really big task.

Neuhaus asked whether there was anyone present who knew of a committee who would suffer if the Senate delayed appointments or following through on one of the recommendations. Would there be deleterious effects? **Beall** replied that from her read of things and from her talking with College Faculty Senate chairs, those committees are operating. She is unsure how many have met, but, for example, the Educational Policies Commission is meeting this week and again next week. They have some charges left from last year. The Committee just did not have student members, and she needed to find out who the student members are so she can tell the temporary chair.

Terlip said that if the group were to look at the Constitution and the By-laws for the Senate, it talks about the committee structure. Under #6 under By-laws, "Committees of the Senate and the Faculty. All standing committees of the faculty and all ad hoc faculty committees shall report to and be accountable to the Senate." She continued saying that they have been around a while. They are standing committees, and right now they are all accountable to the Senate. The Senate could choose to change that or whatever. Continuing to read, "Committees of the faculty which normally report to the Senate shall be accountable to the Senate as the faculty's delegate. They can schedule regular or special reports." It tells what can be done. Then there is another section, which is "Committees of the Senate," and those committees are specified as well in terms of the kinds of things that they can do. **Terlip** thinks that what **Beall's** report

does is contain all of those, but they all are under the governance of the Senate due to the Constitution and the By-Laws.

Beall stated that on that Liberal Arts Core Committee she did seek out Joel **Haack** who once served as the Chair of the Committee, and he said that it was one of those that does report to the Senate and that it should be listed there. She noted that it was a quagmire. When she asked Dewayne **Purdy** to do make these changes, he said, "My condolences on trying to deal with this quagmire."

DeBerg stated that as she sees the problem, she thinks there should be a distinction between which committees are faculty-driven and which committees are administratively-driven. That seems the most important decision. For instance, listed is the Advisory Committee for Inter-Collegiate Athletics, and she does not believe it is a faculty-driven committee. She believes it is an administratively-driven committee and asked if it has ever reported to the Senate? **Terlip** replied that, yes, it has years ago because at that time the NCAA required them to report to the Senate.

East wished to clarify that his understanding is that the Senate is considering whether or not to receive the report from the Committee on Committees dated January 18, 2009, which had some recommendations. So discussion of the committee membership is superfluous to the question of whether or not the Senate should receive this particular report. **East** would suggest that it does not matter whether the Senate receives it or not. By receiving it, the Senate is doing nothing about it. By not receiving it, the Senate is doing nothing about it. It feels pointless, he stated, to be going in circles when no action will be taken either way.

Breitbach stated that several senators felt that it was important for this report to come to the Senate because of concern last spring about making recommendations and working with the administration to address some of the budget issues. Therefore, receiving this report and taking some action on it she feels is in the Senate's best interest. She feels that the Senate

should have a conversation about how it can work with the Administration, how the faculty can be more proactive about making recommendations about how the budget aligns with the strategic plan to make this university a stronger, more viable entity.

Wurtz asked for any others who wished to speak for or against the merits of receiving this set of recommendations. **DeBerg** called the question. 2nd by _____. Motion to call the question passed. The Chair then asked for all in favor of receiving this set of recommendations from the Committee on Committees with great thanks for the work that they have put into it to please say "aye." Motion passed with 1 abstention.

Wurtz stated that the Senate has now received the recommendations from the Committee on Committees' Chair **Beall** and asked if someone wished to make a motion either to accept the recommendations as a whole, have a second, and then discuss the merits of each recommendation or to make a motion to divide the question and to take it recommendation by recommendation. Another option would be to move on to the next docketed item.

Funderbunk moved to accept the first recommendation that the Graduate Curriculum Committee should make formal, annual reports to the Faculty Senate. 2nd by **DeBerg**. **Funderbunk** said that it just seems like a totally reasonable thing that the Graduate Curriculum Committee report annually to the Senate so that senators know what is going on in those areas. **Terlip** noted that, according to the document, currently the Graduate Curriculum Committee reports to the University Curriculum Committee. **Terlip** asked if the Committee will have to make that report as well, or is it the same report? She is agreeable of having the report come to the Faculty Senate, but she does not want to make extra work for that Committee. **Beall** stated that her impression was that it would be the same report, that their report going to the University Curriculum Committee would also go to the Faculty Senate.

Hotek wished to remind the Senate that the Committee on Committees voted unanimously to have the Graduate Curriculum Committee turn in formal reports to the Senate. **DeBerg** described her experience on the Liberal Arts Core Committee that does submit annual reports. She feels it is a good thing for a committee to have to look back over the year's minutes, to summarize what was done, and to think about what might be accomplished the next year. Because it is a worthwhile process, she is in favor of this recommendation that the Committee on Committees has made.

