

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, September 20, 2016**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

Senators Present: M. Adamek, F. Ahmad, R. Balakrishnan, J. Barker, C. Barnhardt, C. Benson, C. Brochu, G. Buettner, S. Campo, D. Caplan, K. Culp, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, P. Dilley, B. Dixon, S. Duck, F. Durham, A. Durnev, B. Eckstein, T. Gallanis, R. Ganim, D. Hall, S. Harwani, Z. Jin, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, K. Lamping, M. Lehan Mackin, D. Macfarlane, U. Mallik, T. Marshall, T. Midtrod, R. Oral, L. Ostedgaard, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, G. Ryan, J. Scott, L. Segre, J. Streit, J. Szot, K. Tachau, J. Taylor, C. Thomas, T. Treat, H. Udaykumar, S. Vigmostad, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wang, E. Wasserman, J. Welburn, P. Wesely, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, D. Wurster.

Officers Present: C. Bohannan, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.

Senators Excused: P. Brophy, J. Colgan, T. Mabry, K. Messingham, M. Nikolas, P. Romitti, J. Yockey.

Senators Absent: L. Allen, M. Blumberg, R. Boudreau, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, I. Grumbach, A. Jung, J. Klesney-Tait, W. Maury, R. Sah, D. Segaloff.

Guests: E. Brothers (Staff Council), B. Butler (Provost), L. Cox (AAUP), J. Florman (Center for Teaching), J. Garfinkel (FRIC), H. Hoerschelman (Staff Council), S. Johnson (Office of the Ombudsperson), C. Joyce (Office of the Ombudsperson), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), K. Millard (Staff Council), J. Modestou (EOD), J. Tiede (AAUP), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Vaughn called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals

A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Ganim seconded that the agenda be approved. Professor Treat moved to amend the agenda by moving the report on the AAUP sanction to the beginning of the New Business portion of the meeting. She expressed the opinion that the AAUP sanctioning of our university is of utmost importance for the Senate to discuss here today in full as we seek to understand what has happened and consider ways to move forward. She was concerned that with the full agenda, many senators might leave before the AAUP

discussion takes place and that the discussion would be cut short. Other agenda items could potentially be postponed, to another meeting if necessary. This important and time-sensitive issue needs our full attention, she added. Professor Tachau seconded the motion. Past President Bohannon commented that some of today's presenters may not be able to remain at the meeting until the end of the AAUP discussion. Vice President Snyder added that some senators may have come to the meeting specifically to hear the scheduled presenters in the listed order. Professor Scott spoke in favor of adjusting the order of the agenda items. He noted that job postings in his field routinely advise candidates to ascertain whether institutions appear on the AAUP sanction list before applying. The AAUP sanction is directly affecting the reputation and future well-being of our university; therefore, he considered discussion of the sanction to be by far the most important item on the agenda and he wanted to hear what the Senate leadership has done to move UI off the sanction list. One of the scheduled presenters, Professor Garfinkel, indicated that he could not stay until the end of the meeting, but that he could come to a future meeting. Professor Treat acknowledged that scheduled presenters would be inconvenienced by an agenda change, but she stressed that the AAUP discussion was of paramount importance to the Senate. Moreover, a guest from the national AAUP organization was present in the room today; he would not be available for a future meeting. Professor Johnson, Ms. Joyce, Ms. Kulper and Ms. Florman all indicated their willingness to present at a future meeting. The motion was approved in a hand vote.

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 26, 2016) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Campo seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Joseph Szot (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Karl Thomas (Internal Medicine) on the Faculty Council, 2016-19
  - Paul Dilley (Classics) to fill the unexpired term of Jennifer Iverson (Music) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-17
  - Steve Duck (Communication Studies) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-17
  - Sailesh Harwani (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Karl Thomas (Internal Medicine) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-19
  - Craig Just (Civil & Environmental Engineering) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Campus Planning Committee, 2016-18
  - Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (German) to fill the unexpired term of Meara Habashi (Psychological & Brain Sciences) on the Council on Teaching, 2016-18
  - Elena Gavrusheva (Linguistics) to fill the unexpired term of Tamara Afifi (Communication Studies) on the Financial Aid Advisory Committee, 2016-18
  - Weimin Han (Mathematics) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Research Council, 2016-17
  - Tracy Osborn (Political Science) to fill the unexpired term of Nicole Grosland (Biomedical Engineering) on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2016-20

- Tong Li (Mathematics) to fill the unexpired term of Jon Wilcox (English) on the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2016-18
- Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Committee on the Selection & Review of Central Academic Officials, 2016-17
- Chris Pigge (Chemistry) to the Financial Aid Advisory Committee, 2016-19
- Mitchell Kelly (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations) to the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2016-21
- Ann Rhodes (Nursing) to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2016-19
- Ali Hasan (Philosophy) to the Judicial Commission, 2016-19
- Paul Gowder (Law) to the Judicial Commission, 2016-19

Professor Wasserman moved and Professor Brochu seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

President Vaughn then requested that Professor Wilcox say a few words about Professor Claire Sponsler, a Faculty Senator and professor of English, who passed away unexpectedly over the summer.

Professor Wilcox stated that Professor Sponsler came to the University of Iowa in 1994, working her way through the ranks from assistant professor to named chair. She was an active presence in campus life, serving three times as an elected member of this body, with a year still remaining of her most recent three-year term. She was also a member, and sometimes chair, of the Campus Planning Charter Committee, building on her interests as a passionate advocate for the Friends of Historical Preservation within the community of Iowa City. She was also serving on the Research Council, and was a repeat member of the Committee on the Selection and Review of Central Academic Officials. Her leadership and good judgment were evident to all in a stint as chair of the Department of English, 2009-13. In 2015, her outstanding contributions to the university were recognized with appointment as the M.F. Carpenter Professor of English.

Professor Sponsler was an effective and modest administrator, whose commitment to the life of the mind empowered everything she did. She was a scholar of medieval literature, particularly drama, and a beloved teacher, keen to share her love of reading at many levels. One of the English Ph.D. graduates had recently reminded Professor Wilcox that when he probed what she wanted to get out of the program she had blurted out “I want to be like Claire Sponsler.”

Professor Sponsler was a giant in her academic field. Every essay that she published was a jewel. Each of her three single-authored monographs pushed at boundaries, with a particular skill for opening up the theater of everyday practice, and two of these books were recognized with prestigious awards.

Professor Sponsler suffered from a brain aneurysm on July 27 of this year, and died two days later. She is survived by her husband, Jeff Porter, a fellow colleague in the Department of English, as well as by her mother, sister, and brother, all living in Cincinnati, Ohio. She will be sorely missed. In the words of Chaucer about his scholar-administrator:

*Sowninge in muchel vertu was hir speche,*

*And gladly wolde she lerne and gladly teche.*  
(General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, I, 307-8, lightly adapted)

### III. New Business

- *Report on AAUP Sanction (Lois Cox, Katherine Tachau and Marian Wilson Kimber, UI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors)*

Professor Ganim moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the Senate not go into executive session, as indicated on the agenda, to discuss the AAUP sanction.

President Vaughn explained that it was his intention to allow non-administrative faculty and representatives from the other shared governance bodies to remain in the room during the executive session. Professor Tachau, a member of the UI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), commented that the UI Chapter members had no interest in discussing this topic in executive session. The members want faculty to be informed regarding the sanction. Professor Wasserman added that closed and secretive meetings had led us into our current situation; he saw no need to perpetuate that process.

In a hand vote, the motion carried.

President Vaughn indicated that the UI AAUP Chapter had requested that this item appear on the agenda in order to explain the sanction and give senators the opportunity to ask questions. A public forum will be held in the evening for the campus community. President Vaughn reminded the group that in September 2015, an officer of the national AAUP sent a letter to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa and the UI administration stating that the UI Chapter had asked the national AAUP to take an official interest in issues of academic governance raised by the Regents' appointment of the new university president. The national AAUP sent several executives to campus to interview various people in October regarding the search process. In December the national AAUP issued a report, *College and University Governance: The University of Iowa Governing Board's Selection of a President*. The report concluded that the Regents' conduct during the search process lacked transparency and violated AAUP principles regarding the appropriate faculty role during search processes. The report also stated that President Harreld "has stated his embrace of shared governance. He has sought to reach out to the faculty for advice and assistance. We believe that it would better serve the interests of the faculty and the university to take him at his word, while also remaining vigilant..."

President Vaughn continued, explaining that then-Senate President Bohannon had met with Hans-Joerg Tiede, Senior Program Officer in the Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Governance, at the national AAUP office in Washington, D.C. to discuss the rules and process governing the sanction. One issue they discussed was whether the sanction would be against the university or against the Board of Regents. Dr. Tiede then sent an email message to President Bohannon stating that "the current procedures of the Committee on College and University Governance are quite explicit in calling for the sanction to be imposed on the institution, and so the committee would need to make an exception to the stated procedures to recommend to its

annual meeting to sanction the Board. If in the view of the Faculty Senate, there are good reasons to make such an exception, it would be helpful to convey them to the Committee.”

