

Corrected  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**10/10/11 (3:20 p.m. - 4:26 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. #1700**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** was unable to attend and sent a notice, regarding the Faculty Roster, which was read by Chair **Funderburk** to those present.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported out of order on her work on the reorganization of committees, noting that the Educational Policies Committee is working hard. The Bylaws and Constitution Ad Hoc Committee will be meeting tomorrow. And the Committee on Committees will work to determine which committees are needed and which can perhaps become ad hoc committees instead. She will also help update the website for accuracy.

Chair **Funderburk's** comments included his announcement of his appointing Senator **Peters** as the new Secretary to the Faculty Senate, a position not filled for many years. The Secretary will coordinate production of the Minutes/Transcript for corrections submitted beyond the simply clerical, and he will also coordinate questions for the President's Leadership Breakfasts. Also, the Chair noted that the Committee on Committees failed to hold an election for the at-large position on the University Curriculum Committee, and he would like to make an interim appointment until an election can be held. He will make some contacts and will put this item on the Agenda for the next meeting. Lastly, a couple of errors came in on the Faculty Roster which were discussed.

2. Summary Minutes/Transcript for 09/26/11 were approved by acclamation with no corrections offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1094 992 Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy from the Educational Policies Committee, regular order (**Terlip/Marshall**). Passed.

1095 993 Emeritus Faculty Request for Jack Wilkinson, Mathematics, effective July 1, 2011, regular order (**Kirmani/East**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1091 989 Moratorium on LAC Category Reviews (**Smith/DeBerg**). Motion to approve the moratorium, passed following roll call vote.

1092 990 Committee on Committees Deliberations and Recommendations from January 18, 2009 (sic 2010). Motion to task the Bylaws Committee with also coming forward with recommendations for reorganizing the committee structure of the Senate, passed.

5. New Business

Election of Senate representative to the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee for 3-year term: Senator **Edginton (Roberts-Dobie)**

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:26 p.m. (**Marshall/Peters**). Passed.

Next meeting:

October 24, 2011

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:15 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
October 10, 2011  
Mtg. 1700**

**PRESENT:** Robert **Boody** (alternate for Deborah Gallagher), Karen **Breitbach**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Jerilyn **Marshall** (alternate for Chris **Neuhaus**), Scott **Peters**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (alternate for Chris **Edginton**), Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

**Absent:** Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, James **Jurgenson**, Michael **Licari**, Michael **Roth**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

Chair **Funderburk**: Call for press identification. None seen.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

Chair **Funderburk** quietly acknowledged Provost Gloria **Gibson** who replied: I don't think I have any comments to make.

Chair **Funderburk**: That's no comments from the Provost.

**Gibson**: No.

## COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Chair **Funderburk**: Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** cannot be here today, and he sent something that he wanted me to read. So, he writes—and this is in regards to the Faculty Roster:

“The Faculty Roster is a list of those who are on the faculty and what departments to which they have appointments. Voting eligibility is defined in the Constitution as those who hold tenure or tenure-track appointments. Those that appear on the list more than once do not get more votes on matters of Faculty Constitution because they do so. Multiple listings should not be a problem. Errors of inclusion of names or omission should be corrected.”

That concludes the Chair of the Faculty's remarks, stated **Funderburk**.

## REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

**Funderburk**: These [items on the Agenda] are reversed. Are you going to say anything about this?

**Breitbach**: I can speak briefly about where we are at on some of this.

**Funderburk**: Ok, we'll go out of order here and do the Committee Report from the Vice-Chair first.

**Breitbach**: Ok, well, Chair—Chair **Jeff** (laughter)--Chair **Funderburk** has asked me as Vice-Chair to oversee a couple of things. So, #1, I am working with the Educational Policies Committee which, luckily, has an amazing Chair of that Committee. **Gayle [Rhineberger-Dunn]** does an unbelievable job of running that Committee and getting things done and holding those Committee members accountable, and everybody pitches in and does something. I don't have to push them along. They are making amazing progress, and we should have both of those policies back to us, I think, next month. I wish all committees ran that way. So, she's good.

Second, I am working with **Jesse [Swan]**, and **Jesse** is kind of stealing the—I mean, not stealing the thunder, but kind of running the show on the Bylaws, the University Faculty Senate Bylaws and our Constitution. We are getting that in shape. And that Committee is finally finding some time to meet. We will start tomorrow.....tomorrow or Thursday?

**Swan:** Yeah, tomorrow at 11:00.

**Breitbach:** (pointing to her electronic device) If it weren't for this, I wouldn't know where I'm supposed to be when. And we hope to get everything in order yet this semester. We don't want that to trail into the Spring semester because of the curriculum package that will be coming before the Senate.

The last thing that I'm working on is the Committee on Committees, and the Vice-Chair is now assuming the Chair? Or Ex-Officio? What did we decide last year? That the Chair—the Vice-Chair is now the Chair of the Committee on Committees?

**Wurtz:** We didn't make a decision. We talked about it that that might be wise.

**Breitbach:** We talked about it. So, we are meeting with the Committee on Committees to discuss that, and we will probably come back with a recommendation. We are also looking at some other things. When you look at the list of committees that report to the Faculty Senate, what we really need to do is get a handle on which ones....first of all, the committee make-up needs to be addressed with the merger of the two Colleges. So that's the first thing that the Committee on Committees is going to be looking at, and I will be working with them on that.

The second is whether or not all of these—you know, which ones need to report and how often, and should it be a regular thing? So that we are not kind of getting reports late. And are there some of these committees that could be handled on an ad hoc basis? For example, the Honorary Degrees Committee could be an ad hoc committee of the Senate when needed. So, I think that we can reduce the number of committees and try to streamline

things. It doesn't seem to make much sense to have a bunch of committees, if they aren't functioning.

**Terlip:** They are not required to report to us anyway. Don't we just hold the election for them?

**Breitbach:** These are the committees reporting to the Faculty Senate, according to the website. And I think we need to

**Terlip:** I have the report from Committee on Committees that they're listed as "committees not required" to report to us.

**Breitbach:** Then we need to fix that on the website, because there are some discrepancies, and so we'll

**Terlip:** I think Committee on Committees just does the elections so they have representation from everywhere.

**Breitbach:** We still need to make sure that everything's coordinated so that something on the website--if it jives with the Committee on Committees Report. And I have the Report from last year, too. But what I'm saying is what's posted does not jive with that, so we need to clean that up.

**Terlip:** Right. Ok.

**Breitbach:** And I know we've tried in the past. We are going to try harder this year. Ok, that's it for now.

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

**Funderburk:** Ok. A few things—some of this is not news to you, but for the record. For the past unclear how many years, quite a few years it appears, we have not taken advantage of the Secretary position as described in our Bylaws. And as I noted in the e-mail, which I had no complaints from anyone about, I am going to—through creative reading of the Bylaws, we are restarting the Secretary position, and Scott **Peters** has agreed to serve in that position. Initial duties will be to help coordinate the production of

the Minutes from various things, ranging from determining what corrections lies past the level of clerical. So that simply correcting spelling and things like that, he will be the person to judge that. And if it goes beyond that, it will be brought to you so you know what changes were made before we actually vote on Minutes.

In addition, and particularly important at the moment, he is going to help coordinate the compilation of the questions for the President's Leadership Breakfasts, and the next Leadership Breakfast is this week Friday, and I got the call to turn the questions in by tomorrow afternoon. So if you have not responded to **Scott's** request for more questions, and you have a good one, or even a bad one, please forward it over that way as quickly as possible. The current tally of new questions is how many?

**Peters:** One

**Funderburk:** One. Two more to go so we can get up to the mark we're supposed to have by tomorrow afternoon.

**Peters:** Oh, yeah. And we have the list of questions from last time that we haven't asked.

**Funderburk:** And we haven't chatted yet about that. Is the plan still to send a note out with the list and let people vote?

**Peters:** Sure. I can try to do that this evening, and people can give quick feedback, I guess, before tomorrow afternoon.

**Funderburk:** Good. So, we want to thank **Scott** very much for taking this on as well. (applause) In speaking of Committee on Committees running elections, or occasionally not running elections that should have been run, it came to my attention Friday that there was a slip up and no election was run for the University Curriculum Committee's at-large position. The person's term expired in the Spring. That person was contacted and asked if they would be willing and able to serve until we could get an election mounted, but they have already accepted other responsibilities that prevent their ability to do so. Being that this is a curriculum cycle, there are

quite a few things up, and, in all probability, starting the election now we can't have anybody on that Committee elected until the Spring sometime. It would be my wish that we would appoint somebody as an interim until an election has been organized to fill that position. However, since I've only learned about this since Friday, I don't come with an idea of who we can appoint. So, I'm more than willing to accept self-nominations at this point, or nominations of friends you have (light laughter with jokes from the floor about "You won't be friends much longer" and "Friends you want to get rid of" and "Soon to be known as former friends") People who like to read are very good on this Committee. We will have that up as an Agenda item for next time, but I do want to call it to your attention, because we really need to try to find someone on that. It's an important Committee. There are some pretty important discussions already going, and I think we do want the maximum representation we can get on this. Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** She's going to kill me, but you might want to contact Karen **Mitchell**. She's been the past Chair of that Committee and knows the ropes, and she's very good at it. But I don't know if she'd do it or not.

**Funderburk:** Good. Thanks for the suggestion. I will follow up there.

**Terlip:** Don't tell her I gave you her name. (lots of laughter, as **Terlip** ducks her head)

**Funderburk:** I'll call her before she sees the Minutes. Ok. Faculty Roster. The posting of the Faculty Roster this time. We did it a little bit differently, I think, than in recent years so that it was posted and also an e-mail was sent notifying everyone. That was either a good or a bad thing, because it did cause a great deal more response than it had in anyone's memory to this. The majority of the things are clerical issues to be corrected. But by the stated, the Constitutional stated things, some of the issues we are supposed to decide here. There are actually two dates that affect the development of the Faculty Roster. The Faculty Constitution states that it will come to us by October the 1<sup>st</sup>, but it is also a Master Agreement item that October the 15<sup>th</sup> is the date that the official Roster be delivered to the Faculty Union. So we have a 15-day amendment period basically.



There are two, best as I can tell, that have risen to the level that we need to chat about them here. One, is a Donna **Wood** who is listed as CBA Management and also in CHAS Philosophy and World Religions. In earlier versions, her position has voting rights in one place but not the other. It seems to be clerical that it was an accidental inclusion that she has voting rights in both Departments listed on the current Roster. And in talking with the clerical person who is doing this, she is not comfortable with the idea of correcting voting rights without us saying that's what we mean to do. I guess that's enough background on that one. If you have questions or—I have a suggestion on it, if.....my suggestion would be that return it to what it's always been on earlier Rosters. Senator **Smith**.

**Smith:** She has a joint appointment in both Departments?

**Funderburk:** Yes.

**Smith:** And wouldn't it then be up to the Departments if they chose? She could have voting rights in one, Philosophy & Religion or Management. I don't know. She does with us. But wouldn't it be up to the Department, the other Department of Philosophy and Religion, to give her voting rights, if they chose to do that? Couldn't she—couldn't that— isn't that doable?

**Funderburk:** Well, the Faculty Roster—for the local stuff they could. But the Faculty Roster has been used to determine the number of votes on issues related to the fully faculty. For example, voting on the recent Constitutional amendment. So currently, it says she has 2 votes. So that's why it is an issue right here. And that's why my, for simplicity, my suggestion would be to put it back where it was, and this was probably dealt with at one time or another. And I believe it was with Management. Is that the sense of the Senate? To return it to what it has been in the past?

**Terlip:** I guess. I would also be comfortable asking her which one she would like it to be counted on.

**Funderburk:** I guess—but this did not come from her. It's actually one of the administrators noticed that a change had occurred, and the people

who'd prepared the list think that it was just their bad in transferring it into a different format. So--

Ok, then the other one is a person not listed that I was asked to give some feedback back on. This is Richard Allen **Hays** who's currently the Director of the Public Policy Program and somehow is not listed as having faculty anywhere. It should apparently have been in Political Science

**Peters:** Yeah, he does.

**Funderburk:** as a listing as a non-voting, which would be in keeping with other administrators on campus, is the assumption, unless somebody takes exception to that. That would be the same way that President Allen is listed in a department. Senator **East**.

**East:** I don't understand. He's listed as not having a home?

**Funderburk:** He's not listed period.

**East:** He's not listed. Ok.

**Peters:** He's a member of the Political Science Department.

**Funderburk:** Ok. If we're both ok on those or ok on each of those, then I will pass that along, and hopefully, there won't be—technically, this challenge period is open until Saturday, the end of this week. So since I'm out of town the rest of the week, I asked Vice-Chair **Breitbach** in the event something comes up you may get something on the ONLYSenatorsONLY list asking for a vote. I've heard rumors that there may be another one out there, but I don't have a name attached to it, so I can't give any information at this time. Ok? That's what I have.

## BUSINESS

### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Funderburk:** Ok, so, call for approval of the Minutes of September 26, 2011. My understanding is that no additional corrections have been received on this. Is there a motion to approve the Minutes?