East noted that he assumed that the two reports would not be the same. Currently, the Graduate Curriculum Committee's report to the University Curriculum Committee consists of approved curricular packets, and it makes no sense for them to present that same report to the Senate, if it is part of the University Curriculum Committee's report to the Senate. Perhaps their report to the Senate would summarize what they did or why they did things or the making of recommendations about things they would do differently, unless the Senate would have them report directly to the Senate for approval of graduate curriculum rather than to the University Curriculum Committee, which presumably would require a revision of the curriculum process.

Soneson asked **Beall** to provide the logic and arguments of the Committee on Committees as to why a separate, formal report should be sent to the Senate. **Beall** stated that there was a feeling among Committee members that they did not know enough about the curricular process within the Graduate Program. Call was made for any other arguments for or against or for the questions for the Committee expert. Hearing none, vote was called for all in favor of accepting the Committee on Committees recommendation that the Senate will ask the Graduate Curriculum Committee to make a formal, annual report to the Senate, later working out the time of year for this report to arrive, to please say "aye." Motion passed with 1 abstention.

East moved that the Senate approve item 3 of the recommendations, which is to change the name of the Advisory Committee for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching to the Advisory Committee for Enhancement of Teaching. 2nd by ____ ____.

East noted that because the University no longer has a Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and yet finds it important to enhance teaching, the name can be changed to reflect the current situation. **Soneson** asked who the Committee advises? **Beall** responded that the Committee's thought was that, although the University no longer has the Center, it still has a need for the sharing of teaching ideas because UNI prides itself on being a teaching institution and on working for the student and on educating the student and that there needed to be some way to formalize the ways that faculty talk about teaching across disciplines and across campus. The Chair recognized **Soneson** as an extension to the question he raised, and he stated that because it is an "advisory" committee, who is being advised? Is the Faculty Senate being advised? Or is the Provost being advised? Or is the College of Education being advised, or perhaps the full faculty body? And how would they be advised? **Beall** replied that the Committee would come up with recommendations for implementing enhancement. For example, if there is an activity in HPELS or COE where they want to talk about teaching strategies that might be helpful to those in CHAFA or CNS/SBS or CBB, then the Committee would set up those kinds of events so that there could be meetings--brown bag luncheons or whatever. It would report to this body, but they would be publicized throughout the University so that there is an emphasis on teaching.

DeBerg noted that she was struck by **Soneson's** close reading of the committee name, and she would like there to be people on campus thinking about how all can improve their teaching; consequently, she wanted to offer an amendment to #3. The new name would simply be the "Committee for the Enhancement of Teaching," removing the term "Advisory" because there seems to be no direct, logical subject. **DeBerg** was asked and agreed that this could serve as a friendly amendment rather than a new motion. **Wurtz** asked **East** if he would accept this as a

friendly amendment. **East** agreed as did the original seconder, _____.
Vote called for accepting the friendly amendment. Passed.

Breitbach stated that she understands that this committee was formed by the Provost when the grant was originally obtained to start the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching. She would like to see that Committee work more closely with the Administration for enhancing teaching at UNI. No further discussion. The motion that the Senate accept the recommendation to rename the Advisory Committee for the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching to the Committee for the Enhancement of Teaching and to charge the committee with responsibility for assessing the needs and providing direct coordination of activities, workshops, speakers, faculty discussion, and also for providing a forum for the enhancement of teaching. Passed.

East moved that the Senate approve recommendation #5 where someone, perhaps the Committee on Committees, designates a person to call an organizational meeting early in the Fall semester for all standing committees. 2nd by **Funderburk**. **East** stated that some of the committees do not have particular tasks; sometimes faculty do not place that work in their planning, so something like this would be useful. It would not be a hard thing to do, but it does require that someone do it. It might be a responsibility of the Faculty Senate, at the first meeting of the Faculty Senate every Fall that one of their activities is to notify each committee that they should meet and to select a chair, if one has not yet been selected, or whatever, and report back to the Faculty Senate who the chair or contact person is. This seems reasonable, he stated. He also noted that if recommendation #5 is approved, then the Senate does not need to worry about recommendation #4 because that would be one of the committees that no one would have to worry about getting going again. **Beall** offered that the report was written before the Writing Committee actually did get reorganized.