During the spring semester the Faculty Council discussed whether to communicate a message on behalf of the Faculty Senate to the national AAUP regarding the potential sanction. The Council decided that it should advocate against the sanction of the university. The Senate officers sent a letter to the national AAUP arguing that it would be inappropriate and unfair to sanction the university because the AAUP report focused on wrongdoing by the Board, not by the university itself. The letter argued that the university has had an exemplary tradition of shared governance and that that tradition has continued under President Harreld. This past June, the national AAUP voted to sanction the University of Iowa for the Board’s conduct in the presidential search. Subsequently, based on the Faculty Council’s earlier discussions, President Vaughn sent a statement to the Senate expressing disappointment in the AAUP’s decision. In the statement he asserted that the AAUP’s sanction against the university was misdirected. President Vaughn expressed the hope that the university could now move forward from this unpleasant episode.

Professor Marian Wilson Kimber, a member of the Executive Committee of the UI Chapter of the AAUP and a delegate to the conference at which the vote to sanction UI was taken, thanked the Senate for the opportunity to provide background and to answer questions about the sanction. Professor Wilson Kimber explained that the mission of the AAUP is to advance academic freedom and shared governance. The AAUP has worked for over 100 years to define fundamental educational values, standards, and best practices. The AAUP occasionally issues reports on these topics, published in a volume that is available for purchase. Increasingly the AAUP has worked to ensure economic security for those involved in teaching and research in higher education, including graduate students. There are 51,000 members across the country. The AAUP has three components. The first part is a professional organization with advocacy units on individual campuses (the AAUP chapters at UI and ISU are advocacy units). The second part is a bargaining unit, with unions on various campuses, including UNI. The third part is a foundation. The AAUP originally grew out of a situation in which a Stanford University professor was fired because his views on various economic issues were displeasing to the wife of the university’s founder. The professionalization of the professoriate and the balance of power between faculty bodies and governing boards were also of great concern to the AAUP’s founding members, who worked to ensure that through shared governance faculty would have an appropriate voice in academic matters.

Professor Tachau explained that the four state of Iowa delegates to the national AAUP meeting were Professor Wilson Kimber, Professor Lois Cox of UI, Professor Dan Power of UNI, and herself. She then introduced Joerg Tiede, a professor of computer science with expertise in logic and linguistics, who has recently become the Senior Program Officer in the Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Governance at the national AAUP office. He also staffs the AAUP history committee and has served on various investigative committees. Dr. Tiede explained that the national AAUP issues two separate lists, the censure list (for violations of academic freedom and tenure) and the sanction list (dealing with college and university governance). The censure list has been in existence since the 1930’s, while the sanction list is a more recent creation. Dr.

Tiede commented that the founders of the AAUP viewed it as their responsibility to point out significant failures of administrations and governing boards to uphold principles that it advocated. That is the purpose of the AAUP's investigative reports. The censure and sanction lists are a mechanism for communicating to the public that the organization has found what it believes to be a significant failure to uphold these standards at a particular institution. The process begins with a complaint. The national AAUP office receives thousands of complaints about violations of academic freedom, tenure, and governance, and must then evaluate these complaints. Only a few are deemed significant enough to warrant an investigation. The presidential search at UI fell into this category and an investigative report was written. The Committee on College and University Governance reviewed the report and recommended to the annual meeting to impose a sanction. Dr. Tiede and his colleagues regularly communicate with the administrations of all institutions on the sanction list and invite them to work with the AAUP toward resolving the issues that caused the sanction. In order to remove the UI sanction, changes to existing Board of Regents policies would likely need to be made to bring the policies in line with the relevant standards; this would probably involve the Faculty Senate and the UI administration working with the Regents to accomplish this goal. Typically, an AAUP representative would need to visit the campus to assess the climate for governance before the sanction could be lifted.

Professor Kolker pointed out that lack of cooperation between the Board of Regents and the university had produced the circumstances that caused the sanction; therefore, she did not see how the Regents and the university could work together to remove the sanction. Moreover, the university had been punished for the Regents' lack of cooperation. Professor Brochu commented that he understood why the AAUP had imposed the sanction, but he expressed the opinion that the sanction had put the university in a bad position: to lift the sanction, change needs to come from the Regents, but the Regents do not seem to care about the sanction. President Vaughn noted that he has spoken to Board of Regents Executive Director Bob Donley and Board of Regents President Pro Tem Katie Mulholland, who have indicated that they are working very diligently to ensure that the search for a new UNI president is an open and transparent process. Of course, we will only be able to judge the process once it is concluded. Professor Tachau commented that before she went to the AAUP national meeting, she also held the view that the sanction against the university was unfair. Now, however, she believes that everyone present who has tenure, aspires to tenure, enjoys academic freedom, and believes that faculty should have a role in determining our curricula, etc., needs an organization that fights for those principles. It is the Regents who put us in this position, so we cannot therefore ask the AAUP not to fight for its principle of shared governance; otherwise shared governance may well disappear. Professor Tachau emphasized that the people who have an interest in making sure the Regents' policy changes are the faculty. This is why the AAUP publishes sanction and censorship lists. In fact, the wide press this sanction has received and the interest of legislators in the harm this does to our university's reputation may influence UNI's search in a positive way. In concluding, she commented that it is unfair to blame the AAUP for standing up for its principles, since we enjoy those principles in action all the time in our academic lives.

Professor Scott observed that the Board of Regents maintains that the presidential search at UI was transparent; therefore, he was skeptical that the UNI search would be truly transparent.

He urged that we not blame the victims in this situation; when we blame the AAUP, we are blaming ourselves. In his view, the AAUP made the right decision. He agreed with the opinion that governing boards do not care if they are sanctioned. It is appropriate then for institutions to be sanctioned, because the faculty do care. The sanction affects faculty and their professional standing. It is a humiliation to faculty and so faculty must stand up and insist that this come to an end. Dr. Tiede concurred with the opinion that sanctioning the institution, allowing for faculty to then pressure the Regents into changing their policies, was a more effective solution than simply sanctioning the Regents, who would likely ignore such a sanction.

Professor Mallik commented that the UI had gone through a controversial presidential search in 2006, as well. She did not foresee a change in the composition of the Board until there is a change in the governor's office. She therefore wondered what actions the faculty could possibly take to significantly impact this situation, e.g., go on strike? Professor Mallik suggested waiting to see how the UNI presidential search goes. If it concludes successfully, would AAUP consider lifting the sanction? Also, she asked if AAUP was planning to make any changes to their policies so that governing boards, rather than institutions, could be sanctioned? Professor Tachau responded that the UI delegation to the annual meeting had asked that the AAUP consider changing its policy to allow for sanctions against governing boards. Dr. Tiede confirmed that the AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance would look into this. Addressing the issue of lifting the sanction, he noted that once there is a relevant policy change, the Committee on College and University Governance would review the change and make a recommendation to the annual meeting to remove the sanction. It was unclear to him if or how the UNI presidential search would impact the UI sanction, although the AAUP would continue to monitor the UNI search.

Following up on Professor Mallik's comments, Professor Gallanis found that while the AAUP's fact pattern for ending up *on* the sanction list was relatively clear, the criteria for getting *off* the sanction list was much less so. It also seemed to him that the AAUP was satisfied with its current policy of sanctioning only institutions, not governing boards. Dr. Tiede reiterated that change in Board policy regarding presidential searches would be the main criteria for removing UI from the sanction list. He added that while there is a rationale for sanctioning institutions rather than governing boards, this does not preclude a future change to the current policy. Professor Lois Cox, a member of the UI Chapter of the AAUP and one of the four Iowa delegates to last summer's AAUP annual meeting, stressed that for her it had been a very difficult decision to vote for a sanction of the university. The leadership of the UI chapter had solicited a great deal of feedback from the members in order to arrive at a decision. Professor Cox expressed the opinion that the university could not blame everything that went wrong in the presidential search process on the Regents; if there had not been some cooperation from the interim administration of the university and the chair of the search committee, then some of the things that happened simply could not have happened, such as the early disbanding of the search committee. She also rejected the notion that the Regents do not care about the sanction. She interpreted the appointment of UNI faculty member Dr. Powers, another delegate to the AAUP annual meeting, as co-chair of the UNI search committee to be a sign that the sanction has had an impact on the Regents.

Professor Voigt asked what leverage the faculty might have against the Regents, in order to work toward lifting the sanction. He suggested that perhaps university personnel involved in the search process be sanctioned in some way and also that the public be informed about the reasons for the sanction. Dr. Tiede agreed that conveying to the public why principles of tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance are important would be very helpful. A politically-appointed governing board will likely respond to public pressure. Professor Macfarland asked if it was the intention of the sanction to bring harm to the university, e.g., to persuade students not to come here, to persuade donors no longer to support the university, etc. Dr. Tiede responded that it was not the intention of the sanction to harm the university, but to communicate to the public that there was a significant failure to uphold standards of shared governance at this institution. The ultimate goal of the sanction is to resolve the shared governance issues and bring the university back into compliance with these standards. Professor Macfarland then asked if our local AAUP delegates were willing to advocate that the sanction be lifted. The delegates indicated that they were willing to do so.

Professor Thomas asked if institutions that had been sanctioned for similar reasons had been able to have their sanctions lifted without changing the composition of their governing boards. Directing his next question to the Faculty Senate leadership, Professor Thomas asked what their perception was of the importance of the sanction to the university president, the individual within the institution who likely has the most influence with the Regents. In response to the first question, Dr. Tiede commented that the most similar situation in recent memory was the attempted dismissal of the president of the University of Virginia. The AAUP conducted an investigation and published a report in that case, but the governing board ultimately reversed its decision in response to a variety of pressures. Secretary Gillan asked what the average length of time was for an institution to remain on the sanction list. Dr. Tiede responded that since the list is short, averages are not meaningful; he did note that one college was recently removed from the censure list after 53 years.

Past President Bohannon commented that, based upon her reading of the AAUP website, there did not seem to be much precedent to guide UI in its current situation. At this time there are only six other institutions on the sanctioned list for shared governance violations and none of them have been sanctioned for a presidential search. The other institutions' violations included, for example, total abolition of the faculty senate. She asked, where does one therefore draw the line on what is acceptable and what is not, and added that this makes it very difficult for us to determine how to proceed. Past President Bohannon declined to respond to Professor Thomas' question about the university president's views of the sanction, believing that it was not appropriate to do so. Dr. Tiede commented that President Harreld had spoken dismissively of the sanction in the press recently. He explained that the process of removing the sanction would first involve consideration by the Committee on College and University Governance. The Committee would then make a recommendation to lift the sanction to the AAUP annual meeting.

Professor Tachau stressed that the university can make concrete efforts to have itself removed from the list. She noted that years ago a former Faculty Senate president had negotiated an agreement with the Regents regarding presidential searches. Unfortunately, that



agreement had never been put into the Operations Manual; perhaps we can do that now. Shared governance means that both the Regents and the faculty have input. Past President Bohannon suggested that, if the UNI search goes well, perhaps we could codify that presidential search process. Dr. Tiede commented that formalizing the role of the faculty in future presidential searches would likely be looked upon favorably by the Committee on College and University Governance. Daniel Power, Professor of Management Information Systems at UNI, delegate to the AAUP annual meeting, and co-chair of the presidential search committee there, commented that he has received assurances from Regents that UNI will have a traditional search process. He viewed the sanction as an opportunity for the faculty to strengthen its position in relation to the Regents. This is an opportunity for the faculty at the three institutions to take actions to ensure that we have searches for senior administrators that we think are fair and open. Clearly, the Board decides who is going to be president at each of the universities; we are never going to take that right away from the Board. The search and screen, however, must take place without interference. For some reason, that seems to have changed recently, but the faculties must reassert their shared role in presidential searches and we must have that role codified in the policies of the Board of Regents. If we can do that, Dr. Power concluded, then we would be in a stronger position to request that the AAUP remove the sanction.

Professor Mallik stressed that the faculty must remain constructive if progress is to be made with the Regents. Professor Caplan observed that last year the Faculty Senate made a statement on the presidential search through its vote of no confidence in the Board of Regents. He asked whether the Senate might now want to issue a statement expressing our views about the AAUP sanction. Professor Wasserman requested that President Vaughn clarify his statement made over the summer regarding the unfairness and inappropriateness of the AAUP sanction on the university. President Vaughn responded that, while mistakes may have been made, he did not see in the AAUP report evidence of wrongdoing by university personnel. The Regents' final decision in the search was directly counter to the wishes of the faculty, with whom the Regents did not engage in sufficient dialog at this stage of the process. Professor Mallik again urged that the faculty stay constructive and move forward.

Past President Bohannon reminded the group that President Vaughn had earlier explained that his statement about the report echoed what the Faculty Council had said last spring. The Faculty Council had discussed a possible sanction and decided to advocate against it. The Council had also decided that the university itself had not engaged in wrongdoing. Therefore, President Vaughn was speaking on behalf of Faculty Council when he made his statement during the summer. She added that the report indicates that there are two interpretations of the facts laid out in the report. One interpretation is that the search was conducted fairly until the final decision was made. The other interpretation is that the search was an illusion. The report then indicates that it chooses the latter interpretation. The report clearly states that the Regents acted wrongfully, but the report is not clear that anyone at the university acted wrongfully. Professor Tachau commented that the report did not directly examine the role of the interim president during the search process, because of his interim status, but the report makes clear that he made possible the deception of the faculty and the majority of people on the search committee. Subsequent press reports would seem to advocate for such a view. She added that

the report states that the majority of evidence points toward the second interpretation (that the search was an illusion).

Professor Wilson Kimber urged that the faculty look toward the future and how we can work toward removing the sanction. We cannot let this crisis pull the university down. She added that the AAUP is an organization comprised of faculty across the country and that it provides a forum for faculty to engage with the current issues in higher education. One of the benefits of the AAUP is that it brings an objective, outside perspective to a particular institution's situation. Professor Oral asked whether there was a policy on presidential searches for the three Regents institutions. If not, then such a policy needs to be written. We should not need to gather assurances from individual Regents each time a search begins that the process will go well. Professor Ganim commented that this is a moment for the faculty to act constructively. He suggested that the Senate create a subcommittee to explore how to remove the university from the sanction list. This would be a positive way to move forward. Professor Prussing also stressed that we move forward. She added that we need clear policies in place that apply to all the Regents institutions. Professor Prussing supported the formation of a Senate subcommittee. Professor Segre applauded efforts to act constructively and create a policy; she pointed out, however, that ultimately it is the right of the Board of Regents to appoint presidents for the universities. Dr. Tiede commented that there are model policies and AAUP guidelines to consider that describe the role of the faculty in the search for and evaluation of administrators. He added that AAUP policy recognizes that governing boards have the final decision in the appointment of presidents.

Professor Thomas moved and Professor Scott seconded that, whereas the Faculty Senate understands the seriousness of the AAUP sanction and wants to work toward the lifting of that sanction, the Faculty Senate would like to appoint a subcommittee to work toward a way to lift the sanction, and the Senate charges the Faculty Senate leadership and the Faculty Council to work with the University President and the Board of Regents to work toward removal of the sanction.

Professor Tachau commented that nationwide we are facing a political problem with university governing boards but not a partisan problem. It is an issue that the AAUP has been dealing with for a long time. She added that this is an opportunity for the three Regents institutions to work together in a way that we have not done so before to establish standards for presidential search processes. As a united group, we have a better chance of enforcing these standards. Dr. Power acknowledged that the Board has the ultimate responsibility to choose the university presidents. However, the search committee puts together the position description. The search committee also conducts the screening of applicants. When the position criteria are applied, the search committee can identify candidates who are acceptable to bring in for on-campus interviews. A written policy will ensure procedural justice, so that candidates cannot be put forward by the Board in violation of these procedures.

Professor Vigmostad asked if the proposed subcommittee would be an ad hoc committee. President Vaughn responded that it would be.

Professor Mallik offered a friendly amendment that the proposed subcommittee work closely with the local AAUP chapter. Professor Thomas did not accept the friendly amendment.

Professor Thomas moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the question be called. In a hand vote the motion to call the question did not pass.

Professor Macfarland expressed the opinion that the sanction was an issue for the AAUP, an independent organization, not for the Faculty Senate, to resolve.

Professor Macfarland proposed the following amendment to the motion, Resolved, that the Faculty Senate urges the local leadership of the AAUP to work diligently and immediately to mitigate and reverse AAUP's sanction. Secondly, that the Faculty Senate urges the national AAUP to consider mechanisms for the appropriate criticism of the Board of Regents.

Professor Mallik withdrew her friendly amendment.

Professor Wilson Kimber commented that if it was within the power of the local AAUP chapter to have the sanction removed, it would do so. However, removal of the sanction requires far more than just the efforts of the local chapter.

It was determined that Professor Macfarland's proposed amendment was actually an entirely new motion. Therefore, a vote must be taken on Professor Thomas' motion before a new motion could be considered.

In a hand vote, the motion carried.

IV. Adjournment – Professor Scott moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the meeting be adjourned. In a hand vote, the motion carried. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.