**Smith:** Motion to approve the Minutes.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Smith** motions. Second? Senator **Dobie**. Discussion? None? No corrections? I'm surprised, because this was a pretty major change, that no one has any additional comments, but we'll let that pass (light laughter and many quiet voices amongst themselves). I'll assume they are accepted by acclamation and move on before somebody notices (more light laughter) to items for docketing.

### CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1094 for Docket #992, Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy from the Educational Policies Committee

**Funderburk:** The very popular 3-time repeat performance of the Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy (laughter) Calendar Item 1094. Motion to docket?

**Terlip:** I move to docket in regular order.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip** motioned to docket in regular order. Second? (Several spoke at once.) We'll give Senator **Marshall** a chance to appear in the Minutes for that. Discussion? All in favor? (ayes around) Opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion passed. Docketed in regular order.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1095 for Docket #993, Emeritus Faculty Request for Jack Wilkinson, Mathematics, effective July 1, 2011

**Funderburk:** Calendar 1095, Emeritus Faculty Request for Jack Wilkinson in Mathematics. Motion to docket it? Senator **Kirmani**. Second? Senator **East** seconds. Discussion? (none heard) All those in favor of docketing in regular order say “aye.” (ayes around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? None. Docketed in regular order.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

DOCKET #989 MORATORIUM ON LAC CATEGORY REVIEWS

**Funderburk:** Now for the Calendar Items to be discussed today. Calendar 1091, Docket 989 Moratorium on the LAC Category Reviews. This was motioned by **Smith**. Seconded by **DeBerg**. Senator **Smith** do you want to lead off with this thing?

**Smith:** Do you want me to move to approve or just.....?

**Funderburk:** I suppose we should do that as well.

**Smith:** I move that we approve this moratorium on LAC category reviews.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Smith** made the motion to approve. Senator **DeBerg** is not here. Do I have a second?

**Kirmani:** I second.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Kirmani** seconded on this. We are now in discussion on the merits.

**Smith:** Yes. This is suggested by Dee Dee **Heistad**, the LAC Director, and she talked about it with the LAC Committee, which I'm the Senate's Rep on that Committee. **Susan [Roberts-Dobie]** is also on the Committee. And the motivations are a couple of things. One, there is currently kind of some uncertainty about the future structure of the program, a potential for having different category structure, and secondly, because of what's

involved on assessment, the Assessment Academy, one of the major focuses of that is on assessment for the Liberal Arts Core. And assessment is a huge part of the part of category reviews. Those who don't know, category reviews are the way that, in essence, the Senate and faculty kind of review the performance of the program category by category, typically on I think it's about a 7-year rotation. It's a lot of work, and I know some of you—**Scott**, for instance—have been involved in category reviews. They are very demanding. And there's a concern because of this kind of—I want to say uncertainty about the program, we would like to have a moratorium of the remainder of this year and the next year, basically, just to kind of stop on the category review. And then when we pick it up, the presumption is we will have in place a stronger sense of what the program will look like, and it will be easier, and I think more motivating, for faculty to be involved in coordinating committees and getting into kind of the—a more kind of ongoing management of the program. That's the rationale.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**

**Swan:** And so this is actually then a recommendation from the Liberal Arts Core Committee, is that right? (**Smith** nods.) That's what I'm learning now. That's what it sounds like now, and so I'm asking, “Is that correct?”

**Smith:** That is correct.

**Swan:** So could we have that reflected this way? As it is submitted to us, I didn't know that Senator **Smith** was on the Committee. So that's good that he's on the Committee. But that it's coming from the Committee, not from a Senator. And as coming from the Committee, then I and my colleagues here think that it makes sense, in that we are supposed to endorse Committee recommendations but not necessarily from, you know, an individual Senator thinking it's a good idea. But from the comments, it sounds like it's coming from the Committee. As coming from the Committee, it certainly makes sense.

**Funderburk:** And the only thing I can comment here is as far as the way I received it initially was from an individual as a suggestion. It was not a formal Committee Report.

**Smith:** Yeah, I didn't

**Funderburk:** I've heard from plenty of people that that's the general consensus of that Committee, however.

**Smith:** Yeah, I didn't how—I mean, the—when you put it in, it asks for first name/last name, and it's from me, but when it's written to this end, the LACC is proposing a 2-year moratorium, so the stuff clearly states it's from the Committee.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip** then Senator **Peters**

**Terlip:** I just had a question. Do you know what programs are scheduled to be reviewed? Do you know where they are in the cycle? I know we did ours for Category 5 last year. I was just curious where we are?

**Smith:** **Susan** do you know?

**Roberts-Dobie:** The CSBS is who is coming up next, and then there's 2 outstanding ones.

**Smith:** CSBS just did theirs. We got to—I think we actually—I'm not sure if it's been brought here, but they've finished with theirs.

**Peters:** Yeah, ours. Category 5 has been done.

**Roberts-Dobie:** But, the discussion is we didn't want them to redo any of—to continue to work into the next year, because asking them for more would be unduly burdensome based on the changes that are to come.

**Smith:** Yeah. I'm not sure which new ones would be launched in these periods, and if I had to guess, I'm thinking it would be more like Category 2. Because you've got Category 1 stuff, Communications, wasn't that recently?

**Terlip:** That was last year.

**Roberts-Dobie:** And it's not Personal Wellness, and it's not Science.

**Smith:** So I don't really know. I'm not sure.

**Terlip:** Well, I guess I was curious about that, because I was wondering if the data they had gathered would be helpful in this process? I mean, in the process of redoing the LAC requirements? Shouldn't some of the program review stuff be useful? For what's working?

**Smith:** It's considered and taken into account, but, you know, I wouldn't say it dominates the—that's—you're talking to—that comes to the LACC, and the stuff on reviewing goes to the LAC-RSC, which is kind of a different body, but which does have access to category reviews. We use them, but it's

**Terlip:** I'm not opposed to this, but I'm just thinking if it's something critical, and, you know, it's going to be 10 years since the faculty's looked at it, that's quite a lot.

**Smith:** Well, it's not going to be 10 years. All it does is it just puts a gap in the thing, and then we pick up in the same place moving forward. So it's not like somebody's going to get dropped out and miss a turn in the cycle. There're—it's just that the cycle's being stalled for a couple of years. You see what I mean? Nobody's getting an exemption.

**Terlip:** No, I understand that, but to the extent that they use the program reviews to come up with the new one, they would be working with really old data. That's my only concern.

**Funderburk:** Two things. Senator **Peters** is in line. And one note for Sherry, particularly in the male voices, try to speak up a bit. The mics with the rumbling are taking out that range of audio. So, without yelling at each other.....

**Peters:** Yeah, I mean, like **Jesse** said, I am inclined to defer to committees, but I did have a question about the rationale here, because it does seem that this is the time when we should be getting more data on the programs that we have, if we are trying to figure out if proposed changes are going to be beneficial or not, or if assuming that everything that has been proposed

goes in as has been proposed, it might be nice 4 years down the line, 5 years down the line, to be able to have a sense of how we've improved or whether we've improved what's there now. And so I don't—I'm a little skeptical of stopping the review process, because it seems like we could—if anything, it seems like we should spend the next 3 years establishing a good firm baseline and invigorating those category review committees, or rather the category coordinating committees, so that they're ready to step up when the Assessment Academy stuff kicks in and they are ready to assess the value of the new programs. And then the other thing was, depending upon what category is being reviewed, I mean, some of the categories are not going to change all that much. Or they might have one additional option added in. So Natural Science, you're still going to have to know how your basic lab courses are doing, and then you're going to have the additional option. Or Humanities, they're still going to have to know how the Humanities courses are doing, and then there's just going to be the Global Humanities as one option. So, if some of those categories are up for review, I guess I'm not quite sure why we would stop the process.

**Smith:** Well, a couple of things. One is that from the standpoint of getting faculty involved, in most cases there are not existing category coordinating committees, and so it's hard to get faculty to kind of be involved in this, recognizing that they, you know, might not want to commit to a committee for a category that doesn't exist down the road. And it's been a challenge getting category coordinating committees anyway. Secondly, given what would happen with the Assessment Academy, I suspect that there's going to be substantial and much more intensive assessment of the program, so the kind of thing is, you know, what people have done historically. And I know your College and that Category 5 was as well done on assessment as anybody, but a lot of the assessment is not very good, and so to get them to kind of do—continue to do not very good assessment, and then we're going, we're saying, “Gee, we are going to come along with some serious assessment.” Why not wait until we get the serious assessment and then get them doing that? Because I can be honest, a lot of the assessment that is done as part of this program is no different than the rest of this University, is not all that strong. So, the argument would be, “Yeah, let's make a clean start rather than perpetuating arguably second-rate



assessment practices in many of these categories and putting a lot of effort into it when it isn't going to give you a good comparison to, you know, adding new courses and stuff like that.” It just doesn't give—I don't think in many cases it will give you good data.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Dobie**

**Roberts-Dobie:** And I think the conversation, I'm sure, showed the CSBS is in and then sending some things back to them is actually, I think, how the conversation arose—is if we had questions would it make sense to go back to the Committee, and the answer was, “It's unduly burdensome to ask you to do work on something—on a structure that possibly will not exist in a year from now, and that the objectives will change.” Should we not say, “If there are different objectives in the futures, why would we want to have people submit reports based on different objectives?” So we don't want to just create work for your College.

**Peters:** I think we are through. I think Category 5 is all the way through ours, but

**Roberts-Dobie:** It's not. We needed to revisit. And so we didn't want to burden you guys with revisits I think is the issue and how that came up in the first place.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>[NOTE: Senator **Roberts-Dobie** was referring to a scheduled review of Category II. The Category V Review Report was accepted by the Faculty Senate from the LACC on September 27, 2010, and the LACC held a follow-up meeting with the Category V Review Committee on November 19, 2010].

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**

**Swan:** And so, if I could ask the Provost a question. I'm sure that this is the case, because it's gotten this far, but the Provost must be fine with not having—they're not assessments, of course, but the Program Review of the Liberal Arts Cores for this period, because it is something (?substantive?)—I mean, the faculty are very happy not to do these kinds of things, but often it is the Administration that wants those to be reviewed. I mean, make

sure that we are doing what we say we are doing. But the Provost, who gave the funding to elevate the Director of the Liberal Arts Core to a real position, I thought in part to foster better—even better—program reviews. My view of the program reviews is that they are fine indeed, and I'm sure they would continue to be, and that the new Director of the Liberal Arts Core was to foster an even better review process. But is that accurate? That the Provost's Office feels that given the current circumstances that this is a good proposal?

**Gibson:** I think this is a good proposal, absolutely.

**Swan:** And so how long does the Provost's Office feel good about us not doing reviews of Liberal Arts Core?

**Gibson:** I think the recommendation is until Spring '13.

**Swan:** Until Spring '13, so through Spring '13. So starting Fall '13, whatever our Liberal Arts Core is will pick up on a review process like this? Ok. Good.

**Gibson:** But I think the important thing is the Assessment Academy work is continuing. That work is not dropping off. The Assessment Academy work on the LAC will be continued during that time period.

**Swan:** Very good.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Breitbach**

**Breitbach:** Do you perceive that assessment work decreasing the burden on those Colleges and committees because it is such an overwhelming amount of work to go through those elementary degrees (?)? Is that anticipated?

**Smith:** I bet what the Assessment Academy does can help, but a lot of it improved the administration in developing category coordinating committees that function on an ongoing basis rather than a once-every-7-year thing. That's been the main problem, is that you only do the assessment once every 7 years. That's not a good way of doing assessment. We haven't really set up, I think, an effective infrastructure of providing

information. I don't know, **Scott**, what your experience was, if you had all the stuff just available to you that you really needed or just the raw data kind of thing.

**Peters:** Actually, yeah, I mean **Siobahn** gave us a pile of data on the facts of enrollment in the courses and all that kind of stuff, and then as far as assessment, we had to collect our own data, of course. Though I will say that ours was—my experience of the process, and **Katherine** was on that committee with me, too, but if anything, I think it actually invigorated the College and turned that once-every-7-years review committee into a standing coordinating committee, which still meets once or twice a year. It goes over whatever the current issues are in the LAC. It has been active in responding to the suggested changes to the LAC, and I guess that's why—my experience with that might be what makes me a little bit skeptical of this, because my experience was that this invigorated our College and got it more involved in becoming—in actively monitoring their category of the LAC.

**Smith:** Yeah, see I think your experience is kind of the exception rather than the rule, because I think most places the coordinating committees get formed and they do their thing more or less well, and then they just go away for another 7 years.

**Terlip:** I can speak to our Department, but we're largely self-contained because it's one Department and just a couple of courses that count. We meet very regularly, so I think it varies.

**Smith:** It does. Humanities is well managed as well, but some of the categories really aren't. I mean rarely—we've had lots of troubles now with some of the Category 1 groups, you know, various subsets there in single categories. It's not getting good assessment. All sorts of troubles with that.

**Funderburk:** I don't see anyone looking for recognition. Are we ready to have a vote on this? Ok. Discussion is closed then. All those in favor of this motion, say “aye.” (ayes around) All those opposed? (a couple heard). Abstentions?

**Swan:** I call for a division of the house. I can't \_\_\_\_\_

**Funderburk:** Ok. Division of the house is called for [**Funderburk** holds the following roll call):

Senator **Wurtz:** I vote in favor of the motion.

Senator **Marshall:** Voting in favor.

Senator **Terlip:** I'm against.

Senator **Dobie:** Favor.

Senator **Peters:** Nay.

Senator **Breitbach:** Favor.

Senator **Swan:** I abstain.

Senator **Kirmani:** Favor.

Senator **Smith:** Favor.

Senator **Van Wormer:** In favor.

Senator **East:** Favor.

Senator **Boody:** Favor.

**Funderburk:** The motion passes. Moving on.

DOCKET #990, COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES DELIBERATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM JANUARY 18, 2009 (sic 2010)

**Funderburk:** [reads the docket] That was the date on that document, but we are pretty sure that was January 2010, because the meetings didn't happen until December of 2009 that it was reporting on.

**Breitbach:** Yes, that's got to be a typo.

**Funderburk:** Yes, but, Senator **Breitbach**, this will need some probably greater clarification before we could even entertain a motion. That's my feeling, unless you want to have the motion and take it

**Breitbach:** Well, I think I'm looking for feedback before we meet with the Committee on Committees. Does everybody have the document, the Report from the Committee on Committees that was sent out prior to the last meeting, I believe? It's a document that is to Professor **Wurtz** from the UNI Committee on Committees with a date of January 18, 2009, but that's

got to be a typo. It's got to be January 2010. And the Committee brought this document before the Senate, and we discussed a few things and supposedly approved a few things, took a few votes, but we haven't enacted some of those things. Is there any way we can get that up? [meaning project it to the room]

**Funderburk:** She's working on that now.

**Breitbach:** Ok.

**Swan:** Are we just talking?

**Funderburk:** Yes go ahead.

**Swan:** Well, I just say—I just want it registered that I couldn't find this, and so I couldn't review it ahead of time.

**Funderburk:** It should have been received in an e-mail directly to everybody on the ONLYSenatorsONLY list 2 weeks ago, I think.

**Swan:** Oh, it was an e-mail attachment?

**Funderburk:** Right. However, I did discover just this afternoon that it was not showing, though it was attached, on the website, which has to do with some more internal stuff we have to change, because there are like 3 places that can make things disappear. [This document was now projected on the large screen.]

**Marshall:** I was going to say I found it about a half an hour before this meeting online, like she just did, because I wouldn't have gotten it by the e-mail sent to Senators, since I'm an alternate, so, yeah.

**Funderburk:** Right. And I will give that explanation. There is something weird in the back-end of our website that there are multiple places you have to publish something, and if you don't find all of them sometimes some of the things, like the attachment, doesn't show up, even though it shows up for those of us who are administrators. We see it and don't realize that you are not seeing it. So anytime you think something is

missing at this point, don't hesitate to send me a note. I found it over lunch myself. Senator **Marshall** and then Senator **Terlip**.

**Marshall:** I just wondered because I also found a second document there that had some handwriting on it.

**Breitbach:** Yes, that's it.

**Marshall:** Then that's part of it? Ok. Because I was unclear—you'll tell me later which part of this the group is talking about.

**Funderburk:** Yes, there's a back-story on it.

**Marshall:** Ok

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip**

**Terlip:** I just had a question about are we also going to try to talk about setting deadlines? When they are going to report elections? Because we still don't have the 2011-2012 report, which should come at the beginning of the year, so we know election results.

**Breitbach:** Yes.

**Terlip:** And I don't want to go out of turn, but

**Funderburk:** No, no, I agree. It's worth commenting that I have asked specifically, and we've had a meeting also about designing a structure here on campus for reporting elections that gets these things done in a more systematic fashion. And specifically I've asked the Committee on Committees to put together its recommendation for how that would run. When I spoke to the Chair of that Committee Friday afternoon, she was hoping that they would be meeting this Friday afternoon to work on this. But I share your concerns. Senator **Breitbach** pointed this out also. Yes, go ahead.

**Breitbach:** I'm just saying that's why we are having this discussion.

**Terlip:** Ok, so I could ask that maybe when you revise the description of Committee on Committees that we put a deadline by which they must report to us, period, in their charge?

**Breitbach:** Yes.

**Terlip:** Yes.

**Breitbach:** I think part of the problem with that Committee is it's not as closely tied to the Senate, and it needs to have a closer tie to the Senate, so that there isn't that breakdown in communication. The other problem is when the Chair of the Committee is no longer on the Committee the following year, there's another huge breakdown, and that has happened, I think, a couple of times. So having the Chair of that Committee as the—the Vice-Chair of the Senate serve as the Chair of that Committee, you have that link, or there's less chance for that breakdown in communication to occur, because we do have a problem not knowing who has won some of these elections.

**Funderburk:** And that topic is up for discussion in the Bylaws Committee to rewrite that potentially, which will ultimately come here for us to decide if that's how we want to have involvement.

**Terlip:** I just didn't want to lose that thought, because I've been really scattered today, and I know my mind. (laughs)

**Funderburk:** I don't see anyone else, so Senator **Breitbach**.

**Breitbach:** So, the Committee recommended that the Graduate Curriculum Committee should have formal annual reports to the Faculty Senate. I see a problem with this, because most of you realize that the curriculum committees, whether they are the College Curriculum Committees, Department Curriculum Committees, typically are on and then off. And so they should report to us—we need to see when is it best for them to report to us. But to report annually doesn't make a lot of sense.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Peters**

**Peters:** Just a clarification. Do the notes, the handwritten notes on here, indicate that this was approved by the Senate already?

**Breitbach:** Approved by us, but it wasn't communicated back to the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

**Funderburk:** The handwritten notes were the copy that I was taking the day of the meeting.

**Peters:** And we don't have Minutes from that meeting? Is that correct?

**Funderburk:** We have Minutes as well.

**Breitbach:** There was a lot of discussion but no follow-through on the actions, is my feeling. And I think—I'm hoping that now having a Secretary, because it's not Sherry's job or anybody else's, you know, it's not her job to follow-through on the actions, and that's where things are falling apart.

**Funderburk:** That's right.

**Breitbach:** We are taking votes and then—and again, I think having a Secretary and having somebody on the Senate who is Ex Officio or Chairing some of these committees I think will help any follow-through on some of the actions on the true votes.

**Funderburk:** Ok, so we have Senator **Marshall**, Senator **East**, and then Senator **Boody**.

**Marshall:** Ok, I just had a—first of all, I wanted to say I support the idea of the curriculum committees only reporting every 2 years, because I'm on the Graduate Curriculum Committee, and I've been on it probably 10 out of the last 12 years, because the librarian component has changed on that committee, and originally we weren't a voting member. And then a few years ago, we became a voting member. So, I was sort of on it forever for a while. But basically we do almost nothing besides every other Fall. Really, I mean, every now and then something is pushed through, but other than that you can't predict it, so I don't know that it's that worthwhile to write a whole report. By I also wanted to mention that I'd like to have somebody—



and I don't know the answer, clarify the name of this committee that's mentioned, because I frequently, in recent years especially, heard it referred to as Graduate College Curriculum Committee. And that's frequently what it's called, and even in the curricular documentation that's online, that's what it's called. So I just—I've never known. I call it—they tend to call it the GCCC now a lot, so that would stick that “C” from the word “College” in there. And the last thing I wanted to say is I'm not absolutely sure that it reports to the University Curriculum Committee as it's stated here. I think maybe it reports to Graduate Council?

**Swan:** That's what it reports to. That's what I wanted to say.

**Breitbach:** There is a Graduate Council that reports—that on the website says reports to the Faculty Senate.

**Marshall:** Yes, they do. But I mean this Committee reports to Graduate Council rather than to the UCC, I think.

**Swan:** That's right.

(Someone speaking out of order and apologizing.)

**Funderburk:** Senator **East**, do you want to go ahead?

**East:** I guess I don't understand what we're doing. (some laughter)

**Breitbach:** Ok, well

**East:** Ok, some of the—if the Senate took action, and this is a matter of the action wasn't carried out, then it should be carried out. I mean, the current leadership should do what is necessary to have it carried out. If this is a matter of reconsidering what we did, then it should take the form of a report from the Curriculum—from some process whereby we have something specific to look at and work on. I'm not particularly enthusiastic about revisiting these things without knowing in advance that, “Yes, we are revisiting them.” So, is there a motion to reconsider the—that motion that was passed a year and a half ago? And, if so, should it be docketed?

**Breitbach:** I did. I docketed this. It was docketed in the regular order to take a look at the report and

**East:** Ok, so this is the discussion of this, and so what—but what's the purpose of the discussion?

**Breitbach:** To revisit this document and to make sure that we want to do what it—to revisit each of these recommendations.

**East:** But we voted on them already.

**Breitbach:** We didn't. That is true. We did vote on them, but to the best of my knowledge we didn't follow-through and take any action on those votes. That's where things kind of—you know what I mean? And so we haven't—so much time lapsed I'm wondering if we want to revisit some of these.

**East:** Ok. No, we do not wish to revisit them. (laughter)

**Swan:** Then we shouldn't have docketed it.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Boody**

**Boody:** I no longer need to speak. Senator **Marshall** already said what I was going to. I'm on the Graduate Curriculum Committee as well.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**

**Swan:** So one of those things that—I don't know what we are doing—now I don't know what we are doing. We did docket this, and here it is out here to talk about this, and so the Graduate Curriculum Committee I wanted to mention is, as has been mentioned, reports to the Graduate Council. It decides—you know, it's like us with undergraduate curriculum—decides about graduate curriculum. It then sends a report to us annually, and we then take it. But it is in charge of the graduate curriculum, so the Graduate Curriculum Committee we could say—I guess, we, you guys did say last year or whenever this was done—to report to us, but they don't have to. And it doesn't make—you know, they won't report to us. I mean, if I were on the Committee, I wouldn't. I would report to the people I need to report to,

the Committee of--and that would be the graduate faculty and each delegate of the Delegate Assembly of the Graduate Council. So I don't know

**Breitbach:** Exactly. That's my point. See, they're not—they're not on the list.

**Swan:** So, you're—you're suggesting that, yeah.

**Breitbach:** When I checked the website, they're not on the list of committees reporting to the Faculty Senate.

**Swan:** And is this why the leadership that doesn't want to take further action on this and wants us to know that you're not going to take further action trying to get a committee to report to us that we shouldn't report to? Because I'd be supportive of that. I'd say, "Oh, yeah, that's good. Let's not do this." Is that what this wants?

**Breitbach:** Exactly. I'm questioning why we passed this if there

**Swan:** Well, let's just not do it.

**Breitbach:** It doesn't jive with what's on the website. So what I'm saying is, "Where's the mistake?" Should they be reporting to the Graduate Council, as it sounds like they should be, and then the Graduate Council reports to us?

**Swan:** That's right.

**Breitbach:** So that would make this

**Swan:** No good.

**Breitbach:** moot, right? That's my point.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip** and then Senator **East**

**Terlip:** My recollection of the discussion was that we thought there was a loophole where graduate curriculum changes were not getting reported to the Senate, and so they were trying to figure out the best way to do that. So, I think what you all have been saying was the intent, that somehow we got—just like for undergraduate curriculum, we get a report--we get a report from graduate curriculum. However that makes the most sense and where it needs to come from, I don't know.

**Swan:** Graduate Council does report to us, though.

**Marshall:** I wanted to say—I'm sorry, go ahead.

**Funderburk:** Senator **East** and then Senator **Marshall**

**East:** Again, if we are going to reconsider action that we've taken in the past, we have to reconsider action. Website is not an official document of the Senate. It does not communicate actions of the Senate directly in its structure. So, if the content is wrong, the content needs to be made correct. In my recollection, and presumably the Minutes show, we voted to approve this. In order to change that policy, we need to have a motion that changes the policy, and we need to discuss it specifically and vote on it. I don't object to us talking about what we need to do with the Curriculum Committee—I mean the Committee on Committees or making our website accurate or those things. I think that's fine. I think we cannot take action today that changes actions. That in order to pass a motion like this or take an action like this, we have to have something docketed that indicates that that's what we are doing.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Marshall** and Senator **Peters**

**Marshall:** Ummm, let's see if I remember. Umm, I'm sorry. I forgot what I was going to say.

**Funderburk:** No problem. Senator **Peters**

**Peters:** Yeah, for what it's worth, I assumed that since the marginal comments indicated that some of these were approved and other things

weren't, I thought what we would be doing today would be discussing the things that had not been approved yet and had not been acted upon and that we would be considering motions to enact those recommendations; for example, #2, which there's no notes to indicate that it had been approved. It's not assuming it wasn't ever addressed.

**Breitbach:** Actually, it was.

**Peters:** It was addressed? (several voices agreeing) All right then.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**

**Swan:** So, I guess I don't understand how a motion could pass with 5 votes.

**Breitbach:** That was their Committee. That was the Committee on

**Swan:** Oh, in the committee, so not in the Senate.

**Funderburk:** Right.

**Breitbach:** Yes, it was their recommendation.

**Swan:** Oh, ok. We don't know how many votes in the Senate. Oh, I see.

**Breitbach:** It was their recommendation. And if you go back and look at our Minutes, there was considerable discussion at that meeting about #2. Their recommendation—they recommended 4 in favor and 1 opposed to combine the Faculty Strategic Planning Committee and the University Faculty Senate Budget Committee into one committee. We had a considerable amount of discussion about that.