DeBerg stated that she thinks it should be a little more specific about who should do this. It will be a big job to contact people on all these

committees, telling them to get together or asking someone to convene it. So she would like the recommendation to be more specific about who is assigned this job annually, whether it be the Committee on Committees or whoever. **Beall** acknowledged that it is a very time-consuming job. She called 4 committees together last year, found the room, got them to meet, led them for an election of a chair, and it takes a great deal of time that she admits she does not have. **DeBerg** continued as an extension of her time, suggesting that the way to go was as the Liberal Arts Core Committee handled it this year by selecting one member of the committee to get the committee together, so that the job is to get one member of the committee to agree to convene the first meeting, and that person worries about the time, place, and convenes the meeting for the election of a permanent chair. That is actually an easier process.

Balong said that perhaps some of the problems with the committee structure might be resolved with this systematic procedure, which might actually take less time. **Breitbach** suggested that the previous year's chair call the meeting for each committee, and if they got into a cycle where the past chair called that initial meeting, and they elected a new chair and discussed what business they needed to address or what topics or concerns they had, and then reported back to the Senate, then that would again address that problem. **Funderburk** was recognized. Because the clerical position for the Senate is currently open and because these are actually Faculty Senate committees, he thought perhaps it would be appropriate for this clerical person hired to actually take care of calling those committees together, so that they do not spin off on their own. Perhaps that will be part of this new person's Fall duties.

East suggested a technological approach with mailing lists and perhaps those would be updated by the new clerical person. But someone, likely a member of the list, must send the messages to the list for each committee. He felt the Senate should not burden the Committee on Committees with this but rather the Senate find a way to do it or disband the committees.

DeBerg noted that the problem with the **East** argument is that often the Chair goes off the committee the following year and so cannot convene the first meeting the upcoming year. A senator stated she has been on a couple committees where they take up these issues at the end of the current year, the need to elect a new chair and to call a first meeting. So this can happen in the late Spring semester or early Fall semester. **Terlip** suggested that perhaps the Senate could ask the Vice-Chair of the Senate to do this because he/she does not have as many obligations.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** stated that the College of Natural Sciences has the tradition of having the current Chair call the meeting in the Fall to elect the new Chair. He was on the committee for several years, and it worked well.

Soneson offered a friendly amendment that the Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate should contact one person on each committee to convene that committee for the purposes of 1) electing a chair, 2) discussing business ahead of it for that year, and 3) formulating a report of that meeting for the Faculty Senate and for the Committee on Committees, and with the charge to convene that committee within the first 3 weeks of the Fall school year. **East** accepted this friendly amendment but wanted to hear reaction from the current Vice-Chair. **Lowell** said she would be happy to do it but just wondered if she need do this right away now, or have these committees already gotten started because it is getting late for this Fall? **Beall** noted that some committees have gotten started. She has sent out lists to people on committees so that they know who the committee members are, but she has not sent to everyone likely. **Lowell** replied that then she should likely let everyone know what has been done, and **East** accepted the friendly amendment. The second to the original amendment, **Funderburk**, nodded his head. Vote called for accepting the friendly amendment. Passed.

The Chair summarized that the new amended motion is that it will be the responsibility of the Vice-Chair of the Senate to contact someone from the committee, making sure that the committee convenes, assesses the work

ahead of it, and reports to the Senate and Committee on Committees. She charged **Lowell** with getting this process started and in place for future years, and **Lowell** agreed to do so. The Chair then called the vote. Passed.

Wurtz next recognized **Breitbach** who requested a postponement of the discussion of the 2nd recommendation to the next meeting so that business can move to the guests here. **Wurtz** stated that that likely would change the order of the day and that, until a parliamentarian is in place for consultation, the Senate likely will be doing this wrong, but she allowed **Breitbach** to proceed to request this postponement due to having guests and the time element for the remainder of the meeting. She did ask the Senate if anyone disapproved and hearing no discussion, the meeting will return to its regular docket order. **Wurtz** did again thank **Beall** as did other voices.

DOCKET 948, CONSULTATIVE SESSION, CATEGORY 5 REVIEW, LIBERAL ARTS CORE

The Chair announced docket item 948, Category 5 Review of the Liberal Arts Core Committee with attachments. She requested a motion to accept the report. **DeBerg** so moved. 2nd by **VanWormer**. Passed. **DeBerg** asked to comment that she has never seen a better category review by the Liberal Arts Core Committee as this Category 5, and she would like the Senate to commend it to all departments on campus as a really worthwhile LAC category review. General discussion approved the commendation. (End of Side B of Tape 1)

.....(**male** speaking).... talking about page 2 is the Table of Contents, page 3 starts the Executive Summary, page 4 includes the Recommendation. (**Female**) asked if the reference was made to the body of the report itself, not the LAC report? (**Male**) replied, yes. (**Female**) stated that that has been done, that they have done that. (**Male**) expressed that he is bothered by it. He asked if the Associate Dean noted is from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. (**Female**) verified this as correct.

