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Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements
   
   Press identification: Emily Christensen from the Waterloo Courier present.
   
   Provost Gibson had no comments.
   
   Faculty Chair Funderburk had no comments.
   
   Chair Peters' comments, at this his first meeting as Chair, included a welcome and introduction of new senators: MacLin, Boyd, Hakes, and Kidd. He noted that the Regents recently made a decision about tuition set-asides and that the Council of Provosts will be working on improvement of large classes. Also, Charlene White will begin serving as the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant in a couple of weeks as an on-campus presence for the Senate. Sherry Nuss will continue as the Kelly Temp. transcriptionist. In addition, Peters announced his appointment of a short-term ad hoc committee consisting of himself, Smith, Dolgener, Swan, and Professor Elbert of Chemistry to discuss FY13 budget priorities with the Administration.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for approval: None

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

   **Motion to docket as #1034 (Breitbach/Marshall). Passed. And full discussion ensued.**
5. Adjournment

**Motion to adjourn at 4:30 p.m. (Edginton/Kirmani). Passed.

Next regular meeting:
August 27, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
June 11, 2012
Mtg. 1717

PRESENT: Melinda Boyd, Karen Breitbach, Betty DeBerg, Forrest Dolgener, Chris Edginton, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, David Hakes, Syed Kirmani, Michael Licari, Kim MacLin, Jerilyn Marshall (alternate for Chris Neuhaus), Scott Peters, Jerry Smith, Jesse Swan, Laura Terlip

Absent: Gregory Bruess, Philip East, Tim Kidd, Marilyn Shaw

Guest Presenter: Bruce Rieks, UNI Budget Director

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Peters [3:03 p.m.]: We have the presence of a quorum, and we’ll come to order. Thank you all for coming today to this special meeting. Since we only have one agenda item, I’m going to save some light bulb and some energy and not put it on the screen [not project the agenda for the group to view throughout the meeting].

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Call for press identification. I see Emily Christensen there [from the Waterloo Courier].

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson, do you have any comments?

Gibson: No.
COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFF FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair Funderburk?

Funderburk: No.

Peters: No comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: If you will allow me, I have just a few comments. First, welcome our new senators: Kim MacLin from SBS, Melinda Boyd from CHAS. Kim is in the Psychology Department. Melinda is in the Music Department. And then David Hakes from Economics, CBA. We also have Tim Kidd who is a new member of the Senate from the Physics Department, but he is, I believe, out of the country right now.

I have a few announcements updating you on a couple of things. Jeff [Funderburk] and I attended the Regents’ meeting last week. You probably read in the press about the Regents’ decision on tuition set-asides. The Board of Regents last week charged a committee with coming up with a specific plan to present to the Legislature that would make recommendations about how to eliminate tuition set-asides within 5 years. It would also make specific recommendations about how to achieve legislative action to adequately fund a statewide scholarship program in lieu of those set-asides and also a plan to increase funding of student scholarships from the Universities’ Foundations. This is an issue we have spent some time talking about in the Senate, and we’ll have to keep paying attention to it. The legislative—the requirements to get this through the Legislature, are obviously not trivial, but the Regents appear to have decided to go down this road in order to head off the threats to the tuition set-aside program.

We also, at the Council of Provosts’ meeting last week, discussed the legislation that passed which requires continuous improvement plans to be in place starting in the Fall of 2013 for all courses of more than 300 students. Associate Provost Licari and his counterparts at the other
institutions are beginning discussions about how to implement this, and at this point the hope is that we can leverage as much as possible of the assessment that we are already doing to try to meet the requirements of this legislation.

Soon, starting in about 2 weeks, we will also have a new administrative assistant for the Senate. As you know that after Dena Snowden retired [sic, moved to full-time in her other position], we hired Sherry Nuss as a Kelly temp, and she’s been fulfilling all our administrative assistant needs. And Sherry’s transcription of Senate services has been great, and she has done a wonderful job serving us as a general administrative assistant, but there have been times when having someone on-campus during normal business hours would be helpful—things such as assisting the Chair with the Senate’s budget, logistical planning for Senate meetings, and things like that. In consultation with the Provost’s Office, what we’ve decided to do is we are keeping Sherry on to produce our transcripts, and then we have a secretary—her name is Charlene White. She is the secretary for the Masters in Public Policy and Women’s and Gender Studies Programs, and she will have a one-eighth assignment to the Senate. So she will have a presence on-campus and be able to help us with those more day-to-day things. Some of those kinds of things Sherry has been able to do. Some of them have been covered by Pat Woelber in the Provost’s Office. Some of them have been covered by department secretaries of the Senate Chair. So now we’ll have someone on-campus to be able to do those.

Finally, senators already know about this, but I do want the minutes to reflect it so that faculty more broadly are aware of it. President Allen asked me to put together a group of senators to discuss the Fiscal Year ’13 budget priorities, the kinds of things that we’ll be discussing today with regard to Academic Affairs, but, of course, President Allen is interested in the university-wide budget. At his request, I put together an ad hoc committee and made an attempt to represent all the Colleges and the various interests on campus. Keep in mind that this is not a permanent advisory board. This is a bridge to what I hope will ultimately be a more permanent advisory role for the faculty in the planning and budgeting process, and we’ll continue to work on developing that process over the next several months. The committee consists of me, Vice-Chair Jerry Smith, Forrest Dolgener, Jesse
Swan, and Jeff Elbert from the Chemistry Department. Now Jeff is not a senator, but all our senators from the natural sciences were unavailable at that time, and Jeff was recommended to me by the Chair of the CHAS Senate.

So, with those announcements taken care of, I want to thank you again for coming. This is, I think, a pretty unprecedented turnout for a Summer meeting, I suspect. In fact, maybe a Summer meeting itself is unprecedented, and I hope that we can all begin today on building the more transparent and inclusive decision-making process at UNI that we all desire. So hopefully we can have a good step in that direction, and it is my first meeting as Chair, so please be patient with me and nice to me. [light laughter around]

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: We have no minutes for approval. We did that through e-mail a couple of weeks ago.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1138 for Docket #1034, Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Update and Discussion of Spending Priorities

Peters: So we have one item to docket and that would be Calendar Item 1138, the Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Update and Discussion of Spending Priorities. Can I have a motion to docket that?

Breitbach: So moved.

Peters: Senator Breitbach.

Marshall: I’ll second
**Peters:** And seconded by Senator **Marshall.** All in favor, please say “aye.” [ayes heard all around]. Opposed, say “nay.” [none heard] The motion passes. And then do we need a separate motion to take it up, or can we just get right to it since it’s the only thing? [voices suggesting just continuing] Let’s just get right to it. Provost **Gibson** I’ll turn it over to you.

**Gibson:** Ok, thank you. Thank you all for being here today. I greatly, greatly appreciate it, and I know that we had discussion back in the Spring about having a Summer meeting, and so it’s not that I can present to you today all of the answers, but certainly we can begin to look at where we are now budget-wise. We do have some information. Other information will be forthcoming. So my goal for—you know, we’ve got until 4:30, is that correct?

**Peters:** Yes.

**Gibson:** Ok. My goal for this time is #1 to look at the budget that we have thus far and then secondly to begin discussing what priorities we might have for FY13 to spend or allocate dollars for next year. The President has decided that each Vice-President will need to submit a request for permanent and one-time dollars. So, in essence I have asked Bruce [**Rieks**, Budget Director] to go over the Budget. I think he can do that a little better than what I can, but you will see that we will have, as a University, permanent dollars allocated to roll over for FY13, and then we will also have one-time dollars. And so I will have to submit—and then there will be discussion about how those dollars will be allocated. And so what I want to get from you, and, of course, I have some ideas, but from you what are your ideas about how those dollars might be allocated? In other words, what are some of the things that I might request for those dollars? So we’re going to start with reviewing our FY13 Budget, and Bruce prepared a handout. [This handout was passed around and is appended to this transcript.] And there is a meeting—[to **Peters**] you did announce the meeting that’s tomorrow?

**Peters:** Yes, tomorrow.
**Gibson:** There is a meeting tomorrow with that [ad hoc] committee to discuss the university-wide budget, so some of these same items on the first page will be discussed tomorrow. They were discussed this afternoon with the P&S Council, and they have been discussed with the student group as well. So, I’ll turn it over to Bruce.

**Rieks:** For those of you that don’t know me, my name is Bruce Rieks. I’ve worked at the University quite a while. I’ve been in the Controller’s Office for many years and worked with a lot of the various business operations and the financial reporting, and about 5 years ago I got involved directly with the budgeting and the planning process and analysis, taking a different flavor on all that. And I think it’s going to be—the road that’s ahead of us is going to be very interesting. And I really look forward to it, because I think we need to be a lot more transparent and get information out sooner and faster, because the planning process comes and goes fast sometimes, and you almost need to start having conversations before now for what we’re going to be doing for ’14. In fact, we will be. I mean, we’re ask for our appropriations request because it takes a while—as you all know—it takes a while to get the ball rolling on everything.

What we have done [with the handout] is try to put together—and again, in terms of evolution, I welcome any input because we’re going to be upgrading this and probably have more graphs and more analysis showing multi-year things, but since this is where we are with ’13 right now, we thought we’d go through and just let you know what’s going on with that. I split this report up into the Assumptions for FY13. There’s a section for Revenue and Additions [titled Resources/Additions], for Uses and Deductions. And then we can talk, too, for the first time that we’ve had a chance to talk about this for many years was some actual ability to allocate. So I got involved with budgeting at a really good time when there was nothing to allocate [light laughter around].

But just to go through some of these assumptions [on the handout], and if anybody has any questions as we go through, it’s depending that we don’t get any reversions for next year. We did receive a 3.2% increase in our FY12 budget of about $2,379,000, but the really special part of this is we actually got approved our—we had a special request for $12 million over 3
years, and we got that $4 million. That was quite a blessing. We based the tuition budget this year on 12,850 students, and there was an approved tuition rate increase of 3.75%. We do maintain an enrollment contingency account of about $500,000. A hundred students one way or the other is about $650,000, and this year we were down, and that contingency account helped us out. Financial Aid budget for at least this year is 18% of tuition, and CBA supplemental is 15% of their supplemental tuition. The Indirect Cost Recovery dollars that we get—our budget’s typically around $2 million that we’re going to be experiencing a projected decrease in that because of the elimination of the federal earmark funding, and we’ll get down to the actual dollars here. And the assumptions are the salary increases for the bargaining agreements and the non-bargained groups receiving an equivalent to that.

So under the revenue/additions sections

**Gibson:** Excuse me. Are there any questions about the basic assumptions?

**Rieks:** About the assumptions.

**Funderburk:** I’ve got one question. If the enrollment number turns out better this year than what

**Rieks:** That’s down approximately 300 students, and the factor in that is that we’ve been successful in graduating students, so we had a higher graduation rate this year, and also the influx of freshmen was down somewhat.

**Smith:** I have a question, too. Were there any kind of commitments or obligations relating to the $4 million extra? Is that just free money to do with whatever we want, or are there specific obligations on that?

**Rieks:** Well, a part of the request was—I mean, we had to put in a specific request for the $4 million, and Gloria, I didn’t—that wasn’t

**Gibson:** Well, there was a specific request, but, of course, as Bruce is going to cover in just a minute, that money went for salaries.
Smith: Ok.

Gibson: I mean, that money’s gone. That’s where it went, but, yes, we did have a request for those dollars as well as the general increase, so I did bring that document. [showing a document] This was the request that we turned in in October.

DeBerg: But the Legislature didn’t put special contingency—put special regulations on how we spend it. That was, I think, Jerry’s [Smith] question.

Gibson: No. They did not.

Smith: Ok.

Rieks: The General Education Fund increased from appropriations with a total then of about $6.4 million, which brought our appropriations up to $81 [million]. The important thing, I think, to note here is that that is still $17.2 million less than what we were back in ’09. So, thank goodness it’s in the right direction, but we’ve still got a ways to go, and there’s no guarantee that they’re going to honor our special request for the next 2 years, but that’s our hope. [continuing with the handout] A minor adjustment to the College of Business Administration expense was reduced a little bit due to also the decrease in enrollment that they’re anticipating.

Edginton: Can I ask a question about that?

Rieks: Uh huh.

Edginton: That $66,000 supplemental tuition, was that part of that add-on tuition that the College of Business…..?

Rieks: Right.

Edginton: Ok, so I’m going ahead here, Bruce.

Rieks: That’s fine.
Edginton: Ok, I’m saying use this here of $66,000—we’re not suggesting here that we take monies that occur as a result of, you know, additional revenues and supplement the College of Business for supplemental tuition of $66,000?

Rieks: Actually, they’re a wash, because we give—if they generate, say, $1.9 million, they also get a budget for $1.9 million. And all this is doing is trying to be transparent by putting down that the net decrease ended up being $66,000, so it came down 66 on the income side and 66 on the expense side.

Edginton: Ok. Yes. No. That’s fine.

Rieks: We’re just trying to keep both sides balanced. It’s that accountant part of me that [laughs]

Edginton: Yeah. I just—when it says “uses” here [on backside of handout], I didn’t know if that referred to it as a reduction as in deductions or if it was going to be an addition.

Rieks: Well, it ends up being both, depending on which side of—for your revenue, it’s going to be a reduction; and on expense, it’s also a reduction, so it’s just a—it balances out each year depending on what they’re projecting for their enrollment situation.

Kirmani: I have a question. What is this 15% for CBA supplemental? What is that?

Rieks: What is CBA supplemental?

Kirmani: Yeah, that 15% for CBA supplemental, what does that mean?

Rieks: That’s how much of their supplemental tuition income—that’s how much they set aside for financial aid for those business students.

Kirmani: Ok.
Edginton: And can I ask a question about that? We’re not suggesting in this budget that that 15% be an expense in the next year’s budget? That’s just a wash also?

Rieks: That 15% is part of their budget for next year, so if they had $1.2 million, 15% of that is—they have a portion that they put in salary and wages, a portion in supplies and services, and 15% goes into set aside.

Edginton: So—but they didn’t receive any income on that 15%, though? Is that accurate? Of that $66,000?

Rieks: I’m not following.

DeBerg: That’s 15% only on what they take in.

Smith: You’re just talking about the assumption that they’re making in terms of how much of the incremental tuition we get is set aside for student aid, financial aid.

Edginton: Ok. But that doesn’t include any enhancements that would come about as a result of taxing that $66,000, even though it’s a deduction?

Smith (?): I don’t know what that means.

Edginton: No? Ok.

Rieks: That’s just a blanket adjustment to get them to where—whether their target figure was $2 million and now it’s $1.9 million. It goes the other way, too. If it was

Edginton: So, if it increases, then, yeah.

Rieks: Yeah.
DeBerg: What’s the rationale between the 15% from the CBA supplemental and 18% from all other tuition? Why the difference?

Rieks: That was the agreement that was struck with the College of Business, and you probably know more about that than I do, Gloria. Were there like student groups that were involved in that? [voices agreeing]

Smith: Yeah, student groups were involved, and that was the commitment that we had from all the relevant parties in terms of how much of the incremental tuition would be devoted directly to student aid.

Rieks: And there’s actually a written agreement on that.

Smith: Yeah.

DeBerg: Did they want more or less?

Rieks: I think they wanted 15.

Funderburk: As I recall, isn’t 15% the number the Board of Regents actually had mandated originally?

Peters: That’s the minimum. [voices agreeing]

Rieks: But I think there was also the thought that the students didn’t want to have more of their money go to pay somebody else’s tuition, too, I think was part of it.

Edginton: So, were students involved in setting the 18% figure?

Rieks: Huh uh.

Edginton: No.

Male voice: At one of the universities, it was 21%.
DeBerg: Well, their parents are getting involved now. [laughter around] So, yeah, they’ve.... [voices discussing aspects of this]

Dolgener: So that 18%, is that set aside we’re talking about.

Rieks: Right. That we’re talking about, right. And so that’s going to be a major FY14 issue.

Gibson: Which was about $14 million.

Rieks: A little over $14 million, yeah.

Gibson: So that will have a dramatic effect, dramatic.

Rieks: [returning to handout] Income investment—or investment income is projected to go up about $50,000 for a total of $821,000.

DeBerg: And what’s that?

Rieks: That’s the money—well, each month we get State appropriations and the tuition income, and Gary Shontz invests our funds, and so he always—we always have to make sure that they roll the money through the bank. They always have x amount that they are able to invest and get some money back on.

DeBerg: But you haven’t included Foundation money that’s earmarked for Academic Affairs as resource?

Rieks: No, this is strictly our main operating budget. I mean, that starts getting—that would get pretty complicated for this presentation.

DeBerg: Ok, but that does give us some more resources than what show up here, right?

Rieks: Oh, sure. Sure.
Kirmani: And what would that be? How much more would that be from the Foundation?

Rieks: I really don’t have that kind of numbers for that, for the Foundation here.

Gibson: You mean for scholarships?

DeBerg: Well, and academic programs. I mean, even our Foundation raised a little for academic programs. So there might be money coming in for, you know, Literacy Center, things like that, right? It doesn’t have grant income here either, right? Because the University takes off a cut on grants.

Gibson: Well, I think

Rieks: Well, yeah—go ahead

Gibson: My goal was to start with the basics of General Operating Funds, and, I mean, if you would like then we can layer on some other things at a later point, but my goal for today was to talk about the General Fund.

DeBerg: I’m just trying to help us understand other sources of income that are out there and not on here.

Rieks: Yeah, sure. Sure. [continuing with handout] It’s a small amount, but I put it on there because it’s part of our balancing for this year—is the miscellaneous income from some student service charges for deferred payment fees, library fines. There’s probably about a half dozen of those. That’s projected to be just a little higher. They completed a major completion on the SIS, Student Information System project, that is going to free up $340,000 out of our budget from this year, so that became an addition to resources. We have a projected increase in—we have Overhead Charges to all the non-General Funds accounts at 2.5%. That’s projected to go up $50,000. Because we’re projecting some enrollment decline, we’re actually going to have a small decrease in our central tuition revenue of about $147,000, so that got added back to our base. And then
we had some one-time funding from our fringe pool reserves. That will be helping the General Fund out by about $750,000.

On the next page, under the Uses and Deductions, let’s see—oh, our actual tuition revenue also because of the enrollment decline is expected to decrease about $346,000, so tuition will end up at about $79 [million], just shy of $80 million. Same thing with the College of Business, it affected their supplemental tuition by a small amount. Indirect cost reimbursements that I mentioned earlier, they are going to go down because of the end of the federal earmark grants. That usually is about $2 million to our General Fund budget, so this is going to be a substantial cut in that one component. They tended to pay fairly high indirect cost grades (?).

Peters: Can you just mention what those earmark grants are? Or give some examples perhaps?

Rieks: I don’t have the specific names or breakdown. We could get that.

Gibson: One of them is the [Rieks and Gibson sorting out thoughts on NABIL, Metal Casting Center, Tech Works, Business and Community Services, Early Childhood area, etc.]

Peters: Just so people have a sense of what we’re talking about. And so we used to rely on federal earmarks to fund those on a regular basis? Those earmarks are going away, and we’ve had to supplement them with General Funds then? Or replace them, I should say.

DeBerg: That’s why we need to have indirect cost income on the resources side, because federal earmarks aren’t the only indirect costs we get. So I don’t want

Rieks: Oh, it is on the—these are just the net changes I’m putting on this report. I don’t—I’m not—I didn’t put what the gross amount is. Yeah.

DeBerg: Oh, I see. Ok.
**Rieks:** Yeah, this is just the changes to get you down to a—this kind of format—there’s many different ways to show stuff, but this one is trying to show the net changes to our revenues and additions and the net changes to our expenditures and deductions.

**DeBerg:** Ok. Ok.

**Rieks:** We also do another report where we show all the gross base amounts and then have another column for these things. There’s all kinds of different ways to show it, and we’ll probably do more of that. But this--again, this was our first just go through with the quick changes that we’re having this year without getting a great big financial report out there.

[continuing with the handout] Salary and fringe increases are projected to increase $4.04 million. Utilities increase is projected to go up $350,000. We don’t have anything determined for building repairs right now. We’re below the industry standard, and we’re currently budgeted at $1.2 million. We also have on the list for consideration is restoring the strategic initiatives, and that’s also to be determined. That is typically central money that the President allocates across campus, and typically—well, what kinds of things does that address? There’s been some help to fund some positions, and

**Gibson:** Yes, I mean, this past year he really—a lot of this money went to help with centers that received federal money that they lost that money. And so he used—this would be a question you could ask tomorrow, and he could give you more detail on strategic initiative accounting. But this is the President’s account.

**Rieks:** The final two remaining items [on the handout], there’s insurance is projected to go up $22,000. Again, not a big expense item, but it’s another one that we have to cover. And then operational contingency is another central fund, and that’s going to increase $100,000, for Total Uses and Deductions of $5.5 million.

That leaves us the net to allocate to the Divisions of $2.3 million, but it’s important to realize that of that $2.3 million about $1.5 is what we’d say
would be available to allocate to our actual base in terms of some permanent dollars, and the $750,000 represents some one-time funding that we have coming into the General Fund, so that would likely be allocated to just one-time things. Like Gloria mentioned, there’s requests that are going to be coming in for that. I mean, some one-time things could be funded out of the $1.5 million pool, too. It just all depends on what the mix of everything looks like.

**DeBerg:** Where does this one-time money come from that not on-going? I’m sorry.

**Rieks:** We had some money in our fringe reserves that went to our fringe pool, and so that actually reduces our fringe rates that get charged to the General Fund, so the net result is about $750,000 that adds to the Fund. Next year--that’s evaluated every year. The more that is, the more and likely that won’t be there next year, but if it is, that would be wonderful.

**DeBerg:** Thanks.

**Rieks:** And then the last section, my copy didn’t have that on it [he reads from neighbors copy]. Potential Reallocations for Academic Affairs, do you want me to just zip through those real quick? Or how do you want to do that?

**Gibson:** Well, before we go there, I want to make sure there are no other questions on the first part of this.

**Rieks:** If there are, too, feel free to send me an e-mail, or if there’s any suggestions for any different presentation you would like. There will be updated presentations, that’s for sure.

**DeBerg:** Well, I would really like some kind of presentation on what the Foundation is contributing. I think that’s really important.

**Rieks:** Ok.

**Edginton:** Both expenses and revenues should be detailed there.
DeBerg: Right.

Peters: Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: I’m assuming that since the set-aside changes that the Foundation has also been charged with some sort of a plan to implement the Board of Regents’ plan to off-set those dollars, right? So that would be something else to include to kind of let us know how they’re seeing that plan to go forward.

Gibson: Ok, I mean, the Board just—that just happened.

Funderburk: Right. It’s new, right.

Rieks: The committee was just formed.

Gibson: The committee was just formed, and from our campus Terry [Hogan, VP for Student Affairs], Joyce [Morrow, Director of Financial Aid], and

Peters: The Foundation

Gibson: And Bill [Calhoun, President, UNI Foundation]. [voices verifying this name] This is a Regent-wide committee. Ok.

Peters: Any other questions for him?

Gibson: Bruce.

Rieks: So, Gloria and I visited yesterday with some of the potential reallocations that we wanted to list on here [the handout]. The Lab School support money that was this year at $3.2 million. Currently, there’s approximately $2.2 million of that that has been reallocated to the Professional Development School. That leaves about a $1 million that is going to be there for distribution to an R&D Center for Education Innovation and then other strategic initiatives that
Edginton: Can I ask you a question about that? In our conversation in the Spring term, we talked about making sure that salary savings came back to enhancing teacher education on this campus, and so I get a little nervous when I see “other strategic initiatives” other than using those funds in support of teacher education or the enhancement of teacher education. There’s a lot of conversation that goes on on this campus about positioning the University as “Iowa’s Premier Public Liberal Arts Institution,” and I take exception to that conversation as it occurs because, you know, from my perspective this is a “comprehensive university” that values not only its liberal arts program but values its professional education programs probably equally as well. And I wonder if 7 or 8 years ago when the term “general education” was changed to “liberal arts,” if we’d have hung onto that term, and if we would have been trying to promote the University of Northern Iowa as “Iowa’s Premier Public General Education University,” it doesn’t quite have the same ring to it in terms of, you know, positioning the institution.

So, I’m concerned about that because in the 21 years I’ve been here, what I’ve seen is a drain on the resources of the College of Education. Now, there are people that would argue that the College of Education was overfunded, but at one period of time we lost $4 million worth of funding out of the College of Education. I know in talking with Dean Watson that we haven’t had any enhancements in the redistribution of funds. You know, he’s basically starting at zero level, at least from his perspective in terms of support for his mission in the College of Education. So, I want to make that point. I want to make it very strongly that what I heard—the rhetoric that came out as we talked about budget reduction was we were going to use these funds, whatever salary savings, to enhance teacher education across the campus, as a whole, because it’s a campus-wide function. And I would like to see us ensure that we maintain that commitment in whatever reallocations that take place.

Gibson: Ok. And that’s part of the discussion I want to have after we finish going through the numbers. I mean, that’s the second part, so you’ve begun to address that.
DeBerg: I have a question. What is the Professional Development School? I don’t know what that is.

Edginton: It leads to certification.

Kirmani: Does it exist?

DeBerg: I’m sorry?

Kirmani: Does it exist? I never heard of it.

Gallagher: That is money that—we still have people—this is my understanding, and maybe this is a good way to correct me if I’m wrong.

Gibson: Yes.

Gallagher: But people who were tenured at the Lab School, there’s a whole lot of people now, since they don’t have the Lab School, where are we going to put their practicum experiences? And so those people have been tasked with their supervision out in the public schools now.

DeBerg: So is this a rename of the Office of Field Experience?

Edginton: Pretty much.

Gibson: It’s still the same faculty, and it is the field experience. It’s the same thing. I mean, it’s just what Deb [Gallagher] said.

DeBerg: Has the name change been official? I mean, is this an official name now? [some voices sorting it out]

Gallagher: The professional development—the school—I’m sorry, where is it [on the handout]?

Gibson: It’s the—well, right below that there’s the R&D.
**DeBerg:** I know what the R&D School is. I don’t know what the Professional Development School is.

**Gibson:** Ok.

**Terlip:** They piloted that a couple of years ago when they first started trying to do supervision out in [many voices sorting this out] Isn’t that the name of the model they used rather than the Lab School?

**Gibson:** Yeah, it’s the PDS. I mean, it’s the PDS model, so, I mean

**DeBerg:** It’s not on the Department of Teaching website, for instance.

**Edginton:** No, but it’s the supervision of the Phase II activities, plus a number of years ago there was a movement to start a professional development program, and that continues, and I assume that would be part of the supervisory responsibilities of those people who are out in the field.

**Gibson:** It is. But I think to your point, to be consistent with what we’re calling things. The faculty will be a part of the Department of Teaching.

**DeBerg:** Right, but on their website they don’t have such a thing as PDS. I mean, I’ve been just on that website, so I was asking about what it means and what the status of that title is. Right now they have the Office of whatever, Field Experience. But that’s basically what this means?

**Gibson:** That’s right.

**Rieks:** This was basically set up as a program code under—I think it’s under Field Experience.

**DeBerg:** But has it gone to the Regents? I’m just asking what’s its status?

**Rieks:** Program codes don’t go to the Regents.

**Gibson:** Well, this is a budgetary term that he’s using, that Bruce used. It’s a budgetary term.
DeBerg: Ok. Ok.

Gibson: The faculty are under the Department of Teaching.

DeBerg: Ok, so $2.2 million to the Department of Teaching.

Gibson: Yes.

Swan: Well, on that then, what are they going to use this extra money for? $2.2 million. So they’ve been doing their activities

Gibson: That’s not extra money.

Swan: That’s not extra money. Oh, then I’m misreading this. “Malcolm Price General Fund support $3.2”, $2.2 of that is now going to go to Teaching? So I’m misinterpreting it.

Gibson: This is not clear. The tenured faculty that were at Malcolm Price Lab School will now be a part of the Department of Teaching. They will have responsibility for basically Level I-IV, but primarily Level II Field Experience. So, of the tenured faculty at Price Lab, if they wanted to remain at UNI, this is where they

Swan: That was a reallocation, I see.

Gibson: So it’s a reallocation of the salary money, so it’s not new money. It’s a part of that $3.2 million General Fund dollars that went to Price Lab School. Ok? So, we’re using $2.2. We had $3.2, and so what we’re saying is that we’re going to have savings of approximately $1 million, and then that goes to the point that Chris was making about where is that approximately $1 million—how is that going to be spent?

Gallagher: The R&D—is the State of Iowa also contributing to that?

Gibson: No.
**Gallagher:** No. They’re part of it, but they don’t contribute to it, is that correct?

**Gibson:** That is correct.

**Gallagher:** Thank you. Just wanted to clarify.

**Peters:** Senator Kirmani.

**Gibson:** And so we—but that’s a very good question because we do have responsibility to use some of this million dollars for the R&D.

**Edginton:** But now let me ask a question. If the R&D School would have been implemented, had the Lab School been retained, we would have gotten the per pupil allocation from the State? Right?

**Gibson:** Yes.

**Edginton:** Ok.

**DeBerg:** So that would be a loss.

**Edginton:** And how much would that have been for? $2.2 million, something like that?

**Gibson:** Well, yeah, that’s what we got this year.

**Edginton:** Yeah, ok.

**Peters:** Senator Kirmani.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, I was wondering in the proposals how many of the tenured faculty remained? Because I understand that some of them have chosen not to remain here.

**Gibson:** There were a few that took jobs elsewhere. I can get you that breakdown. I didn’t bring that with me today.
Peters: Shall we continue down the list?

Rieks: There will be some savings from the ESIP program, but that is yet to be determined. There’s some savings from phased retirements, and that’s yet to be determined, but that would potentially provide some fundings to reallocate for this upcoming year. And then there was a reduction of $125,000 from Intercollegiate Athletic support, and that has been reallocated to Academic Affairs. And just as a FYI, that $125,000 is a part of a 3-year $500,000 reduction. I think it’s $125,000 each year, and then the final year is the final $250,000.

Peters: Any other questions about the changes?

DeBerg: Should we have counted the loss in per student reimbursement to Price Lab as a deduction to the monies available since we got that money this year and won’t have it next year?

Rieks: But that was in a fund outside of the Gen—outside of our Operating Fund. That was—that came last year, of this current year, and just plain won’t be there next year. But the General Fund support of the $3.2 million has always been imbedded within the General Fund Operational Support money. That one is going away and some of the associated expenditures are going away on that side of the fence.

Gallagher: Like energy costs for heating—you know, the energy that Malcolm

DeBerg: Utilities.

Gallagher: Yeah, utilities at Malcolm Price, which I understand were pretty expensive.

Rieks: Eventually there will be some savings for that, but still there will have to be some level of utility expense and some level of maintenance. It will all be very minimal. Custodial will be—there won’t be a need for much of that anymore. Yeah, so there will be some savings there.
**Gallagher:** So our energy costs are going to go up even with the savings from that? Just as a general

**Rieks:** Yeah, because it’s a huge campus, and we’re at the mercy of what the coal prices are doing, and that was the number that we’ve been given from Physical Plant.

**Gallagher:** Yeah, right. I was just looking for a way to think about how much the increase of overall

**Rieks:** Yeah, well, and hopefully we did—we’ve experienced some leveling of utilities and some decreases in the last couple of years because of a lot of the energy efficiencies that they have implemented. So hopefully they will gain something out of that next year. It probably will be more likely the year after that.

**DeBerg:** So where was the $2.2 million for individual student income? Where was that parked in our budget, if it wasn’t in the General Fund? Where is that accounted?

**Rieks:** Are you talking about the money that the school districts pay?

**DeBerg:** The per students—yeah, where’s that go?

**Rieks:** It was spent this year.

**DeBerg:** But it went to General Fund, and then it was spent.

**Rieks:** No, it didn’t go to General Fund. [many voices sorting this out] They were required to be—they were accounts set up outside of the General Fund. They got

**DeBerg:** Ok, thank you.

**Rieks:** because they had all their separate revenues and ________ fees and everything, so they were set up
**Peters:** Price Lab had 2 separate funding streams.

**DeBerg:** I did not know that.

**Peters:** Some funding from the General Fund and then they had funds separate.

**Swan:** So I have a follow-up to that just so I understand. So now we’re going to take a million out of the General Fund for the R&D, so we didn’t spend any money this year/last year out of General Fund for the R&D, but now we have to spend $1 million for the R&D. Is that what this is saying? [many voices saying “no”] No. So where is this $1 million coming from?

**Rieks:** Well, last year the General Fund we had appropriations for within our General Operating for $160 million of $3.2 million. What was set up, because they have to account for this all separately once they got into the R&D at Lab School, we had to set up account totally separate outside of the General Fund.

**Swan:** And that was $2.2 million.

**Rieks:** That was $2.2 plus we’re required to then show that as support money that moves out of the General Fund. We have to track—it’s an accounting, those little accounting messes. You have to move the money, the $3.2 over to the R&D fund so then they had their total $5 point something million and then all their expenditures to be paid out of one fund, rather than go here and have $2.2 million and $3.2 over here. You try to keep all the resources in one bucket for them, so you can see all the expenditures that apply to that, but the $3.2 stayed within the General Fund. It’s always been there, whether it was the—in prior years it was the Lab School. That money’s always been in the General Fund. So it stays there. The other money just drops away, outside of the General Fund.

**Swan:** Oh, so this year out of the General Fund we did spend $1 million for the R&D?
Rieks: $3.2. For the current year? Fiscal Year ’12 you mean? Or for Fiscal Year

Swan: Oh, so we spent $3.2 for R&D or for Malcolm Price? [a voice attempting to clarify] So for Malcolm Price. But for the R&D that we’re having to keep, it would be $1 million that we spent out of the General Fund?

Rieks: I wouldn’t say that for sure.

Gibson: I mean, that decision has not been made. What we’re saying is that there will probably be about $1 million savings. Part of that $1 million savings has to be designated for the R&D. Now, I have not made a determination whether that will be $200,000, $400,000, $500,000, but a part of that must go to the R&D. Ok, and then

Swan: So we won’t attempt to spend as much as we did before, or there doesn’t have to be as much spent as we spent this year, since we don’t have the $2.2 [million] per student income. So that’s definitely gone, right?

Gibson: The $2.2 is gone.

Swan: Right. And we don’t have to spend that, right? So I don’t understand. We have an R&D from the Legislature.

Gibson: Ok, I think you’re—either you’re getting things mixed up, or I’m getting things mixed up.

Swan: I’m getting them mixed up.

Gibson: Ok, so if we look at this past year, there was $3.2 million from the General Fund. This is General Fund money. And then there was the per pupil allocation, ok? And that was the $2.2, ok? So the school operated on over $5 million, over $5 million General Fund/per pupil funding. So if we go back to last Fall, you will recall what I said was that if we were making cuts on campus that there would also have to be cuts for the R&D or Price Lab
School. And that cut would have to come from the $3.2 General Fund. It couldn’t come from the per pupil funding, ok? Is that clear?

Swan: That’s clear. I still don’t understand the R&D and why we have to—we have to keep having an R&D.

Peters: I think Senator Terlip might be able to

Terlip: That was the name put in the legislation when the Legislature funded this initiative for Iowa’s Research and Development School. In the past that meant the Lab School. We still have to fulfill that initiative, whether it’s developing online things or teacher training things or whatever.

DeBerg: That’s what the law suit is about.

Terlip: And that’s what—how much of the cost savings should go to that. And actually my question was do we know how much in the Lab School budget was spent on R&D activities last year? [other voices agreeing]

Swan: That was part of my question. Are we spending more by putting $1 million to it here? Is that more?

Gibson: I think we made an attempt, and I don’t know where that ended up because it was—when you look at the functions of, you know, having our students, our UNI students there educating the students, the pre-K-12 students and

Gallagher: There are a lot of in-service things for other schools and lots of research.

Gibson: Yeah, so I can check to see if we have that breakdown. I’m just not quite sure if we do.

Gallagher: It’s hard to tease out of the budget.
Gibson: It’s very hard, but there was a legislative request, I believe, and I don’t—so let me see what we sent in to the Legislature, because there was a legislative request for that, that asked that very question.

Swan: Ask about a good estimate.

Peters: If I can interject here, we—taking note of time, we are at about 5 minutes to 4:00. We’ve got about 35 minutes left in our designated meeting time, and I know the Provost does want to talk to us about ways that we can continue to—in ways that we can participate in setting priorities in the coming years, so I think might I suggest that we try to wrap up this discussion of the numbers? Senator Edginton.

Edginton: I want to make one more point—not in support of what you’re saying. But what I was arguing for earlier was the maintenance of the moral commitment that the University made to enhancing teacher education, whether you called it R&D Development School or whether it goes in some other direction, I want to follow the path of that money to make sure that it goes where people said it was going to go. That’s all.

Gibson: Ok, so every Fall, and I don’t know the exact date, but we—the Legislature does ask us for a budget for the next year. What are our budget priorities for the next—for the upcoming year? So, what we submitted for FY13 appropriation request, our request was $2.9 million. It was actually higher, but the Board of Regents asked us to knock it down. So it was $2.9. So [referring to a document she brought], $1.5 million was “lead the nation in pre-K-12 education.” And we have a long list—I can get you a copy of this so you can post it, if you would like—of what we would do with that $1.5 million. The second area was “enhance undergraduate education and student success.” That was $1 million. The third area was “ensure accountability and safety.” And that was approximately $489,000. So those were our 3 major priorities when we submitted the budget. So that was $2.9 million.

Now, you can see what we received. We received $2.3 plus the $4 which was already spent. I mean, that was gone before we even received it. Plus other monies out of that $2.3 were also committed. So what we have was
that we had a budget request of almost $3 million, and we received $2.3. What we have now, and again this is Academic Affairs, on the back of your sheet, $1.5 million in permanent money, permanent dollars, $1.5, and $750,000 in one-time money. So, what the President has asked the 3 Vice-President to do is to submit a request on how you would spend that money $1.5 [million] or $750,000. So, if we go back to what we asked to spend the money for in the first place, it was pre-K-12, undergraduate education, and accountability and safety. Now, we are not tied to these areas, but it seems to me if these were our priorities back in the Fall, they should be reflected in my request for the dollars.

**MacLin:** This question may be because I’m uninformed at this point, but who and how were those 3 priorities determined?

**Gibson:** They were determined by the Cabinet, so I, as the Provost, said I want dollars to go to pre-K-12. The other factor that we used was the Strategic Plan, so this is goal #3 on our Strategic Plan. Enhance undergraduate education and student success is goal #1 on our Strategic Plan, and of course, accountability and safety is also a part of our plan.

**MacLin:** Ok, thank you.

**Gibson:** So, the question now—I have to fill in my forms. They are due on Thursday, so a lot of this you don’t have a lot of time. They are due on Thursday, and the President plans to let each of the Vice—we will have a discussion, but he wants to let us know as soon as possible, which makes sense, how much of these dollars we will receive. So that’s one source of funding.

The second source of funding would be the million dollars, approximately $1 million, from the Malcolm Price or R&D. And what I’m saying to you is part of that has to go to the R&D, but the other will be salary savings. ESIP is—for now I can’t comment. There was a grievance, and that’s going through the process, so I don’t know how much I’m going to have for ESIP. I don’t know.

**Kirmani:** Do you think you will know it before Fall?
**Gibson:** I have no clue. I have no clue. The other savings, the Inter[collegiate] Athletic Support, that $125,000, so I do have those dollars.

**Kirmani:** The savings from phased retirements, that’s not in the grievance. That number should be available.

**Gibson:** I’m not sure if it’s part of the grievance or not.

**Peters:** Senator Smith, do you have a question?

**Smith:** Yeah, I was wondering if you talked about the, you know, the initial kind of suggestions that you had for how much for k-12 education, how much for improving undergraduate education? Did you have specific initiatives and with projected dollar amounts under those general headings? So for us to kind of decide where we’d want it, it actually, I think, would depend on what specific initiatives we’re talking about.

**Gibson:** Exactly. And my first initiative is to hire faculty. I mean, that’s what I want to do, hire faculty. We also need to hire senior faculty, not just pre-tenure faculty, so that was my number 1 item on how we would spend the $1.5 million.

**Smith:** Do you have those even broken out by department?

**Gibson:** I have them broken out in areas, but again this is—when we start talking about departments, this is where I’m asking for what your thoughts are, because there are different ways that we can do this.

**Edginton:** I’d like to make a comment. I think you fulfilled your moral obligation that I spoke to in terms of that distribution and whereas I’d like to argue that all the money go for teacher education, it seems to me that the distribution of funds will allow for some enhancement of programs across the University, and certainly enhancing student success enhances the success of students being trained in teacher education. And the issue is the same with the issue of accountability, so as far as I’m concerned, you’ve done what you said you were going to do, and I compliment you and
congratulate you in terms of doing that. In terms of the specificity of where those monies go, I think really that it’s not something, Jerry, that I would like, Senator Smith, that I think that the Senate should weigh in on. I think that’s a negotiation that takes place between the Dean and those units in terms of where the demand and where the needs are. And I’m going to give you an example. Forrest and I will sit here, and we’ll argue for the School of HPELS and for Physical Education, in particular, because they’ve gone from 190 students to 360 students with no additional enhancements for resources.

Dolgener: Actually decreases.

Edginton: Decreases in enhancements. And so, I mean, we’ll sit here, and we’ll argue that. That may not be the priority of the College of Education. It may be that they want to build, you know, the literacy program and bring a senior faculty member into the literacy area. I don’t know. That’s something that the Dean. He’s going to look more holistically and comprehensively at the needs of the College and the priority of the other College.

Gibson: One of the ways—excuse me—one of the ways that we could look at these dollars is just as the President is asking me to submit a form for a rationale as to how much money I want and how that money is going to be spent and why is that important? Departments could be asked to do the same thing in conjunction with the Deans.

Peters: Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: I have two points. One is flashing back to the APA, the way it was originally presented to the Senate was supposedly to select individual programs that as we had resources to start defining ourself as an institution by picking the areas we were going to be strong in. So my personal hope would be that we’d revisit that notion again now that there actually are resources. The other question I had is I understood there were some conversations happening about recreating and reconstituting a Center for Teaching Enhancement. I would be curious here what the thought is on that at the moment.
Gibson: Yes, I am interested in reconstituting that Center. It cannot be as it was before, because we don’t have the dollars, but I could see taking some of the one-time money and coming up with a structure where we could start slowly rebuilding that Center. There was a Senate committee, my understanding is, some years ago, that

MacLin: I was on both of the committees over the past 10 years, and I can submit, however that works, the documentation to both of you. One is the report that went to the Senate in 2005 where we had all our recommendations and all of our data we collected across campus, and then another committee that I was on in 2008, which actually at that point was a real search committee. We got all the way up to the point of making an ad, and then we got pulled. But one of the things that we did in that 2008 committee was we evaluated 11 other teaching centers across the country and really kind of categorized the types of centers that are out there, how much they cost, and is there a happy medium with whatever dollar figure we might have that we could implement? So I can make sure you—I can give that to you.

Gibson: That would be very helpful.

Marshall: I was on one of those committees, too. I don’t remember which one, but I don’t think I saved anything.

MacLin: I save everything. [laughter around]

Smith: I want to go back to Chris’s comment because, I mean, I can understand your point that if we get down to “Should the Senate be in the role of kind of putting or expressing itself about the hiring of particular faculty?” that seems too micro-managing. But on the other hand is it the—are we satisfied with, “Well, yeah, let’s put $2.3 in this big objective and $1.5 in this other one.” That seems like pointless. It just doesn’t seem like enough managing, enough input, enough real value added for our role here. So I would like—I would hope there’s kind of an intermediate level that we could find, and talking about things like the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching would seem like one of those, particular
initiatives where the Senate could go on record as saying, “Yeah, we really do support that. That’s the kind of thing we would like to see money in.”

**Peters:** I have Senators **Kirmani, DeBerg, Swan**.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, I was wondering if there was any assessment of that teaching center? How effective was that? I personally thought it was a waste of money.

**Hakes:** I did, too.

**Gibson:** I wasn’t here, so I don’t know.

**MacLin:** I think that in the report that we submitted to the Senate we have some—it’s fairly lengthy—I think we have some information about that.

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

**DeBerg:** Well, I mean, this is a—I think that shared governance and faculty consultation requires more than 1 meeting 4 days before a big thing is due. So I’m a little frustrated. I think the APA model is a lot better, that is, you have faculty who year-after-year continue to work with a lot of data, and a lot of faculty input from across the University. So I’m frustrated. I don’t know what we could do today without any more data than this, and

**Gibson:** I think that if—I’m sorry.

**DeBerg:** I mean, we could just pick a few things out, but how can I evaluate a teaching research center recommendation unless I see what else people think they need?

**Peters:** Let me just say briefly, and sorry to interrupt, Provost **Gibson**, but this is happening late, but one of the reasons it’s happening late is because of just scheduling issues. I was out of town 2 weeks ago. Last week was the Board of Regents meeting. This was literally the quickest we could get this meeting together and get it scheduled. But perhaps we could have a discussion not necessarily about the particulars, but about how—I mean,
we know Provost Gibson is going to say she wants to hire faculty. We have a little bit of time after that Thursday deadline to figure out where we want faculty hired, and at that point perhaps we can have more faculty input in those types of strategic decisions.

Gibson: Yeah, but—that’s what I would hope, that can we agree that we need to hire faculty with part of the money?

DeBerg: It depends on where, frankly.

Gibson: Well, [pause then several voices with a strong “yes” and then light laughter] Thank you. We can hire faculty. That’s what I want to do. Can we start looking at models for the Center for Enhancement of Teaching? I’m hearing that not everyone would agree with that initiative, but I would like to go down that road. We may not. We may end up doing a little. We may end up doing more, but is there a consensus at least that this would be something that I could apply for some of the money? Our infrastructure, our IT infrastructure is woefully underfunded. Woefully. We are not a campus that’s wireless. Most campuses have been wireless for a decade. Our technology is nowhere where it needs to be. So, again, we’ve made strides over the last 3 years. We used some of the ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) money. We used some of the maintenance of effort money. But I still—our infrastructure. I’m not talking about the hardware, the laptops, but the infrastructure is not there. And then the 4th thing that I—so I don’t know if you agree with that or not, but we can come back and talk about that. And then the 4th area that I feel is important, there is a serious disconnect between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs when it comes to recruiting students.

Kirmani: Yes, I tell you it’s very bad for ______________, too. It’s shameful.

Gibson: Well, there is a disconnect.

Edginton: Throw International Programs in there also.

Kirmani: I’m really amazed as to how this University functions.
DeBerg: I don’t want to pay for Admissions. I don’t want to fund Admissions. They need work, granted, but

Gibson: Well, I’m not—I didn’t say Admissions. I said there’s a disconnect there.

DeBerg: I said Admissions. I don’t mind.

Gibson: There is a disconnect, and if we are to grow with enrollments and recruitment, Academic Affairs has to play a greater role.

Peters: Senator—I’m sorry.

Gibson: And so I think that part of the money should be used to look at again structures that we might want to consider, whether that’s a person out of my office—I think I am suggesting that’s what I would like—a person out of my office that, or even a dual-reporting, but somehow we have to address that disconnect. So those are areas that I feel are important.

Peters: Senator Swan.

Swan: Ok, quickly and then to the point that I indicated that I wanted to speak about. To have a greater role in recruiting, I think then Academic Affairs, I’d be very happy to participate in this, should ask the President of the University to take monies out of Student Services and put them in Academic Affairs to increase Academic Affairs activity in that area. I don’t think that we should use current Academic Affairs money to increase expenditures in that area. I think expenditures are quite high in that area already. I think that you’re right. Things could be done better, and there are certain ways that they could be done better if we reallocate at the University level. I feel something similar to that about IT. There is University-wide monies, not Academic Affairs monies to go to updating IT on campus, and so that, too, I’d be very eager to advocate and contribute to any advocacy possible at the presidential level for that.
But I wanted to talk about Academic Affairs and these priorities. For instance, #1, $1.5 million for p-K-12 enhancement, teacher preparation enhancement. I think, and lots of my colleagues of course think, that the best teachers are those who are genuinely and finely liberally educated, and so when the liberal education dwindles and becomes enfeebled, and the teachers then go out and teach with an enfeebled liberal education, they are in fact not good teachers. And so I think that, yes, we should hire, and that’s very good to hire, and to enhance teacher education, and the monies would be following teacher education if we hired in liberal arts and strengthened the liberal arts as well as in, of course, the professions. The teacher ed. profession, of course, in not the only profession that UNI feels strongly about and even rather identifies with. The liberal arts as a foundation for all of the degrees at the University make all of the professions that we feel we excel at preparing makes them better than other institutions, and so I want to encourage us to think as I think when you talk about these 3 areas, including #1 $1.5 for p-K-12 teacher education enhancement that that includes obviously their liberal education.

Gibson: Excuse me, and you understand that we won’t have the $1.5 million. This was just the proposal that was submitted.

Swan: That’s right. Proposal. But whatever we do have, two hundred and fifty dollars [laughter], then we think broadly and not territorially, not uniquely about that area. And the same thing with student success in undergraduate education, that second priority. We know that if they are students who receive a genuine, good, hardy liberal education succeed in whichever profession they elect to pursue. So I hope that we will continue to think and advance in the liberal arts. So that’s what I wanted to say about Academic Affairs. All we can do in this kind of meeting is say I want us to remember that that’s very important to our students and to Iowa.

Gibson: And if I could, and I will send this document, the first couple of sentences under the second initiative, “Goal 1 in UNI’s Strategic Plan is to be a leading undergraduate public university that provides a strong liberal arts foundation. To achieve this goal, funding is needed to hire additional faculty in selected areas and to provide support for professional development.”
Swan: Sounds very good. I join Senator Edginton and compliment you on that. [light laughter around]

Peters: I’m sorry, I have Senator Gallagher who has been waiting for a long time and then our NISG rep, Jamie [Yowler, Director of Governmental Relations for the Northern Iowa Student Government] after her.

Terlip: Can I get on the list?


Gallagher: Yes, well I’d like to second that. I’m in teacher ed., and I absolutely think that it ought to be—there ought to be this tremendous reciprocity and singleness of purpose. You’re absolutely right about that. I would rather hire a good faculty member, wherever they are, than hire somebody to—like a keyhole fit. And I’d want to make sure that we rode pretty strongly over the issue of the quality of faculty that we attract for various positions. Who heads the searches and what they’re looking for and what the criteria are, because, we can? And can the unit that’s hiring attract at this point a good faculty member? That’s something to pay attention to as well. Give me a good English professor over another one somewhere else in one of the professional schools, I’ll take that, if they are really a good, solid faculty member. It’s maybe a nuanced point, but—the other thing about, one other point about the infrastructure, and you’ll be hearing more about this on Monday morning, but assisted technology. We are way below compliance to the new ADA regulations that went into effect in March. Those are accountability issues. They’re also legal compliance issues, and it also plays into the accountability and safety. So, I wanted to make that point.

Gibson: Yes.

Peters: Can you state your name?

Yowler: My name is Jamie Yowler. I’m Director of Governmental Relations for 2013 for Student Government, and we had our last meeting with some
of the Vice Presidents. Provost Gibson wasn’t there. She was out taking care of other things, but one of the things that you were talking about for IT is our philosophy on IT here is that “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it” just isn’t going cut it anymore, and some things do need to change and not only helping facilitate between faculty and students but between yourselves, being able to communicate better. Having everything go wireless is not only helpful for the next 5 years but for the next 20. Just maybe spending some of this one-time money now on some of those things is really important. And then one second thing that we thought was very important we wanted to see was implementing more programs to enhance faculty research as well as faculty research combined with students and spending some of that money for that because we feel as if students (a) don’t have that opportunity, and (b) that faculty could use that opportunity to bring in additional funds.

Peters: Ok. Senators Edginton, Terlip, and then Chair Funderburk.

Edginton: Whereas I’d like to compliment Senator Swan on his extremely well-constructed babble [laughter around], you know, I think it’s important to look historically at what’s happened at this University. Over the last 20 years, the budget of the College of Education has been drained $4 million dollars. $4 million dollars has been taken out and moved to liberal arts. Isn’t that enough? Isn’t that enough?

Voice: No

Edginton: No, you’ll say it’s not enough. It’s enough! You know, if we’re going to have a premier program at the University in education and teacher education, we’ve got to restore us to where we have been historically. I’d also just like to comment on Senator Smith’s comments. Often I don’t agree with him, but I think

DeBerg: I’ll agree with him today.

Edginton: Well, I will today, but we have to have some elasticity on the edges. You can’t say there’s going to be $1.5 [million]. It may be that there needs to be $1.7 and we need to take—draw from the other, or the reverse
has to occur. That negotiation has to take place. And I think that wise people will make those kinds of decisions in terms of the placement of those funds. But I really appeal to you to suggest that we continue to push money into the liberal arts program in some respects is self-serving and undercuts the professional education programs at this University, and really we really need to look closely at the relationship between what we do in liberal arts and in the area of professional education. I heard this conversation go on again for the last 20 years, and we keep draining the professional education programs. It’s unfortunate.

Terlip: I actually would kind of like to echo a couple of the statements made by our student representative today. And in particular in looking at the Center for Teaching Effectiveness, I really personally think maybe we need to look broader and look at a Faculty Development Center so that those research concerns and things could be brought in as well, rather than that focus that it had before. Seed money for research or innovative courses or those kinds of things would be really nice to have there.

Peters: Chair Funderburk.

Funderburk: One of the things I’m assuming you’ll keep in the mix anyway is I keep hearing that we’ve got certain programs that are bursting at the seams and could take more students if they had faculty. Given our downward turn in enrollment this year, which I think a lot of that has to do with bad PR, but I do think it would be a good time to make sure that we take an opportunity to maybe increase the numbers there, if there’s student demand areas that we had additional quality students by bringing additional quality faculty. That should be a priority at the moment as well.

Gibson: This is a good problem to have, that we have money. I mean, I’ve not had permanent dollars to spend in the 3 years that I’ve been here. I’ve had one-time money. And we don’t have a lot of permanent money this year. Of the $1.5 million or whatever it is, I’m certainly going to do my best to get the most of that money. I think that the other Vice-Presidents and certainly the President understands the importance of hiring faculty. If you’re going to move an institution forward, you have to have faculty. You have to keep hiring faculty, and so I don’t think that I’ll get any argument
there. But, of course, the other two Vice-Presidents are going to present their proposals as well for things that they feel will move the University forward.

Peters: Senator DeBerg.

DeBerg: I just want to second Jesse’s “please don’t spend this money on technology or on helping the Admissions Office out,” really. After the SIS junk, I am—if we spend another dollar on technology anytime soon, after all we’ve sunk into that, I mean, I feel like we’ve just made this huge commitment to new techno stuff, and the idea of spending our first batch of our new money on that, I find that totally demoralizing. And the other thing is that, honestly, unless basic changes are made in how we recruit students, another person, another administrator in the Provost’s Office is not going to crack that nut. That is a nut that one person in the Provost’s Office cannot crack. You would be better off to pay faculty who don’t feel like helping out right now—you would be better off to pay faculty to call prospective students if that’s what you want them to do than to put another administrator in the Provost’s Office. But I do not believe that you should feel obliged to bail out our enrollment management outfit. That—you cannot bail them out. I’m sorry. You simply cannot do this as much as you might want to. But faculty are unwilling to help you out much right now, so why not pay them to call prospective students if that’s what prospective students want?

Peters: Senator Smith.

Smith: Well, I strongly support improving the Liberal Arts Core, but I’ve got some quarrels with how it might be done. I happen to believe that there needs to be improvements in the curriculum. There’s been an effort to do that. Maybe some useful stuff will come out of it, but there also needs to be some significant improvements in the management of the program, in standards of teaching and grading and other things. And that’s up to the faculty. I would be very concerned about just throwing money into it, and particularly with hiring faculty in departments when often they’re hired to teach in the Liberal Arts Core, and they end up not teaching a Liberal Arts Core [course]. They end up wanting to teach in their majors. So I would
argue that if you do hire faculty in departments, make sure that there’s a commitment from the departments to provide tenured or senior faculty or those new faculty to make sure they teach in the Core. And I would also say we’ve got to make the other improvements. It isn’t just a matter of putting more faculty in the program. It’s a matter of improving the program in terms of management and curriculum, not just throwing in more bodies.

DeBerg: That’s professional development for faculty. [voices agreeing]

Peters: Senator Swan.

Swan: So first and foremost I wanted to say about the p-K-12 enhancements that looking at the College of Education for those monies that are to go there, please make sure that they are for teacher enhancement, not other activities that that College engages, not other professions that it engages. Make sure that it’s exclusively in the College for teach—actual teacher enhancement. With the liberal arts, of course, teachers in the high schools particularly, secondary ed., are largely liberal arts teachers, and that includes math and social sciences and this sort of thing, and so that’s why hiring in those areas, having competent, good, senior liberal arts and sciences professors enhances the education of teacher ed. students. Of course, Liberal Arts Core is important, and we do continue to operate to enhance it. You have a director who is advancing it more than it’s been advanced in years, and so those things I agree should continue to move forward, and perhaps hiring senior, tenured faculty whose understanding is that they’ll teach in the Liberal Arts Core could be a way of lifting the Liberal Arts Core sort of status amongst faculty. That would be something new to hire a tenured faculty member at the associate or full professor level with the understanding that that is what she is going to do. That would be quite a feat, if we were able to do that at this time. So there are lots of things going on here, but I want to make sure that when we’re enhancing teacher ed. that we’re doing it globally, doing it universally.

Gibson: And when we say pre-K-12 education, that’s all the Colleges. It’s not just the College of Education.
Swan: Yes. Good. Good. That’s my babble for now.

Peters: Let me just note that we have about 2 minutes by my watch until our 4:30 adjournment time. Senator Gallagher.

Gallagher: Yeah, what Senator Smith said about looking at curriculum and looking at the program, I think that goes beyond the Liberal Arts Core. I think it goes to the professional programs, too. There are some very exciting, innovative things that could be done that would improve and be more efficient, but I haven’t seen really much discussion around the budget in terms of leadership for looking at curriculum and really giving it a shakedown. That needs to be done.

Peters: Provost Gibson, any concluding remarks?

Gibson: Just to thank you for your ideas and thoughts, and although I do have to get my forms turned in this week, I do see this as an ongoing discussion. I don’t see this as just a beginning and an end. But this has been very helpful to me, and I don’t know if we’ll have another meeting this Summer, but certainly we have our work cut out for us in the Fall, if it waits until then. So I’ll keep you posted. [voices saying “thank you”]

ADJOURNMENT  [4:30 p.m.]

Edginton: Move for adjournment.

Peters: Senator Edginton to adjourn. Second from?

Kirmani: I’ll second.

Peters: Senator Kirmani. All in favor? [ayes heard all around] [voices again thanking Provost Gibson]
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FY 2013 Budget Development

FY 2013 Assumptions:

- State appropriations increased 3.2% or $2,379,273 plus our special request of $4 million (first of three year request)
- Tuition budget based on enrollment of 12,850
- Tuition rates increased 3.75%
- Maintain enrollment contingency at $500,000
- Financial Aid budgeted at 18% of tuition; 15% for CBA supplemental
- Indirect Cost Recovery greatly reduced due to elimination of federal earmark funding
- Salary increases per bargaining agreements with non-bargained groups receiving equivalent

Resources/Additions:

- State appropriations for the General Education Fund increased $6.379 million. This increase brings total General Fund appropriations to $81.114 million. Important to note that appropriations are still $17.2 million less than FY 2009 appropriations of $98.3 million.
- Decrease CBA expense budget due to projected decrease in supplemental tuition, $66,887
- Investment income is projected to increase $50,000 for a total of $821,000.
- Misc. Income from student service charges, $15,393
- Completion of SIS project, $340,000
- Projected increase in Overhead Charges to non-General Funds accounts, $50,000
- Decrease to Financial Aid due to decrease in Tuition revenue, $147,916
- One-time funding from fringe pool reserves, $750,000

Total Resources/Additions $7.8 million
Uses/Deductions:

- Due to enrollment decline Tuition is projected to decrease $346,000 for a total of $79,745 million.
- Due to enrollment decline CBA Supplemental Tuition is projected to decrease $66,887 for a total of $1.912 million.
- Indirect cost reimbursements are projected to decrease due to ending of federal earmark grants, $555,000
- Salary and fringe increases, $4.04 million
- Utilities increase, $350,000
- Building repairs (below industry standard @ $1.2M), increase TBD
- Restore Strategic Initiatives, increase TBD
- Insurance projected to increase 6%, $22,550
- Operational Contingency increase, $100,000

Total Uses/Deductions $5.5 million

Net to Allocate to Divisions, $2.3 million:

- The amount remaining for allocation is projected to be $1.572 million.
- One-time funding of $750,000 will be allocated to one-time requests.

Potential Reallocations for Academic Affairs:

- MPLS General Fund support of $3.2 million - reallocate $2.2 million to Professional Development School with remaining $1.0 million for the Iowa R&D Center for Education Innovation and other Academic Affairs strategic initiatives.
- Savings from ESIP to be determined.
- Savings from Phased Retirements to be determined.
- Reduction of $125,000 in Intercollegiate Athletic support
The University of Northern Iowa's mission is to provide transformative learning experiences that inspire students to embrace challenge, engage in critical inquiry and creative thought, and contribute to society. At UNI, the focus is educating Iowans who subsequently tend to stay in Iowa to work and live. New funding will be used to improve the university's ability to educate students to meet Iowa's workforce and economic development needs.

- **Lead the nation in pre K-12 education** - As outlined at Iowa’s 2011 Education Summit, the need for transformative educational change provides challenges and opportunities UNI is poised to address. With additional funding, UNI’s teacher education program will better prepare future teachers, provide professional development and track effectiveness of current teachers. The initiatives listed below add tremendous value to statewide education reform and help position Iowa as a leader in Pre-K-12 education. Funding is sought in the following areas to:
  
  - Recruit ten faculty for their nationally distinguished and innovative approaches to teacher education to provide campus-wide and state-wide leadership in development of highly effective teachers. Specifically, these faculty will contribute to multicultural education, bilingual education, early childhood education, elementary science education, education policy and ethics in higher education, social and political foundations of education and literacy education.
  
  - Strengthen UNI’s role as a professional development resource for educators across the state in the areas of technology-rich learning environments, developmental (physical, social, ability) competency, early childhood education, education policy and ethics, elementary science, cultural competency and early literacy acquisition.
  
  - Provide support to improve the relationship between cooperating and student teachers through enhanced clinical practices, professional development school partnerships, site-based clinical faculty, and exploration of residency models.
  
  - Prepare pre-service teachers to use assessment to inform instruction and to monitor students’ progress through the use of multiple measures; and enhance their abilities to create individual learning plans and competency-based continuums to assess and evaluate learners’ academic growth and achievement.
  
  - Develop a system for novice teachers to monitor and guide UNI graduates in their first years of teaching using InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) as standards for developmental and continuous progress.
  
  - Recruit a distinguished research director for the Research and Development School to provide leadership for a research agenda to measure effective reform practices in collaboration with university, local school, and state department personnel, as well as to translate results to the public.

- **Improve educational outreach across the state by:**
  
  - Developing programs in the Urban Eight school districts to encourage students of color to enter education fields. One such national program is Today’s Students, Tomorrow’s Teachers which provides leadership development, child development content knowledge, and apprenticeship experiences for 9th through 12th grade students of color interested in the teaching profession.
  
  - Researching and implementing strategies to improve the relationships between parents and schools to enhance learning. Programs such as Mother Read and Father Read demonstrate to parents the value of home literacy development. Program personnel show parents how to select conceptually-appropriate materials to read to their children and how to select books that their children can read independently.
**Enhance undergraduate education and student success** - Goal One in UNI’s strategic plan is to be a leading undergraduate public university that provides a strong liberal arts foundation. To achieve this goal, funding is needed to hire additional faculty in selected areas and to provide support for professional development. In addition, student success efforts will be intensified, including improving time to graduation. UNI seeks funding to:

- Hire five faculty in strategically-selected programs to support STEM initiatives and programs that address the workforce needs of Iowa. Emphasis in recruiting a diverse faculty will be a priority.

- Provide professional development support to enhance teaching excellence. Faculty will:
  - Pursue curricular change to ensure its rigor and relevance
  - Increase the delivery of on-line and distance education courses
  - Use technology to increase effectiveness of face-to-face classroom learning and connect students with global information resources
  - Develop strategies to address diverse learners and learning styles.

- Improve retention rates and reduce time to degree for all students, with a focus on reducing gaps for underrepresented students by making investments in academic support staff and other student services including tutoring, peer mentoring, MAP-Works and ALEKS (technologically-based systems that improve student placement and tracking of progress)

**Ensure Accountability and Safety** - by improving:

- Emergency communication to students, faculty and staff by augmenting the UNI Alert Notification system to tie in with interior fire alarm speakers in campus buildings

- Emergency management preparedness by increasing resources in training for response to man-made and natural disasters, facility security, access and monitoring

- Technology security to meet the growing challenges related to information technology and protection of electronic materials

- Resources to support identified technology upgrades to increase efficiency and accountability.

**Strategic Initiatives Request - University of Northern Iowa** ................................. $12,000,000 ($4,000,000 per year/3 years)

The cumulative effect of successive budget reductions has resulted in a widening shortfall of funds. Because of UNI’s high dependence on state appropriations for its general fund budget (46.7% vs. 33.5% at SUI and 35% at ISU), reductions carry a disproportionate impact. Therefore, UNI is requesting a special appropriation of $12 million, to be added to the University’s base budget $4,000,000 per year for FY 2013, FY 2014, and FY 2015.

The two major revenue sources for Regent universities are state appropriations and tuition. The latter can be enhanced by attracting out of state students who are charged higher tuition rates. Enrollment at UNI has historically been Iowa students. UNI’s Fall 2010 enrollment of 13,201 students is comprised of approximately 91% resident students, the highest proportion of the Regent universities. Therefore, modest increases in resident tuition rates combined with state appropriation reductions have a greater impact on UNI.