**Swan:** Leading to what end?

**Terlip:** Kept them separate.

**Swan:** To keep them separate, ok.

**Funderburk:** We actually had a second separate motion, unrelated, that came forward asking us to reactivate the Budget Committee.

**Swan:** The Budget Committee. That's right. Ok.

**Breitbach:** Again, which we

**Terlip:** Who did report to us, and now it's another whole can of worms, but..... (laughs)

**Funderburk:** Anyone else in the line up? Senator **Peters**

**Peters:** I have a question, and if you want to rule it out of order or not pertinent, feel free, but I'm just trying to understand, well, as everyone is perhaps, the committee structure, but where do their charges come from? Where do committee charges come from? Who makes them? Because they are not in the Senate Bylaws. They are not in the Constitution. Where did they come from?

**Funderburk:** You know, also they are not in writing anyplace to figure out if this document is accurate, whether the website is accurate, or what you think your committee is doing is accurate.

**Terlip:** (passing hard copy to **Peters**) Or their charges as listed in their last report. The last report gave a charge for each of the committees.

**Funderburk:** The last report also notes a whole bunch of committees with membership, people who haven't been on the committee in 2 years by their own report.

**Peters:** So they have just been created over the years by somebody?

**Terlip:** At one time or another, I think the Senate created each of those, but we'd have to go back through all the Minutes to figure out which meetings.

**Swan:** And by accepting the Report, we endorsed the Report, including the charges.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Wurtz**

**Wurtz:** As I recall, and we would need to go back to our Minutes, as we attempted to assess the recommendations in this Report, we discovered we didn't know enough to be able to do that. And it was much of what we're talking about here that we don't have access to “when was that committee formed?”, “what was the original charge?”, and that's where we decided we needed to ask, and we put it on the Vice-Chair to revisit the issue of “where are we in our committees?”, get that nailed down, to as much as possible go back to Minutes and discover when things have been constituted, when things have gone away, and that we would come back and look at this when we were operating from a solid knowledge base. Which is what **Karen** is again attempting to give us, is that solid knowledge base.

**Funderburk:** The overall committee structure as it stands right now is a quagmire. It's hopeless. I mean, half the people don't know they are on the committees. The folks that are allegedly chairing committees don't answer your e-mail, so you can't even always get anything out of them. And then somebody else has got a problem because they need somebody from us to be on the committee that that committee is supposed to get. So, we need to get a handle on this. I have asked the Bylaws to also consider the possibility of changing our docketing procedures to require that items coming before this body go through a committee before they are accepted as docketing, in part so we don't have discussion about things that aren't really ready for us, but also so that it gives committees a clear job all the time, which helps to keep it together. Because it appears in talking to some of the people that some of the committees kind of came apart because they didn't have a clear charge at the moment—or they had a charge, but they didn't have anything to do about that charge at this particular moment, if that makes sense. So, this is a big issue. Senator **Wurtz**.

**Wurtz:** And I'm sure there are those who would disagree and that there would be grounds for that, I'm still thinking it's in our best interest to wipe the slate clean and start over. That going back and revisiting and trying to

figure out is going to take a tremendous amount of time. That we should just say, “What do we need now?” and move forward.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Breitbach**

**Breitbach:** I think we can go through the list and identify half of those committees that are functioning well, have stable chairs, and report to us annually. I think we can go through and do that. It's the other half that I think we need to do as Professor **Wurtz** indicated, and that's just about wipe the slate clean and start fresh.

**Funderburk:** So probably the important

**Breitbach:** I think we are all agreed that that's what we need to do.

**Funderburk:** I think the important question that hasn't been posed yet indirectly is, “What do we as a body—how do we move and proceed with facing this?” It keeps coming up, and I think each time somebody throws up their hands because they can't get anything done and walks away, but we are having increased difficulties because we haven't addressed this problem.

**Breitbach:** Let me give an example. We have a committee called the Advisory Committee for the Center of the Enhancement of Teaching. We have not had a Center for the Enhancement of Teaching for some time. It may very well be that in the future we have a Center for the Enhancement of Teaching, and at that time the Senate may want to consider an advisory board or a committee for that, but right now it does not make sense to have a committee for something that does not exist.

**Funderburk:** Senator **East**

**East:** We have the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching, or we have a Committee for the Enhancement of Teaching. It's not an advisory committee for the Center. We changed the name of it in this action we took a year and a half ago or whenever it was. We changed the name of that Committee. I agree the Committee is not meeting. I was a member of it. I had a failed attempt at—purely my fault that the Committee did not



meet last year whenever we were trying to make that happen, but—and I agree it's one that we might wish to get rid of. On the other hand, we might wish to revitalize it, but I think there are a number of committees we wish to look at and—so I'm in full agreement that we need to do that. But I don't think we do that by revisiting action that we did.

**Breitbach:** Ok, then I would like to propose that we have an ad hoc in the Senate that works with the Committee on Committees to do just that.

**East:** Second.

**Swan:** Do you want the Bylaws Committee to do that?

**Breitbach:** I really want the Bylaws Committee—well, if you can't

**Swan:** It's related, I mean, that's why

**Funderburk:** You're absolutely right. It

**Breitbach:** It's related. I was going to say, it can't be in isolation. It has to do that, and right now the members of that Committee are—are we all Senators?

**Swan:** Yeah.

**Funderburk:** Yes.

**Breitbach:** We could do that. We could just say that they are also going to take on that task of bringing back those recommendations to the Senate.

**Swan:** Is that fine with Senator **East**?

**Breitbach;** We've got to get something done on this. We can't stall another year.

**Swan:** He made the motion, so make another

**Breitbach:** That would make sense to combine that and not create yet another committee.

**Swan:** That has to work with another committee.

**Breitbach:** Yes, and report back to yet another committee. (voices and laughter) Ok, I would like to move that the task—the Bylaws Committee would also be looking at the committee structure and working, if necessary, with the Committee on Committees.

**Smith:** Second.

**Funderburk:** Second from Senator **Smith**. First motion needs to be dealt with.

**Swan:** I was going to add that, good.

**Breitbach:** Discussion. Discussion.

**East:** That's the point of order I would like to raise. I mean, there was a motion on the floor that got ignored.

**Peters:** Had it been seconded?

**East:** It had. Certainly you may withdraw the motion, but—if you think that's necessary in order to continue.

**Terlip:** **Karen** made the other motion. You need to withdraw it.

**Swan:** Who made the motion?

**Terlip:** **Karen** made the initial motion.

**Breitbach:** In withdrawing it then we need to take action on these votes, so I will need to contact the Graduate Curriculum Committee and inform them that the Senate has (dissent all around)

**Funderburk:** No, no, no. (many voices giving opinions on the current state of the floor) The one you made right before that. Are you willing to withdraw the motion?