(**Male**) then asked why the Associate Dean of CSBS is specified, as opposed to someone else, when any college may offer courses that might meet some of these requirements? (**Female**) replied that she thinks to give power to the committee and authority. A faculty committee is a group of people who may or may not have the deemed authority or the administrative authority to follow through on things, not just getting recommendations from other colleges for courses, but also doing things like the assessment and the oversight of that area of the LAC, she explained. In this case, this administrative structure has worked since formation of the review up to this present day. That is how that college decided to create a coordinating committee for this part of the LAC, and it has worked very well. (**Male**) replied that the point is that the LAC of the University curriculum, as are the various categories, do not belong to colleges and, therefore, it seems inappropriate to be tying particular categories to particular colleges. (**Female**) stated that the Senate approved the formation of coordinating committees in the Spring of 2008 or perhaps it was 2007, so they are actually following a recommendation from the LAC Committee that those committees be formed, a recommendation that this Senate approved, and that those committees are housed in colleges for certain areas of the LAC which are logical for those areas of the LAC, like 5 which is predominantly Social and Behavioral Science, and like Category 4 which is the old CNS, and Category 3 which is the old CHAFA. There is a Humanities Committee. There is a Non-Western Cultures Committee. So there are committees that could be college specific or what was formerly college specific as a simple form of bringing together people, rather than trying to get people who are spread across the University together. She acknowledged that both the Humanities and the Non-Western Cultures had a little problem with that, but they do come together as committees for oversight.

VanWormer was recognized and noted that, as a member of the committee, it seemed to work very well with the way it was set up because they were discussing social sciences. **DeBerg** was recognized who noted that last year at a contentious meeting or two the Senate did approve a College of Education course in Category 5, so the coordinating committee

will have to be expanded to include at least a faculty member from education. She also stated that that may be one of the things that the Liberal Arts Core Committee might be looking at this year, the nature of the coordinating committees and their standing.

Chair **Wurtz** welcomed a guest and asked her to state her name for the audio transcription. Brenda **Bass** gave her position as the Associate Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and noted her wish to respond to **DeBerg's** comment. The Committee in mention has been expanded and includes a faculty member from each of the departments that offers a course within the area, so both within the CSBS and also the College of Business and the College of Education. It is interdisciplinary in nature and reflects the category. They chose to set up the coordinating committee with the position she now holds as the Chair to retain consistency and to maintain the structure of the Committee, moving it forward. **Wurtz** called for any other observations or requests for information on Category 5 of the LAC.

Moving on to docket number 949 which is the Humanities category, this is another accepting of a report. **Soneson** moved that the Senate accept this report. 2nd by **Roth**. Passed. **Wurtz** then opened the floor for senators who wished to ask questions or make observations on Category 2A, Humanities. **Soneson** noted that one of the recommendations, if he is not mistaken, involves putting in place a director or dean of the LAC so that there is a larger coordination of courses and a budget to go along with this largest program on campus. He wondered about the status of that recommendation. He continued that **Morgan** has functioned as a director or chair or something for a while, but since she has stepped down, he asked her if anyone has replaced her. **Wurtz** stated that **Morgan** indicated she would defer to Vice-Provost **Licari**. **Licari** verified that the position of Liberal Arts Core coordinator will be filled this year. The paperwork is underway for selecting **Morgan's** replacement. **Soneson** asked if this is the same position or something upgraded as full-time with a budget and some power? **Licari** stated that it is not an upgrade to the

level suggested, but it is a beefing up of the ability and expectations of the position. He cannot say more for now.

Neuhaus wished to thank **Morgan** for all her amazing work and endurance of long meetings. Many voices offered thanks and laughter and applause.

Chair **Wurtz** moved on to docket item 950, the receiving of the 2008-2009 Liberal Arts Core Annual Report. **Soneson** moved that the Senate receive this report. 2nd by **Hotek**. Vote called. Passed.

The Chair opened the floor and addressed **Morgan** who laughingly declined becoming a senator but who wanted to make note that all the category reviews and category-related assessments and that sort of documentation is currently available on the LAC website in secure format. Anyone who wants to see the most recent category reviews, assessment methods, and SOA reports for any of the categories that have been completed within the last cycle may see them in secure format on the LAC website under the Faculty/Staff link. This report just received by the Senate is the 08-09 report. The 09-10 report is in the hands of the LAC Committee to consider, as well as the Capstone review report. She noted that she may return, so do not count her out, and that the reason all these are delayed was that this was a big curriculum year, and they wanted that to get to the Board before any reports

Soneson moved that the body adjourn. 2nd by (**male**). Chair Wurtz adjourned the meeting.

Submitted, as directed, by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate