

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
08/22/11 (3:20 p.m. - 4:20 p.m.)

SUMMARY

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy announcements included no press present.

Provost **Gibson** offered comments thanking various faculty groups, announcing two major searches, announcing the upcoming Strategic Plan Implementation meeting, and discussing budget information.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered comments that he has announced the Fall Faculty Meeting for Monday, August 29, which will include voting on the amendment to the Constitution.

Chair **Funderburk's** comments included thanking outgoing Chair **Wurtz** for her 3 years of leadership, Nuss for her assistance in getting his leadership term underway, and to all who attended last Saturday's Retreat. He also noted he would be sending out some abbreviated Robert's Rules of Order via pdf to Senators. He mentioned Faculty budget concerns, addressed the amendment to the Constitution, and lastly complimented Provost **Gibson** on her teaching expertise in his classroom.

2. No Minutes up for approval.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

- 1083 981 Request for Emeritus Status, Michael R. **White**, Industrial Technology, docketed in regular order (**Neuhaus/Terlip**)
- 1084 982 Request for Emeritus Status, Diane **Thiessen**, Mathematics, docketed in regular order (**Kirmani/East**)
- 1085 983 Consultative Session with Associate Provosts Virginia **Arthur** and Michael **Licari** regarding new wording for policies on Academic Ethics and Student Academic Grievances, docketed in regular order (**DeBerg/Bruess**)

- 1086 984 Consultative Session with the Director of the UNI Museum on its current status and planning for the future, a report, docketed for 3:20 p.m. to 4:05 p.m. on 09/26/11
(DeBerg/Swan)
- 1087 985 Motion to guarantee that program cuts, reorganization, and/or expansion be supported by the current University Strategic Plan, docketed in regular order **(DeBerg/Bruess)**
- 1088 986 Motion to reserve West Gym (WST) for academic purposes, docketed in regular order **(DeBerg/Neuhaus)**

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1076 974 Filing of the Spring University Budget Committee Report and a Request for Action to Improve Faculty Involvement in UNI's Budget Process. Item divided into 2 considerations.
1) Motion to receive the Report and thank the committee **(Terlip/DeBerg)**, passed. 2) Motion to table the Report for future discussion **(Swan/East)**. Following discussion, motion to call the question **(DeBerg/Peters)**, passed. Then motion to table also passed.

5. New Business

Appointment of 2 Senators to the University Speakers Committee:

Peters

Roth

Election of a Faculty Representative to the Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council: **Dolgener**, for the duration of his Senate term (through Spring 2013)

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:20 p.m. **(Neuhaus/East)**.

Next meeting, 09/12/11, will be in the University Room of Maucker Union, 3:15 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
08/22/11
Mtg. 1697**

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

Absent: Deborah **Gallagher**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. and welcomed everyone back.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Press were not in attendance.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost Gloria **Gibson** had a few comments, some additional information following last Saturday's Faculty Senate Retreat, and a correction of information from that Retreat. For the Minutes, she offered her thanks to faculty who came out last week for the Fall Faculty Workshop. She expressed her appreciation for their attendance and for the Organizing Committee's work. She also thanked the faculty who worked on the LAC, especially the Cornerstone project. She anticipates a very exciting experience for students who are enrolled in Cornerstone. She also thanked faculty who have worked on the Student Assessments Committee and the Diversity Initiatives work.

Gibson noted two very important searches this Fall. One search is for the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Dean Philip **Mauceri** is chairing that committee. The other search will be for Dean of the Library and will get underway soon.

Gibson noted that a Strategic Plan Implementation Meeting is set for September 1 for the point people. Each of the strategies will have a person or persons responsible for each particular initiative, and they will move forward at that meeting in coming up with actions steps, metrics, and indicators. The point people likely already know about this, and they will be invited to attend this meeting on September first.

Lastly, in regard to budget information, she reminded everyone that the Iowa Legislature ended its session late and therefore little work was done this Summer on the University Budget. But, because the reduction was less than anticipated by approximately \$300,000, those dollars were allocated to Academic Affairs against the AA deficit. Her report to the Senate in late April included an announcement of a \$2.5 million deficit for Academic Affairs. That deficit is now \$2.2 million. President Allen has provided some one-time bridge money of \$700,000 to help Academic Affairs with that deficit, but this is one-time money. This money came from additional tuition dollars of the last year because enrollment exceeded expectations. Each Vice President will be allocated a certain amount of money, one time, as a bridge from these additional tuition dollars.

Gibson noted that she has not yet completed her work of finding that \$1.5. However, she has started that work with the Academic Affairs Council. Part of that money will come from retirements. It will also come from phased retirements for individuals who are in years 4 and 5, which means that those individuals will be placed on soft money, the bridge dollars. At the end of the year for those on year 4 and 5, there will be no permanent dollars on those lines. So, it is not a strategic way to impact the budget deficit, but because she must report to the President how she is dealing with the deficit, this is where she is for now. There are also some permanent cuts which have been found, and they are also moving other

lines on soft money rather than General Fund dollars. She noted that she misspoke at Saturday's Retreat and wanted to correct that here. If the enrollment is over 13,350 students, then those additional revenues will revert to Academic Affairs against the AA budget deficit.

This is the short-term plan. She reminded those present, that the long-term plan is to look at programs with an eye to program reduction. There have been no decisions about program closures or faculty lay-offs. There have been **no** decisions. The first step in that process will be to meet with United Faculty, which they hope to do as soon as possible from early- to mid-September. At that point in time, discussions will begin as to how to come up with a definition of programs and criteria which will be used to evaluate programs. Her goal is to have a transparent process, to communicate openly about the process and how to move forward, keeping in mind that looking at programs with a critical eye will be necessary, not only with regard to budget reduction but also to move strategically in the future to strengthen those programs that need additional dollars.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** noted that he sent out an announcement this morning that the Fall Faculty Meeting will be on Monday, August 29, 2011, at 3:30 in Lang Hall Auditorium, the same Monday as last year. A completed agenda will likely be sent out by Wednesday. He also sent out the announcement that the constitutional amendment which had been agreed to be put forward by the Senate would be voted on and one comment came back. He forwarded that to **Funderburk** for consideration.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Chair **Funderburk** offered public thanks to Senator Susan **Wurtz** for chairing the Faculty Senate for 3 years. She should get a special kudo someplace for not once but 3 times around. He also gave special thanks to Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate Sherry Nuss. For the last month they have been e-mailing 12 to 30 times a day most of the time trying to figure out what either one was supposed to be doing at any given moment. Thanks

also were expressed to those who attended the Retreat on Saturday, including Provost **Gibson**. He felt all had a really nice time. He appreciated the very candid, frank discussions and some really good questions to get things going this year.

He has had a request to forward a very abbreviated version of Robert's Rules of Order and a general outline of the current motions to new members. Unless anyone objects, he will send it as a pdf to all members. He is still working on having some such documents more easily available on the website, and if money allows, we should be able to do that.

On the topic of money, whenever possible, the Chair asked that Senators please not request additional mailings from the Administrative Assistant, Nuss. As an hourly employee, such requests affect the bottom line. If you must, of course, go ahead, but otherwise, as a general rule, retrieve the information as directed from the Faculty Senate website. Two points along these lines: 1. When the review copy of Minutes is sent, it will be as a pdf attachment prior to approval at the next meeting after which it will be uploaded to the website; 2. Even though the button says "download," it actually is for "viewing" the document. To save it to your computer, you would need to actually do that. He will work on nomenclature there on the website.

The amendment to the Constitution is out there, **Funderburk** noted, and he received the wording change from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson**. His feeling is that the amendment and any changes are now in the domain of the full faculty rather than those who submitted it. So he plans no action unless someone guides otherwise on that.

Senator **Smith** asked if the Chair was not planning to have a discussion by this Body as a whole on it? **Funderburk** stated that it was discussed at the Faculty Senate Retreat. Discussion at the Retreat and their reading of the Constitution gave virtually anyone the right to submit a document. The form in which it was submitted was in an effort to get it in before the first Faculty Meeting to get it moving forward to actually happen this year. The general consensus at that table was to go with it as it was and then let the

discussion among the faculty go as it is. Technically, he or any member of the Committee could have submitted it just as an individual of the faculty. **Smith** replied that he understood that and that he regrets he was unable to attend the Retreat, but he is disappointed that all Senators will not be able to have a discussion here of the proposal. **Funderburk** noted that in the Constitution it had to be submitted 7 days prior to the actual Faculty Meeting where it will be considered, so there was a timing issue there. Also, it was not submitted with the intent that it was coming from this Body. It was coming from an ad hoc committee of this Body, which is why it would not be accurate to say it was “ratified,” because it was in no way ratified here.

Lastly, **Funderburk** stated that anytime he can he would like to do something unusual, which does not often happen here. Turning to Provost **Gibson** he stated, “So I am going to blindside you like I said I was not going to do.” (laughter in the room) He continued by stating that the Faculty Senate spends plenty of time talking about things that are not very pleasant, yet not often seen is something like Dr. **Gibson's** work in the classroom, which he has had the opportunity to witness when she lectured twice in his classes. Sometimes, he noted, we forget that Administrators are often fabulous teachers, too. “She is outstanding,” he shared. In the two lectures he heard, he learned a huge amount. There are at least 40 students who would also give a rousing endorsement, so he wanted to thank her publicly for visiting his class. He noted that they may be hard on her as an Administrator, but they do value her other abilities. (laughter all around)

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

No minutes awaiting approval.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1083 for Docket #981, an Emeritus Status Request from Michael R. **White**, Industrial Technology, to be effective June 30, 2011. Senator **Neuhaus** moved to docket in regular order. Senator **Terlip** seconded. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1084 for Docket #982, an Emeritus Status Request from Diane Thiessen, Mathematics, to be effective June 2011. Senator **Kirman** moved to docket in regular order. Senator **East** seconded. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1085 for Docket #983, Consultative Session with Associate Provosts Virginia Arthur and Michael Licari regarding new wording for policies on Academic Ethics and Student Academic Grievances. Senator **DeBerg** moved to docket. A bit of confusion ensued as the Agenda stated the possibility that this might be considered today. However, that had been decided against but not removed from the Agenda. Associate Provost **Licari** was asked if they were ready to consult on this today, but **Licari** responded they understood it would likely be docketed in regular order, so the September 12 meeting, pending the fact that Faculty needed an opportunity to review the documents under discussion, which he felt was appropriate. Therefore, **DeBerg** moved that it be docketed in regular order. Senator **Bruess** seconded. Discussion included Senator **Breitbach** stating that perhaps a reminder needs to be sent to all faculty to take a look at the documents and to send any concerns or questions they may have to Senators prior to that session. Senator **Terlip** asked where the documents could be located. Chair **Funderburk** stated that they are now on the Faculty Senate website linked to that petition and that it was his idea that perhaps this could be discussed today as it seemed nothing else was on the docket for today. Then the documents were found not to be linked correctly and another item came up for discussion, so this consultative session needed to be slated for regular order with the Agenda never revised. Vote taken on motion to docket in regular order. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1086 for Docket #984, A Report from the Director on UNI Museum's current status and planning for the future, to be docketed for 3:20 p.m. to 4:05 p.m. on 09/26/11. **DeBerg** moved to docket this as a consultative session at the date/time requested. Sue **Grosboll** will come to talk about the Museum. Senator **Swan** seconded that motion. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1087 for Docket #985, Motion to guarantee that program cuts, reorganization, and/or expansion be supported by the current University Strategic Plan. **DeBerg** moved to docket this item in regular order. **Bruess** seconded. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1088 for Docket #986, Motion to reserve West Gym (WST) for academic purposes. **DeBerg** moved to docket in regular order. **Neuhaus** seconded. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Calendar Item 1085, showing on the Agenda, is in error and will be discussed at an upcoming session, in regular order as Docket #983.

DOCKET #974, FILING OF THE SPRING UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT AND A REQUEST FOR ACTION TO IMPROVE FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN UNI'S BUDGET PROCESS

Chair **Funderburk** stated that he hoped Senators had reviewed this because it does mention naming two representatives and because it also calls for a report to be produced by September 1, 2011, which could give some fodder for discussion. The Chair of this Committee was invited but declined to be here today, **Funderburk** reported. Also, no members of the Committee seem to be present today. The floor was opened for discussion

DeBerg asked to return to the motion as stated for clarification. (The petition was projected on the screen for all to see.) **DeBerg** asked what the "University Budget Committee" is? She wonders who constitutes it and at what level it works? Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** stated that it was formed in

the time there was money allocated to the Senate, disbursed amongst the Colleges. The amount was around \$100,000. They received proposals for it. It was formed to improve infrastructure. The Committee was formed to be a group that reviewed proposals. This happened in the late 90's or early 2000's. **Swan** asked if that was the charge? **Jurgenson** replied that that was the charge of the Committee when it was formed. **Swan** asked if this is its current charge? He stated that from the Committee on Committees listing each Committee has a basic charge and wonders if that is its charge today? **DeBerg** said she feels the Senate Budget Committee is different from what a University Budget Committee would be, so she is asking the Provost and Associate Provost if there is such a thing as a "University Budget Committee"? **Gibson** said she was not aware of a committee with this name. **Licari** noted that the Faculty Senate Budget Committee that is cited on the Committee web page of the University Home Page:

<http://www.uni.edu/committees/faculty/university-faculty-senate-budget-committee>

does not list the charge at all. **Jurgenson** agreed, saying that that is because the purpose of its formation disappeared when the revisions began to appear in the Senate Budget. **DeBerg** asked if there was perhaps another Committee that operated at a University level, not just a Senate level?

DeBerg had another question: Does the Senate have in their roster of committees a Senate Budget Committee? Several responded that, yes, there is a University Faculty Senate Budget Committee. **Licari** noted that it has not been active. **Swan** stated that this last year it met to produce this. **Funderburk** said that this Report was the effort to reactivate that Committee. **Swan** said that every year there are elected members. He was elected but left the Committee this last year and was not a part of the Report submitted. **Funderburk** clarified that this all came about because the Faculty Senate did have action before it asking it to either form or reactivate the Committee. The Senate sent the charge for the Committee to meet and prepare a report. This is the Report that then came with the attached recommendation. He added that part of the questioning was for the Committee to explain what they do now.

DeBerg called for a point of order. She believes that a motion coming from a Committee does not need a second, so she asked if they are in discussion of this motion? **Funderburk** agreed. **DeBerg** then stated that she believes that it is a really good idea to increase faculty participation in University budgeting. She thinks it is lacking in a big way. However, she is not certain about the term “University Budget Committee,” if it does not exist. So there is a little detail in there that she is not certain about. But she is in agreement with the force of this motion, and that is to at the very, baby-even-before-birth-womb-like condition of the yearly budgets that some faculty be involved, rather than just talking about how to make cuts.

Neuhaus wondered if there is not maybe some sort of a consultative action that needs to take place at some point to find out just how the budgets are born, grow-up, and are formed. And is there an appropriate point or a possible point where the faculty could at least provide some consultation with that? It seems to him that the Faculty Senate sent these folks off to pursue something that was not there—this Committee that apparently, if it exists, it exists maybe in name only or for some other purpose. But he does think that some of the things that are stated in some of the documents are not terribly prescriptive in “you will do this at UNI.” He wonders if the Faculty Senate might want to ask this Committee to try and back up again and make some inquiries with those who are making budget decisions whether they can provide some advice or something along that line. Right now, he is not sure what to do with this thing, because he is not sure who they would be sending these folks off to play with and that makes it a little problematic for him.

Terlip stated that she thinks that in reading their Report they did consult with **Schellhardt** to look at the process and said that he said that maybe that process would be put up on the web. But as he is no longer here, she wonders if indeed there is something on the Vice President's page for the budget process. If you look at their report, they did do all of that already, and then they gave some ideas of things that could be done. She would like to divide this question into two parts. So she would move that the Senate consider receiving their Report first and then consider action second. Her

motion is to split the question into those two parts. Seconded by **DeBerg**. No discussion. Vote. Passed.

Senator **Peters** wondered what was just split? Does the motion under consideration begin based on information provided? Is that the motion the Senate is considering? **Funderburk** agreed. Then he, **Peters**, is not quite sure what they just split because the motion is to appoint, and they have just accepted the Report. **Terlip** explained that she is asking if the Senate would like to first accept the Report and then deal with the request, because she would like to accept the Report and thank them for their work, but then they can talk about what they want to do with it separately. **Peters** continued that the motion is to get together with the Administration and come up with a set of recommendations as to how faculty can cooperate in the budget-making process. **Funderburk** stated that he has the same understanding.

Funderburk called for a motion to accept the Report and to thank the Committee. **Terlip** so moved. Seconded by **DeBerg**. **Swan** asked for clarification and whether accepting a Report meant doing as it requested. **Terlip** explained that, no, it simply meant archiving the Report—just receiving it. The second part of the divided question will be whether or not the Senate will act upon their recommendations based on that Report, stated **Funderburk**. Several jumped in to clarify that the Committee has made the motion but first the Senate wants to accept the Report and thank the Committee. Vote taken on motion to accept the Report and thank the Committee for their work. Passed.

Funderburk then asked if anyone needed a full reading or could everyone read the projected Report and petition. Upon request, the Chair read the petition: *Based on information provided in the University of Northern Iowa Budget Planning and Development Document and the AAUP statement of principles on The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters, be it resolved that the UNI Faculty Senate appoint two of its members to work with the current University Budget Committee to create a set of recommendations for (1) incorporating direct faculty input in the preparation, implementation, review, revision and reallocation of the*

university budget and (2) inclusion of faculty on the President's Council where budgetary matters may be discussed on an ongoing basis; with a report of recommendations due no later than September 1st, 2011, to the Faculty Senate

Neuhaus mentioned that the date proposed, September 1, 2011, likely seemed like a long way off when it was first made back in the Spring. In fact, that date, he thinks, is a problem. Moving that date off a ways he could support the motion a bit better than now. **Gibson** has a question about #2 "inclusion of faculty on the President's Council." She wondered what is meant by this. Does the request mean the "Cabinet"? **DeBerg** replied, no. **Gibson** and **DeBerg** sorted out just what might be meant by the terminology "President's Council" as no such group by that name exists, and both agreed that this must be clarified. **East** noted also that the "University Budget Committee" as such does not exist, which makes the motion unclear as to what it refers to or to what they need to be doing. If they are referring to that Committee that made this report, it is not called the University Budget Committee, and its charge presumably was not what they did originally and was not to do this Report. So he feels confused. He thinks the intent is to somehow more officially involve faculty in the budget planning process, and he thinks that has merit, but it also is fraught with problems. Presumably faculty are already involved in the budget process in that each Department has a budgeting process which moves on through Deans, etc. To him, this needs some thought and some discussion with Administration before it can be fully resolved.

Funderburk noted **DeBerg** and **Terlip** in the line-up and explained for the newer members that there is always the option of sending this back for clarification, if that is the decision of the Senate. **DeBerg** then suggested, if others were open to it, that they return it to the Committee, however the Committee is constituted for this academic year, with at least a couple of comments. One would be to clarify which campus budgeting advisory group the Committee has in mind. Secondly, to verify the existence of a "University Budget Committee." And third would be to change the date because this is being considered this year rather than last. She would like

the new Senate Budget Committee to look at these 3 things and bring back responses to the full Senate.

Terlip wondered if clicking on the latest advisory report would determine who the report came from. **Breitbach** has done this on her laptop, and **DeBerg** asked Nuss to project the Report for the group to view. **Breitbach** read at the top of the Report: “From the University of Northern Iowa Budget Committee—To the UNI Faculty Senate” and stated that, first of all, we have some confusion historically about the Senate's Budget Committee. It is one of those committees that no longer has a valid charge, as a reason for existence. And we seem to have, in the past year, resurrected it and given it a slightly new name, and come up with some new charge. **Terlip** said that that clarifies it. The submitter was not talking about the University Budget Committee. He was talking about the Senate Budget Committee. **Breitbach** agreed, saying, however, that they misnamed it, and that has caused a great deal of confusion. It is a committee that no longer needs to exist.

Swan, although not involved with any of this last year, sort of heard about it and asked if the Faculty Senate did not send this to a Committee because a College Senate wanted the Faculty Senate to send it to a Committee? If so, why does the Faculty Senate not know who is sending back the Report? He thinks he knows who is sending back the Report, although he was not involved with doing it. He is having trouble understanding how people who are involved with asking a Committee to make a Report cannot know the Committee that is sending back the Report that was asked for. So, by looking in the Minutes for whomever the Senate sent it to, you will know. And if they mistyped their name, then the Senate can figure that out. They may feel frustrated if the Senate cannot seem to figure out who they are. The Senate can look at the Committee on Committees Report. The Budget Committee is there. It says what it does. It lists its members. It says how they are elected. Those are the people who wrote this report and sent it back. They have fulfilled the obligation that this Body last year asked them to do. That is where this stands. But some today are saying, no, that apparently it does not exist, that the Senate does not know what Committee it is. **Swan** feels that is distressing. The Senate might not like it.

It might be no good. The Senate might say, well, they should not have sent it to you. The Senate might say they do not like the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences recommendation to the Senate this year. They thought they liked it last year. They are thinking better this year. There are lots of things the Body might say. But it seems the Senate does know who they sent this to, who is sending it back, what they are asking to be done, and now the Senate either does what they tell us to do or recommend or not. The Senate can just say, "We are not going to do this now," and then send it to somebody else. The Senate can form a sub-group to figure out what is going to happen so that when it comes back they will know who it came from and will not forget or something. But Swan does not think it appropriate to send things back, telling them that they are not clear as to who they are, because that will just be maddening.

Funderburk commented that part of the confusion is that he knows who sent it and who the Committee is and, in fact, the Committee membership list has **Swan's** name on it. The problem is that they identify themselves as the same Committee, word for word, as what they are asking the Senate to appoint members to and work on. **Peters** stated that he is confused as someone new to the Senate as to what exactly this Report is asking the Senate to do. It first appeared to him that the Senate was being asked to form an advisory committee with members of the Administration. But now on looking closer at the language, he feels that the Senate is being asked to appoint a couple of Senators to get together with this Committee. If this Committee has been given a charge by the Senate already, then why are they asking for Senators to get together with them? He admitted that he is very unclear as to the purpose of the motion.

DeBerg asked to return to her original idea of sending it back to the Committee and what to tell the Committee. First of all, she wants some clarity from the Committee about which campus advisory group they wanted Senators on. They say "President's Council." Maybe that's the name of it. She also wants them to verify the existence of such a thing as the "University Budget Committee," because she is unsure what that is. If they simply mistyped and meant "Senate Budget Committee," then it is easy. They just make a correction in their document. Thirdly, they need to

change the date for the deadline for some response from the Committee. Those are the things she would like from the Committee to clarify their motion. **Funderburk** pointed out that the name of the Report states “Report from the University of Northern Iowa Budget Committee.”

Neuhaus noted that a problem the Senate often runs into is knowing who is actually on a committee. Just as with **Swan** being listed as on this Committee but is not, often the lists are not up to date due to various reasons. So in returning this to the Committee, some of that Committee who wrote it will no longer be there and new members may be on hand. Maybe the primary author will still be on the Committee, but the Senate may need to do some digging to try to call those folks in to get some clarification on all this.

Provost **Gibson** asked for some clarity on committees. She remembers coming to Faculty Senate meetings last year and hearing about committees but personally does not think anything was resolved clearly. She realizes that others may not agree with her thinking here, but she feels the Senate needs to know what the committees are, what their charges are, who are on the committees, and so forth. Questions, such as how many committees does the Faculty Senate have, seem appropriate. There has not seemed to be clarity on the matter of committees of the Faculty Senate for the two years she has been at UNI. This may be the place to start.

Funderburk noted that Vice Chair **Breitbach** and he have met on this very issue, and she has agreed to head up this year's effort to determine committee structure and committee membership and to formulate some sort of structure of informing everyone of the outcomes of elections, including the winners (laughter).

Swan agreed that this issue needs work. He also reiterated that whomever the Senate sent this request to for coming up with this Report, that is who is sending it back. He found a replacement for his membership on the committee, but that person may not have attended or worked on the Report. And then the form was not retyped and other elections may have been held, so he suggested perhaps tabling the issue because the Senate

appears not to know what they have done. He feels it is much better to say “We do not know what we have done,” than to send something back to colleagues saying “You do not know what you have done.” He moved to table this matter indefinitely--until the Senate knows what it has done and what it next wants to do. **East** seconded. Discussion included **DeBerg** stating that she feared if it were tabled that the Senate may never take it up again, and it is a really important issue. **Swan** offered to join **DeBerg** in putting it on the agenda of the next meeting or the one following that. **DeBerg** agreed. **East** noted that someone who wants this addressed needs to find out more information to be prepared to discuss it in a knowledgeable manner. **Smith** wondered aloud if it were tabled who would actually take the initiative to resolve the ambiguity and uncertainties that are seen right now. Who will do that, he asked? When you send it back, then there is somebody on this phantom committee which has real members who will do something about it. If tabled, who will do anything and maybe it will be just a way of dying.

Vice Chair **Breitbach** suggested scrolling to the end of the document and then read to conclusion. It says: *The University Budget Committee (which she interjected she thinks is the Senate Subcommittee) is gathering materials related to best practices in the area of faculty involvement in university budgeting. We will continue to gather information on this topic. However, we await your reply on how we should proceed in helping to improve the university budgeting process here at UNI in light of this report.*”

Breitbach thinks that having faculty input in the direction of establishing priorities of how UNI budgets its money is a good thing and that the Senate should continue to work on that. However, she does not think that this Committee has today a charge that is still viable considering the purpose for which it was initially created. It is just one of those committees that after 20 or 30 years does not fit the initial charge. So unless the Senate wants to restructure the charge of the Committee, the Senate should dissolve this Committee.

DeBerg asked if the Senate did not create a new charge? **Breitbach** replied that it has not been published anywhere. **Jurgenson** recalled that the

Senate already knew what this Committee had been and decided to have it pursue this effort to involve faculty in the budgeting process. **Breitbach** said she could not find it online anywhere. **Swan** stated that he wished to table this because he had just heard that the Faculty Senate Chair and Vice Chair are looking into resolving these matters. When they have resolved these matters—found the charges, recommended alternate charges—when the Senate has passed those, then this can be taken from the table, and the Senate can address the Committee cogently. So he thanks the Senators for continuing to work on resolving the Committee issue by the next meeting or perhaps the following one. He feels it would behoove the Senate and all colleagues to table this and resolve these matters through the Chair/Vice Chair's industry in fixing the Senate Committee structure.

Smith asked if the Chair and Vice Chair are confident that they will in some reasonable time come back with something that the Senate can act on relating to this? **Funderburk** clarified that the question concerned committee structure not this topic. He agreed that they could make progress on the committee structure, charges, etc. On this particular budget topic he does not anticipate receiving a great deal of information from the source he contacted prior to today's meeting. There seems to be a degree of frustration that the Senate is too slow to move with this issue.

DeBerg called the question on tabling. Second by **Peters**. Vote. Motion to table passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair **Funderburk** reported that at the Saturday Retreat those present discussed committee assignments and agreed that it would be preferable to solicit nominees and then vote. One committee needing 2 Senators is the University Speakers Committee which reviews applications for funding for speakers on campus. For the past several years it has been Senator **Soneson** and he, **Funderburk**. It is an excellent committee that never, ever meets, he stated. (laughter) It is all carried out by e-mail and is quite interesting to read the various proposals of what is going on on campus. He solicited nominations, including self-nominations. **Peters** self-

nominated, and **DeBerg** nominated **Roth**, who agreed to be nominated. They were both accepted by acclamation.

Another committee needing a Senate representative not listed on the Agenda is the Inter-Collegiate Athletic Advisory Committee (IAAC), which the Senate agreed last Spring to have a representative serve on. Unclear was whether this representative would be an actual Senator or a Senate appointee for that Committee. The terms are 3 years, but in discussions with that Committee, he suggested if an actual Senator were to serve, it would be for the duration of the Senator's Senate term—1 year, if 1 year left, etc. Therefore, **Funderburk** asked if the Senate wished to make this a Senator representative or someone appointed as a liaison. He believes the Committee would like a Senator for more direct contact with this Body.

DeBerg moved that the Senate elect a Senator to serve on this really important Committee. **Terlip** seconded. No discussion. Vote. Passed with 1 abstention from **Neuhaus**.

Next, volunteers or nominations were requested, with **Funderburk** noting the Committee generally meets the last Monday of each month which will sometimes conflict with Senate meetings. They meet 2-3 times per semester. **East** inquired as to who else is currently serving on this Committee. After some offering ideas as to possible members, **Breitbach** read from an online list she pulled up: Joel **Haack**, Administration; Tim **Gilson**, COE; Rex **Karsten**, CBA; Russ **Campbell**, CHAS; Ronnie **Bankston**, CHAS; no one currently from CSBS; Mark **Jacobson**, non-voting faculty; Pat **Whitt**, P&S; Dakotah **Reed**, Student; and Jacqui **Kalin**, Student

There is a non-voting membership on this rather large Committee, **Breitbach** noted, including Lisa **Jepsen**, Jan **Bittner**, Jess **Nissen**, Troy **Dannen**, Jean **Berger**, Daren **Koudele**, Stacia **Greve**, Kara **Park**, and Diane **Wallace**.

Senator **Edginton** stated that he served on the Committee as Ex-Officio member for 19 years, and the Committee primarily monitors the academic

performance of student athletes. That is the major focus and concern of the Committee, he said. In addition, a couple of issues always come up: 1) A request is often made to the Senate about early registration for athletes because of scheduling problems, and that has been consistent over the years; 2) The violation of University policy when athletes are engaged in a University-sanctioned function and the student athlete is sometimes penalized by the professor when they miss a class for those events that they are involved in. He thinks that the monitoring of the academic portion of the student athlete's work is very important. Beyond that, there are reports that are made by the coaches at each meeting, so you get a sense of the flavor of the work that is going on in terms of the Department and the specific teams and some of the challenges they are facing with budgeting issues and staffing and concerns faculty would have in any other academic program.

Funderburk pulled up an e-mail to note that the meetings currently scheduled are October 3, November 7, and December 5. Their opening meeting will happen September 11, so if the Senate does not today decide on a member, then **Breitbach** or he will go to that meeting. That meeting will focus on what they will plan to do this year, so it might be ideal to select a Senator today, but if the Senate needs more time, then it needs more time. The next Senate meeting is the day after the IACC's first meeting. After some discussion of nominations, two surfaced as viable: **Dolgener**, nominated by **Kirmani**, and **East** nominated by **DeBerg**. A show of hands elected **Dolgener** to serve on the IAAC until the end of his Senate term in 2013.

Funderburk called for items from the floor. Hearing none, he called for a motion to adjourn and announced that the next meeting of September 12, 2011, will be in the University Room of Maucker Union at 3:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Neuhaus moved to adjourn at 4:20 p.m. **East** seconded. Vote. Passed.

Submitted by, Sherry Nuss, Administrative Assistant, UNI Faculty Senate