**Breitbach:** Which one's the one before that?

**Wurtz:** You had two on the floor simultaneously. (several voices continuing)

**East:** You made a motion that we revive—that we had—that we revisit the committee structure.

**Breitbach:** Oh, I think I was not actually making a formal motion.

**Funderburk:** But he seconded it.

**East:** You said, "I would like to move...."

**Breitbach:** So he seconded it. What do I have to do?

**Funderburk:** Say, "Yes, I withdraw."

**Breitbach:** Yes, I withdraw.

**Funderburk:** Will the second please agree to withdraw? (many voices at once; evidently an assent from the seconder) The petitioners have withdrawn that motion. Now the motion on the floor currently for discussion is to task the Bylaws Committee with trying to deal with committee structure as well, and so there's discussion open on that amendment now that we're back on Robert's path. Senator **East**.

**East:** I don't object to that, but they seem less related to me than is being made out. Currently, the Bylaws presumably say something about the formation of committees, and certainly that would be something that would need to be in there, but the call—I mean, the charge and set details of committee appointments would not be part of the Bylaws unless you recommend—as on the Committee on Committees—you are recommending that someone be, that a particular position on the Senate

be part of that committee. Otherwise, they are mostly unrelated tasks, and I don't object to those people doing it, but I don't see the relationship.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Wurtz** and then Senator **Swan**

**Wurtz:** Two things: one is I think that we should revisit, and this would tie it more closely to the Bylaws, that it might be wise that the Senate policy is we form no committee unless we are going to appoint a Senator to be a liaison member, that we are going to be serious about our committees. Having a Senator as a liaison member will help with communication and will help us to not just form committees all over the place, because we are committing a Senator as a liaison member. The second thing, I noticed that we seemed to be assuming that we will continue with the Committee on Committees. I'd like to see that assumption also set aside, that there might be a better process than having a Committee like this.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**

**Swan:** I was taking notes because those are very appropriate to the Bylaws Committee, so we'll pursue those. And so in answer to that, that sort of answers how they are related. The Faculty Constitution also delegates to this Body the authority of the faculty, but then over time it's just tacitly approved, if the faculty doesn't get together and overturn it. It also authorizes this Body to further delegate, specify authority, such as through Bylaws, to committees. And so committees can take actions that the faculty or its delegate assembly authorizes to take action, and if nothing contradicts it over a period of time, it's the view of the faculty. And so that's how it's directly—it can be and is directly related to the Bylaws and the Constitution, so I can see that it does make sense that the Bylaws Revision Committee would consider the further delegation of authority or eliminating it. There's some faculty who want no further delegation of authority beyond the Faculty Senate, so it goes both ways. So that's how it's related.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip**

**Terlip:** I agree that this all needs to be revisited, but I think we also don't want to err on the assumption that just because something hasn't met that there's not a need for it. I mean, I think there are some good ideas here that might need reworked, and it sounds like we just want to throw everything away and start over, which is fine, but I think this is a source we can look to as well.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Breitbach**

**Breitbach:** The reason for that comment was that I think there are certain committees that are only used every couple of years and might be handled as an ad—on an ad hoc basis, rather than having elections every year for a committee and maintaining a committee structure and a chair, then maybe for 2 years there's

**Terlip:** I think there are other ways that you can do it besides just committee and ad hoc committees. I mean, there are—I'm just saying I don't want the ideas to go away (cell phone rings) This is one of my children, excuse me. I'll take this outside (laughter).

**Funderburk:** Anyone? (pause) So, we're ready for a vote? The motion is to task the Bylaws Committee with also coming forward with recommendations for reorganizing the committee structure of the Senate. All those in favor say “aye”. (ayes around) All those opposed? (2 nays) And abstentions? (1 abstention) Ok. Motion passed. On to New Business.

## NEW BUSINESS

**Funderburk:** Well, what do you know? It has to do with committees. (light laughter) The Faculty Senate member of the Facilities Planning Committee, we have two nominees—actually three nominees combined for 2 positions.

**Breitbach:** I'm already on the Committee.

**Funderburk:** Right, you're not one of them. Susan **Dobie** managed to convince Chris **Edginton** that between the two of them they could maintain, so that's a single nomination. And then Betty **DeBerg** self-

nominated at the last meeting as well for this Committee. There's still room for a third, if you'd like to have a really lively election.

**Breitbach:** I will comment that it is an interesting committee. It meets once a month on Thursday afternoons. They provide cookies. But you get to see some of the plans for building and improvement and expansion and renovation. You also get tours. You get to discuss some of the bright ideas, proposals that come forward. They are not all approved. So it is a rather interesting committee, and I've always enjoyed it.

**Roberts-Dobie:** And when you say—I'm sorry, I just started

**Funderburk:** Please go ahead, Senator **Dobie**

**Roberts-Dobie:** When you say, "split the nomination," I would attend the next 2 meetings, and then **Chris** will begin to attend when he returns to his Senate responsibilities, should he and I be elected.

**Funderburk:** Yes, we have two for one spot, so three people for one spot.

**Swan:** Oh, I see.

**Funderburk:** But two of them are together. Ok, are we ok with having an open election? Nobody's feelings are going to be hurt if you don't get to go to these meetings? Ok, so all those in favor of Senators **Dobie/Edginton** for the Facilities Planning

**East:** Point of order. This is Senator **Edginton/Dobie**, right?

**Dobie:** Yes, it's like **Edginton** with **Dobie** in parentheses.

**East:** I mean, he's the Senator for 3 years.

**Dobie:** He is. Right.

**Funderburk:** Right. And it's a 3-year commitment, and in this case, the anticipation is that it would be a 3-year commitment. That was the hope of getting the overlapping. There's always the possibility that next year's Body

would choose to reconsider everything or who knows? Ok, let's try that one more time. Senator **Edginton/Dobie** in favor? (9 hands raised) Senator **DeBerg** (hands raised). So, Senator **Edginton/Dobie** is our new Facilities Planning Committee representative. I will let **Morris** know about that. And as I recall, the next meeting is next week on the 20<sup>th</sup>. Any other New Business from the floor?

**Swan:** We're not doing the Report? I mean, maybe I just missed that.

**Funderburk:** The Report? Oh, the thing with..... I still have not heard anything from the Museum person. I wrote again today. So I cannot comment further.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Funderburk:** The Chair would be very entertained by a motion to adjourn. (light laughter)

**Marshall:** I move that we adjourn.

**Funderburk:** So, Senator **Marshall**. Thanks for that. Second?

**Peters:** Second.

**Funderburk:** Second from Senator **Peters**. All in favor? (ayes around) Opposed? (none heard) Thank you very much. (4:26 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate