

3-24-2014

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 24, 2014

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2014 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 24, 2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 31.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/31

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
03/24/2014 (3:30-4:48 pm)
MTG # 1752

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

Mackenzie **Elmer** from the Waterloo Cedar Falls *Courier* was present

Senate Chair **Smith** made comments regarding the departmental responsibility for providing extended and separate exam administration for students with special accommodations. Next, **Smith** made a statement urging the UNI faculty to be genuinely engaged and committed to the Regents Efficiency and Transformation Review as part of their professional responsibilities, and to seek ways to improve the university, making it stronger and more effective. He welcomed Kathy **Sundstedt**, training as the Faculty Senate's new Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist, thanking and describing Sherry **Nuss**, outgoing AA, as a "real gem." **Smith** welcomed three guests for two consultative sessions: United Faculty President, Joe **Gorton**, and second, Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager**.

Gorton said that although appointed by President Ruud to be directly involved in the Efficiency study, and, not opposing the Regents Efficiency and Transformation Review, he has some concerns about the committee composition, which contains no faculty, and the Pay for Performance model. He believes the Review may not reduce bureaucracy or athletics, but result in cuts to academic programs and faculty, citing trends including a 7% decline in tenure-track positions between 2003-2012, and a 12% increase in adjunct faculty and administration. He reminded faculty to be prepared to defend the core missions of higher education and scholarship.

Provost Gibson commented on the recent data request received from the Deloitte Efficiency study. As the request occurred during Spring Break, it was deferred until such data could be collected accurately and efficiently by March 28. The group will be on campus the week of April 7 for interviews. In her consultative session, **Gibson** explained how some of the savings realized from last year's closure of Malcolm Price Lab School went to the Department of Teaching and were used to retain that faculty and develop new student field experiences. Other funds were prioritized and were used for one-time budget requests that came from all departments. A sizable portion went to the Department of Communication Disorders, which had turned away many graduate level applicants. Other one-time money was used for Library and ITS upgrades, International Programs and Museums and Student Success Initiatives, including the Academic Learning Center and Student Advising.

VP Hager's presentation explained the use of last year's one-time appropriation of \$10 million, and the FY2015 budget, which is based on an assumed Legislative 4% increase in the General Education Fund and an enrollment of 12,200. He cited the need for improvement in the budgetary process to create more transparency and to obtain greater faculty input. His presentation was made at other campus open forums.

1. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

The Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for March 3, 2014 was approved without changes (**Edginton/Walter**).

2. Docketed from the Calendar

1238 Resolution to Encourage Contribution to the UNI Institutional Repository and to Initiate Discussions about Open Access.

**** Motion** to docket in regular order (**Marshall/Peters**) Passed.

3. New Business

None

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1233/1129 Consultative Session with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton**

1234/1130 Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice-President **Hager**.

5. Old Business

None

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Walter/Strauss**)

Time: 4: 48 pm.

Next meeting: Monday, April 14, 2014

Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 pm

Full Transcript of 37 pages, including 2 Addendum

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 24, 2014
Mtg. 1752**

Present: Senators Melinda **Boyd**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Vice-Chair Tim **Kidd**, Jerilyn **Marshall (Alternate for Gretchen Gould)**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Chair Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Senate Secretary Laura **Terlip**

Also Present: NISG Vice-President Blake **Findley**, Provost Gloria **Gibson**, Associate Provost Michael **Licari**, Associate Provost Nancy **Lippens**

Absent: Senators Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Todd **Evans**, Faculty Chair Jeff **Funderburk**, Syed **Kirmani**, Kim **MacLin**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**, Michael **Walter**

Call to Order: 3:30 p.m.

Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order with Courtesy announcements and Call for Press identification.

Smith: I believe we have MacKenzie **Elmer** here from the *Courier* but no one here from the *Northern lowan*.

Provost Gibson: I just have a brief comment. This is just to let you know in case you may not know already that last Monday, we, being the University Administration recieved an email regarding the Deloitte Efficiency Study last Monday with a request for information to be provided by Friday, March 21. (several laughs) Many of you were on break, doing your research, grading papers, and doing an assortment of other things, so I did, in case you didn’t know, Kelly **Flege** is our point person, and I gave her a call, several calls last week—telling her that it would be very difficult for us to get information, that information, to her by Friday. She was very understanding of that. We both agreed that it is better to have accurate information turned

in than to try to rush and get information turned in to Deloitte. For Academic Affairs' portion, we have set up our own website and database that we're funneling information into it. Our goal is to have as much data as we can ready for this Friday, which I think is the (March) 28th. There are a lot of questions, as I'm sure you would anticipate, not only from UNI, but from the other two institutions as well. Kelly has been fielding those questions for us and getting back to Deloitte. There have been questions that she has shared that have come from Iowa or Iowa State, so we have some similar questions that are similar that come from all three institutions. We are working our way through this. It is a Board of Regents project. We're doing our best to get as much done efficiently and correctly as possible. And again you should know that Deloitte will be on campus the week of April 7th, and interviews are being set up, including an open forum, with Deloitte. So, I thank you for assistance that you have given to your Department heads or deans that might be asking you for information. Thank you for that. And we will all work together to get through this as best we can.

Smith: Thank you Provost Gibson. Faculty Chair Funderburk is not here, so he has no comments. But I am here and I do have a few comments. The first of which pertains to a topic I addressed in my meeting preview email, which was item 1218/1114: the petition regarding extended and separate exam administration, that we voted down at our last meeting. I stated in the email though we agreed at that time that I would draft a new petition for the Senate to act on, information that has since come to light suggests to me at least, that no further Senate action is called for at this time. I explained that in the email. I wanted to see if you were in agreement with me on that? Is everyone comfortable with that? and if so we're just going to let this pass. Does anyone feel there's something the Senate should do at this time?

Peters Since the person who filed the petition is not on the Senate, could you summarize for the minutes what information 'came to light'?

Smith: The person who filed the petition would know about this since she gave me the information. It is a good point. Basically what I found was that this is an issue that had been addressed by... it is covered by apparently an existing university policy; I don't know if it's a formal university policy, but the prevailing policy or practice is that Departments are supposed to provide accommodations for students who need those special accommodations to take exams. When departments aren't able to do that, then the Testing Services, the place in the Academic Learning Center, Test Services, serves as a backup, and they do handle exceptional requests. In talking to them, they can't handle a much greater volume, and it's not clear that they need to-- if departments are aware of their responsibility, and take efforts to do this. Many departments apparently do a good job of it. The department in question, which happens to be my department, apparently either wasn't aware of it, or didn't do a good job, or maybe they were not asked to do the job. So, if we work through the departments and they live up to apparently their responsibilities, at least for the time being, this should be okay. Okay? If you're comfortable with that, then we're going to let that guy go.

The next comment I have pertains to the Regents Efficiency and Transparency Study. President Ruud discussed this in a message he sent to the university community last week. I know Senator **Peters** emailed us a copy of the message his department head was sending out regarding the information that the consultants want departments to pull together. Over break, Provost Gibson copied me with the consultant's initial data request. Initial Data Request? Its huge! To UNI and all the Regents -- our sister institutions, I believe that UF President **Gorton** will be talking about that in his remarks he'll soon making to the Senate.

So things are starting to happen and and these developments I'm sure, will intensify in the coming weeks. I want to say that I agree with suggestions have been made: that faculty need to be engaged with this project, that we can't afford to stand aside, ignore it; we can't afford to assume that things

will turn out well. That said, I want to make another comment that I think is even more important: Based on what I've seen on this campus and elsewhere during my academic career, when faculty are confronted by a change initiative, their knee-jerk response, like that of most members of most organizations, is to resist. Our primary way of dealing with the threat of change is to come up with rationalizations that justify continuing on with all our current ways of doing things. Now, certainly in many cases we are justified in maintaining the status quo. However, if you think significant, substantive change isn't needed in American higher education, including UNI, then you just haven't been paying attention. In my view, the Regents Efficiency and Transformation Review is an opportunity for this institution to make changes that will help it prosper during the coming decades. But to take advantage of this opportunity, faculty need to be engaged in the review process. But, we need to be engaged with the mindset of proactively looking for ways of making improvements, of making this university better, and not with the self-serving-protect-the-status-quo-mindset that too often characterizes faculty at this, and other institutions. UNI cannot afford to continue being the same university it's always been. And we, the faculty, as part of our professional responsibilities, must insure that UNI comes out of this review as a stronger, better, more effective university.

Since I'm chair, I get to say that kind of stuff. Pardon my comments. Finally, one other comment, on a lighter and a happier note, I want to welcome Kathy Sundstedt, the Senate's new Administrative Assistant and Transcriptionist. Thank you, Kathy. She is a recently retired teacher who has prepared meeting transcripts for other organizations. She will be tutored today and to some extent in April, by Sherry, our departing Administrative Assistant, who Kathy's abilities and performance, expected performance, not withstanding, we're sure going to miss Sherry. She's really been a real gem at this job.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: So, that completes my comments and we are now ready to get into the next item on our agenda, minutes for approval. The minutes for our March 3 meeting, having been distributed for your comments and approval, are ready for formal approval. I need a motion to approve the minutes for March 3, 2014

Motion: Edginton/Walter all aye

Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

Smith: Items for Docketing, of which there is one, being number calendar item 1238 which if docketed would be item number 1134 with a very long title: Resolution to Encourage Contribution to the UNI Institutional Repository and to Initiate Discussions about Open Access. First, any discussion of the wisdom of considering this item for docketing? I need a motion to docket in regular order

Motion: Senator Marshall

Second: Senator Peters

Discussion:

Smith: Let me just say, that this petition was submitted by Ellen **Neuhaus** of the Library. It concerns an important issue the Senate will want to carefully review, hopefully sometime this semester. Any other discussion of this matter? Then I believe we're ready for a vote to docket in regular order

Vote: all aye to docket in regular order.

NEW BUSINESS

Smith: Does anybody have any new business they would like the Senate to address at this time?

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS:

Calendar item **1233** for docket **1129**: A Consultative Session with United Faculty President Joe **Gorton**

Smith: Hearing none, we are ready to move on to consider the items on today's docket, the first of which number 1233/1129 is a Consultative Session with United Faculty president Joe **Gorton**.

Thank you Joe for coming. In requesting this session, Joe said that it had to do with the Regents Efficiency and Transformation Study. He assured me that he would need no more than 10 minutes for his comments, after which we'll have questions and discussion, but I will want to manage that because we have another consultative session that we need to do today. Right now we're ready to turn it over to Joe.

UF Faculty President Joe Gorton: First, I want to thank you Jerry for approving my request to speak with you today. I know all of you have a busy agenda so I really appreciate the opportunity to be here. Second, I want to be clear at the outset that I am not here to oppose the Iowa Board of Regent's Efficiency and Transformation Review. Nor do I recommend anything less than full cooperation with the consultants who are conducting the analysis. Instead, my goal is to provide some additional context that might be helpful for you in future deliberations.

The Efficiency and Transformation Review has been presented as single initiative that will seek out possible savings from each part of our university. However, it is important to know that this is not the only review launched recently by the Iowa Board of Regents. Last year, the board created a Performance-Based Revenue Model Task Force. As you might know, pay for performance models link revenue allocations to outcome measures such as degree attainment, credit hours completed, retention rates, and contribution to the workforce. In these models the burden for performance falls almost entirely upon the faculty. In some quarters this market-based approach is described as No Child Left Behind, writ large for higher

education. The members of the board's Pay for Performance Task Force are Regent Katie Mulholland; Len Hadley, retired CEO for Maytag Corporation; Cara Heiden, retired Co-President of Wells Fargo Home Mortgage; and Mark Oman, retired Senior Executive Vice President of Wells Fargo and Company. There are no professors on the task force.

According to Rudy Fichtenbaum, Professor of Economics and President of the American Association of University Professors, pay for performance models lead to standardized testing and decline in the quality of higher education. Pay for performance is not in vogue because it works, but because it satisfies a legitimation function for colleges and universities. South Carolina learned the hard way about pay for performance. In 1996, that state adopted a pay for performance model that coupled higher education revenues to outcomes such as graduation rates. By 2003, the approach was abandoned because both faculty and administrators found it to be unworkable.

In addition to their pay for Performance-Based Revenue Model Task Force, the Board of Regents recently required all three universities to create Peer Selection Committees. The purpose of these committees is to update each university's list of peer institutions. As most of you know, that list is used for accreditation reviews, academic program reviews, curriculum design, and collective bargaining. It can be an important tool in the development of academic programs.

Now we have the Efficiency and Transformation Review. We are told this review will include all parts of the university. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the history of UNI or other universities to suggest that we will see significant reductions in bureaucracy. On the contrary, historical evidence makes it clear that when cuts are made the ax falls almost exclusively upon academic programs. Bureaucratic bloat and athletic spending seem to be immune from cuts.

The fact that the pay for performance initiative and updating of university peer lists occur at the same moment as the efficiency study do not add credence to the notion that academic programs will not be the prime target for what President Rastetter recently referred to as, “the most ambitious cost-saving review in a quarter century.” The concerns is not lessened by Executive Director Donley’s statement to the media that, “One hope is that the new review will spark growth in online classes, which have been slow to gain traction at research universities nationwide.” Regardless of how one feels about the growing prevalence of online courses, Mr. Donley’s comments add to the concern that academic programs, rather than bureaucracy and athletics will be the primary target of the highly paid efficiency experts.

The totality of information suggest the real possibility of a preset agenda of cuts to academic programs that will be legitimated by a slick and expensive report from a Big Four firm. Keep in mind that the final report that will be produced prior to Iowa’s next legislative session.

Speaking of politics, it is worth noting that we live in an era when powerful ideological and economic elites are striving to diminish the role of higher education in our democracy. The truth is they are succeeding. It would be naïve not to consider the board’s initiatives within that context.

I also want to speak just for a moment about recent trends in UNI faculty composition and administration at UNI. From 2003 to 2012, the number of tenured and tenure track professors not holding an administrative position declined seven percent. During that same period, the number of non-tenured track instructors increased 22 percent, and the number of people in administrative positions (Executive, managerial, professional and scientific) increased 12 percent. In other words, at UNI the number of professors is declining, while the number of adjunct faculty and administrative personnel are increasing. Like pay for performance, this is in keeping with a disturbing trend in American higher education. These trends are not in keeping with the promise to devote as many of our scarce resources as possible to the

core missions of higher education and scholarship. Therefore, the litmus test for the validity of the efficiency study will be whether it recommends changes to reverse these trends, so that students, their families, and taxpayers will receive the very highest education value for their tuition and tax dollars.

It would be remiss of me to not mention that President Ruud has appointed me to the UNI committee that will be directly involved in the efficiency study. He has also appointed Vice President Tim Kidd. He also agreed to my recent request to be part of the peer selection committee. But when all is said and done it will probably be the Faculty Senate that will have the most to say about the impact of the review upon UNI's academic programs. So my goal today is to encourage you to go into this process with your eyes wide open; to be skeptics; to read through the spin and the Orwellian jargon, and most of all to be prepared to defend vigorously the core mission of this university. United Faculty, the UNI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, stands ready to join you in that effort. Two years ago, our university was blindsided by program cuts that we all remember too well. Let's be sure to not be caught off guard again. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you, Joe. Any questions or comments for President Gorton?

Gorton: (hearing none) Good.

Strauss: Thank you. I appreciate Joe bringing the presentation to light and shedding light on what he predicts might be adverse outcomes. Thank you.

Smith: Anyone else? Then thank you, Joe. Okay.

Calendar item 1234, for docket 1130: a Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager**

The next item on our docket and I believe the major item of business for today is number **1234/1130**: Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Vice-President **Hager**. This session has to do with the university budget; both the budget that is currently being considered for approval in Des Moines and the process by which financial plans and budgets are developed at UNI and used to manage university activities. Thank you for coming VP Hager. I've got PowerPoint presentations from both of our guests and if I'm not mistaken, I think Gloria you were going to take off first.

Gibson: I want to thank you for the opportunity to talk about the FY15 budget request. I do have a notebook with all of our budget requests for Academic Affairs. But what I'm going to do is sort of summarize the budget requests for Academic Affairs. But before I do that, I want to step back and just briefly contextualize where we are from 2012.

[First Slide: See Addendum 1] 2012: We, the University, experienced a significant budget cut that was painful for us all. The budget had been cut each year, even prior to my arrival. You've seen that data. We closed Malcolm Price Lab School. The savings there was approximately \$3.5 million, excuse me, \$3.1 million. We kept the faculty; we needed the faculty and so we transferred about \$2.1 million to the College of Education for the faculty in the Department of Teaching. The Faculty have done an excellent job in creating a new field experience for our students.

Gibson: By mandate of the legislature, we also had the R & D requirement and so we transferred \$300,000 into a separate account for the R&D which has now become the Center for Educational Transformation. We hope to have an announcement out this week about an Interim Director. So, the transfer then from Malcolm Price, after we take out the money for the College of Ed and CET, was approximately \$600,000.

Gibson: We also had a savings of \$776,000 from the Early Separation program. Initially, we had a savings of \$270,000 for the phased retirements.

As you know faculty had an opportunity to rescind those, and just about all of them did, except for one or two, I believe. But the phased retirement savings to the Provost's Office was a little over \$100,000. So that when you take what was saved from Malcolm Price Lab School, from ESIP, and from the phased retirements, we realized about \$1.5 million. Those funds were then reallocated to the university.

I want to talk a little bit about how they were reallocated. (**next slide**) Last year, this academic year, we could not hire faculty, with those funds, we didn't have time to do the searches, so those dollars were used for one-time projects. This is just a sampling of some of those one-time projects: Renovations and materials for the library, remodel of International Program space, our Diversity initiative, Cornerstone sustainability initiative, our Pretenure summer fellowships for pretenure faculty, our Capacity Building awards for tenured faculty, our Level 2 and 4 field experiences, and ITS Network Upgrades. These are just a few of the projects. So we took the permanent money and we allocated it to these one-time projects.

So, this year, the Deans worked with Department Heads and Faculty to present at Academic Affairs Council, the needs for faculty hires. Now, I should say that the needs were greater--they always are--than the money that we have. So when we look at the total amount requested for faculty hires from the deans, it was \$1.7 million. So, the wish list—if you could have all the faculty that you feel you need--put that on a list, we're going to discuss it and prioritize. So that list was \$1.7 million. Well, we didn't have quite that much money to spend so, what we did was to talk about priorities, and each of the deans made a case for their particular college, and this is what we came up with.

Gibson: I'm sure your eye goes immediately to Communication Sciences and Disorders. I understand that. It was surprising to me as well. The challenge with that department is because there is a clinical aspect to that work, they not only have to have the faculty, they have to have a clinical

supervisor and they have to have a secretary. So, all of that was necessary. I would say—Mike, [Associate Provost Licari] correct me if I'm wrong, of all the departments on campus, this is probably the department where we turn down the most students.

Licari: Yes.

We turn a lot of students away from that program, so this is an investment in that particular department. Each dean made their case. We made the allocations. For the Library, you're going to hear more about the Digital Scholarship Services next meeting. The dean there wanted to invest in that area. And the University and the Provost's Office does have a commitment to the Museums, the UNI Museums, and so we have allocated money for the renovation of that space and have allocated dollars for personnel for UNI museums. So when we add that and other permanent expenditures, and some those are staff, some of those are other faculty and departments, we have about \$1.5-\$1.6 million. These searches are going on right now in your departments. They are going on right now.

Peters: I have a clarification question: Those numbers include salary and benefits?

Gibson: Yes, yes.

O'Kane: A quick clarification: You said to renovate the museum. Do you mean the building on the corner?

Gibson: Oh no--the Library. In the library. If you go down to the first floor, they've already started some of the renovation. They've bought some cases and some other things. That the building, the building on Hudson, leaks. It is in a state of total disrepair. I don't know what VP **Hager** will eventually do with that building. We still have artifacts in that building but we're trying to get them out as soon as we can. We had an email a couple

weeks ago that there was another leak in that building. So, not that building— the library.

Gibson: Okay, so where are we for FY 2015? Again, the Provost's request is \$1.3 million and basically my request is for faculty hires and services that are going to contribute to student success. I'll break those down for you in just a minute. Then, all of the other numbers are for each of the other units in Academic Affairs. Each department head filled out a request so we have a request from each unit that are here. (points to large folder) Again, those requests totaled \$14.6 million. And again, I asked each department to "Give me what you feel you need." So this is from each of the departments. It includes faculty. It includes S & S. It includes equipment. It includes additional staff, it includes... everything.

Smith: Just to be clear...this is above the base? This is over and beyond the base of the budget? These are additional things?

Gibson: Exactly. \$14.6 million: This is for Academic Affairs. That's the request from Academic Affairs. That's the request. That's what's in this book. (points to book of requests)

Smith: If legislators are nice, we'll get it all. (laughter)

Gibson: (last slide) The Academic Affairs council had a retreat, a min-retreat and we said, "We're not getting \$14 million; we're not getting anywhere close to \$14 million, so how can we prioritize our request?" that is then folded into the University request that Michael is going to talk about. So these are our priorities: New faculty lines and opportunity hires: \$559,000. We would love to institutionalize the Cornerstone budget. Right now we pay for every year with one-time money. Student Success Initiatives: That's the Academic Learning Center, Student Success Initiatives, Academic Advising. We really need more advisors-- it's a dire

need. S & S: everyone, every department requested an increase in S& S and to only have \$150,000 is...I don't have a word for it.

Gibson: Library Materials budget **must** be increased..**must** be increased. It's surprising how much new journals, electronic journals, they are very, very expensive. And then, building repair projects. There is still a lot of building repair needed in academic building and again this is but a drop in the bucket \$200,000. So the Academic Affairs budget prioritized list \$1.4 M. \$1.4 million--that's for Academic Affairs. As you will hear in a minute from Michael, the total amount that we have—we may have--depending on what the legislature decides very soon, maybe next week we'll hear something-- is actually about \$1.3 million.

Heston: I just have a question about building repairs. Is it typical for building repairs to come out of the Academic Affairs budget rather than some other component of the university budget?

Gibson: No, but we just felt that there were some projects that absolutely need to be done, and so we decided to put those on our priority list.

Smith: Any other questions for Provost Gibson?

Edginton: Could you jump back a couple of slides to that \$900,000 figure. I didn't quite understand. That was a very large part of that portion of the budget you were explaining, but there wasn't any detail there in what was going on there in "Other Department Expenditures of \$911,621."

Provost Gibson: The Deans will come to me for additional lines that are needed in various departments. So these are additional lines. For example, in Comm Studies, Communication Studies, there was a request and justification for a Digital Studies faculty member. This was a new major that was approved a couple of years ago. Digital studies major that was approved a couple of years ago and there was a need for an additional

faculty member. Special Ed.: Sometimes, especially in the College of Education and also in the College of Business—Well, in all the colleges, we run into issues of accreditation, so there is a ratio of faculty to students. And we really can't afford for that balance to be disrupted, or we'll find ourselves in significant trouble. So for some of these, for example, Special Education was given a line, Communication Sciences & Disorders was given a line. Those pertain to accreditation issues. The College of Ed received funding for two endowed chairs through the Jacobsen gift. Those endowed chairs needed to be topped off so we used money for that. We have a Library Media Faculty position; we as part of EPSCoR, we had to provide faculty for EPSCoR, that was the \$20 million grant that the three regent institutions received. We also contributed to a counseling line, again that was an accreditation issue. We contributed to staff positions as well. We needed additional funding for Level 2 and Level 4 field experience, A Grants Specialist, that's someone in Christy Twait's shop; Academic advising; A STEM coordinator, a commitment for three years, and also an Instructional Specialist in the Academic Learning Center. I can get you all of the numbers but the faculty lines there were \$538,000 and the additional staff positions was \$373,000. So that's where that \$900,000 is.

Edginton: One additional followup question, and I think we we're going to talk about this when we talk about policy number 2.13 and that's the role that faculty play in the process of providing input and information to people in decision making roles, whether that a consultative process, that shared governance I don't recall where in my unit there was a request for budgetary information that came to us, that would have allowed us to move forward items. They may have been moved forward by the director of the school. But I don't think it penetrated down to the faculty. I may be wrong. Maybe you can recall any conversation or maybe in some of the other units. (refers to Scott) There was no penetration of this question down to the faculty. So my comment, and I'll make it later, when we talk about this policy is that we need to work very aggressively at this issue of shared governance to make sure that decisions regarding resourcing and future

budget processes get penetrated down, very early, to faculty, so they can have that conversation, and since the bulk...I mean, what percentage of our resources of Academic Affairs go for faculty?

Gibson 72%? 72% I think that's faculty and staff, probably. It's pretty high

Edginton: Since the bulk of our expenditures are for faculty, 72%, or more, it seems to me that when the issue of faculty resourcing comes into play, that that particular issue needs to be fully addressed by the faculty. If there's a vacant line, they need to have that conversation. If there's a possibility that the budget can be influenced in the future, faculty needs to have that conversation, and that information needs to percolate up through the system so that not only does the unit head get that information, but the dean get the information—I think what Jerry is suggesting that the policy that's been crafted, that the provost and the cabinet also get that information so that people are heard, so that its not just pseudo-form of participation.

Gibson: I agree with you. There are no faculty hires that are done without faculty involvement.

Edginton: It depends on how you define that process.

Gibson: Faculty hire faculty. What I'm saying is that faculty hire faculty. Frankly, I don't know how a search would be approved without faculty input.

Edginton: Job descriptions may be written and a disciplinary focus or program area focus may be put in place, and then the faculty being told, "Will put you on a search committee" and you have to respond to this. That's not in keeping with my sense of how this process should work. There should be faculty involvement way back in the very beginning.

Smith: I don't want to discourage this discussion, but I think we will talk about this later and would rather to keep this focused on the Provost's presentation right now if we can, and we'll get back to these things.

NISG Findley: Is there a difference between the faculty lines that are spelled out, and the faculty lines in the other permanent expenditures, or is it just spacing issues?

Gibson: This slide, yes. This line came from the reallocation. But the Provost's office has other funding, but this came directly from the reallocation.

Smith: Any other questions, again, that pertain to the Provost's presentation because we've got VP Hager on line? And if not, I'll turn over to VP Hager.

Gibson: I just want to say that I understand what you're saying, Chris...

Edginton: I'm trying to improve the process.

Gibson: Yes, I understand.

Edginton: It's not a critique.

Cutter: I would like to follow up then, because one example that may clarify is this: When look at Museum personnel, that's something that a lot of departments might be relevant to. But in History, our faculty didn't hear anything about that. History and Anthropology might not be the hiring groups, but might be able to add something to the conversation on that.

Gibson: Okay

Smith: Are there questions? Then, I'm going to turn it over to VP Hager and try to get up his PowerPoint.

VP Hager: Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I had the pleasure of assuming this position two years ago in the middle of the program cuts. [Smith laughs] One of the things that became painfully obvious, and this is probably a gross understatement, is we need to change the budget process at this institution. There is way too little input from various constituents, including faculty, in this process and we're in the middle of changing this process.

Senator **Peters** and I had some conversations last year and I understand that there is a process working its way through the Senate now, and rather wait for that process to be completed, the President, and I concurred with him, thought we needed to at least take some intermediary step this year and have transparency to the process and share some of the requests that have come through. And so, the requests were due Jan. 31 and Provost Gibson has shared the requests from Academic Affairs. The executive management team reviewed those mid-February after soliciting input from some of our areas. And then, I've got a little "road show" that we're taking on the tour here: You can see March 24, I'm here today, there's a couple of open forums in the next two days in the University room, across the hall at 11 and then we'll be meeting with the student government on April 2.

VP Hager: The Executive management team will review again in April and the President will make a final decision. There is no date next to the President's decision, because that's really determined by when the legislature makes the final appropriation for the institution, and if history is any indicator, it will be made at the 11th hour of the last day of the session, and who knows when that is. Everybody is saying its going to be earlier this year because of an election year. We haven't seen bills out of either House or the Senate related to budget yet. So, time will tell.

Sometimes that can be a very short-order process. If the legislature doesn't get done with their work until some time in May, then we need to see if the governor is going to sign or veto particular items. We might be pushing the envelope to actually get a budget developed and so the thought was: we'd get all the input now, and then the president will have the input so once he knows what the budget will be for the next year, he can make those decisions, having the benefit of the input from everybody.

VP Hager: The other thing that it is a little bit of a challenge is, in the spirit of transparency, how do we have a conversation with each other, internal to the university, but not necessarily have a conversation external to the university, that may have an interesting impact on the appropriations? If we have some –where we think as an institution some area we'd like to spend some funding, but legislators don't agree with that concept, would that have a negative impact on funding?

And so the compromise (and we'll ask for some discretion, Mack) was to not distribute the requests electronically, but have a PowerPoint slide [**See Addendum 2**] so that we can show them, so that we can take feedback. Bruce would you distribute...I don't know if you all know Bruce Reiks, the director of budget development for the institution (distributes recommendation) (moves to next slide) We've done a broad-brush FY15 approach for what the budget could look like for FY15 based on the governor's recommendation.

Normally we would have another column that says this is the Senate's recommendation and another column that says the House recommendation. They came out with joint targets this year. We haven't seen actual bills from either of them yet. As soon as we see a specific bill, we'll add a column. But for now, what's before you is just based on the Governor's recommendation, as we don't have anything from the House or Senate yet.

The assumptions are on the screen. You can see we assumed an increase in enrollment up to 12,200, a 4% increase in general education funding from the Legislature, \$4 million to the base, and then the tuition increase is 0% for resident undergraduate tuition and the respective ones are on the screen for the others. So those are the assumptions going in to the budget I handed out. What I'd like to do with you is just kind of walk through this. (next slide) I'll walk through the sheet, so you can track and I'll show you what I find interesting, and I can certainly field questions at any time. This is the top part of the revenues. You can see the state appropriations, the \$7.7 million increase is the \$4 million to the base and the 4% increase, and that comes up to \$7.7 million. We are sitting on, last year we had a one-time appropriation of \$10 million. We drew down \$6 million this year. Next year we're planning on drawing the remaining \$4 million, so essentially its a decrease of \$2 million in that one-time appropriation. While its nice to have the one-time (appropriation) and if we take this out another year, the \$4 million goes away, and that's why we have asked for that \$4 million to the base.

These tuition revenues are from the tuition increases, and then the enrollment change, that \$392,000 is the change from where we are at now, 12,153 (or something like that) up to 12,200 (students) so that's the revenue we expect from that change. All in all—the revenues we expect to increase about \$6.5 million. Does that make sense? Any questions on the revenue side?

On Expenditures, if we look at the changes, because we know this will be the second year of the United Faculty contract, and the second year of the AFSME contract, we can fill in these numbers for what they will look like for next year. And so that's what we've done here. This will be a little bit more interesting conversation next year, when neither of those are probably settled this time of year. We'll cross that bridge when we get to it. You can see the projected salary increases based on our current staffing levels; fringe benefit changes. The decreases of \$239,000 is for the ERIP

program, the Early Retirement program, from four and a half years ago. Next year will be the fifth year of the early retirement program which started mid-year, so we only have to pay half of a year, and that number will go away entirely then in FY16. So we can assume about \$3.2 million in automatic expenses, just based on personnel expenses.

Now on down, the other expenses in here, we've kind of just slotted in pending discussion with campus, the Financial Aid goes up because we have tuition revenue going up, so that's the financial aid formerly known as Tuition Set Aside. We usually try to keep institutional strategic initiatives at \$400,000. It was brought down a little bit, so we brought that back up. Institutional expenses, \$65,000, is things like insurance, property insurance, for the institution, what we pay to the fire department, those kinds of things; some institutional memberships go there, so those are those increases.

We've added in an enrollment contingency of \$1.3 million. This essentially equates to about 200 students. So if we hit 12,200 (students) next year, this will be money that's available on a one-time basis next year. If we don't hit 12,200 (students), this is the first place we'll take it, so we can avoid impacting any programs or anything. Utilities are anticipated to go up about 3.2%, so those are about \$1.6 (million). The total is about \$4.9 million, between the general institution and the personnel is about \$4.9 million of expenses we anticipate. You take that off of the \$6.5 and we've got about \$1.3 million, the lower right hand number, that should be available, we anticipate, to add to base funding. So I'll stop right there and see if there's any questions. If you want to back up a second Jerry. Are there any questions on the draft FY15 budget?

Peters: Be an optimist, let's say we got 12,250 (students). That would also be one-time money used for that year, or would it be committed to ...?

Hager: It would probably be seen one-time money and then we'd evaluate it for base money for the future year. What the President would like to do, is if we have that one-time money available, is he wants to run a mini-budget process. We probably won't know that until closer to January when we see what our retention is for second semester. But he wants to run a mini-budget process and take the requests from across campus on what are the one-time expenditures that would be helpful, and move through that kind of quickly, but have the same process for the whole campus; to have that kind of involvement in decision-making with the one-time money.

Strauss: Thank you for coming and giving us all these details. What are Institutional Official's salaries? What is that?

Hager: That would be President, Provosts, Vice Presidents...

Strauss: Academic Administration, tell me, what's that?

Hager: Those would be in the next line down, Academic Administrator's salaries.

Strauss: If you add that to faculty salaries and take the ratio, its about 15% of academic salary expenditures go to administration. Is that a reasonable ratio?

Hager: I couldn't tell you how that compares to peers or anything off the top of my head.

Strauss: I'd be really interested to know.

Hager: Yes. I don't know if IPEDS tracks that in that format or not, Bruce. I don't think it is one of the IPEDS categories. I think they're rolled together. I don't know the answer to that question.

Strauss: That speaks to some of the concerns that faculty have about administrative bloat. If we knew what our peers were doing, then we'd know how bloated we were or how thin we were. I think it would be an interesting thing to present to the faculty. Thank you.

Hager: Sure. Any other questions on the draft budget before I move on to requests?

Heston: I was just curious. It looks like P & S [Professional & Scientific] salaries have been pulled out, so we spend about half as much on P & S as we do on faculty? I would like to know how that compares institutionally-- across institutions. Its not clear to me exactly who gets P & S and what gets P &S. I know some of that is IT stuff, but, I'm not sure what else is categorized into the P & S column.

Hager: P & S would essentially be is anybody that's not (this is a simplification) a faculty member or somebody that's not paid hourly. So most of the salaried people, like Academic Advisors would be there; there's ITS staff. What would be some other examples off-hand? Lab managers maybe. There's really just those three broad categories of employees.

Gorton: It would be good to have those numbers before bargaining next year. They're going to be good numbers, I hope.

Hager: I'm obligated by code to wait until bargaining to have that conversation, Joe.

Gorton: I sent you an email on this and I know you've been busy, but I thought it would be a good time to ask. On the health and dental numbers on the FY14, the numbers are \$13.9. When I look at the other numbers, that's considerably lower than say FY13 numbers I have. Am I right about that? Bruce, do you know?

Hager: No, I think on that email, Joe, what you're talking about the meeting we had on that, that is all up and down rates, and this is general education funds, so auxiliaries like the Department of Residence would be included on those other numbers.

Gorton: Okay. Alright. And the \$1.3, the \$1.1, is a projected increase in general education fund health & insurance?

Hager: Right. There would be some outside the general fund that would also increase.

Gorton: Got you. Thank you.

Smith: Other questions at this point?

Hager: Well, if we look at the \$1.3 million in the lower right hand corner, I've got four slides here. We can just walk through the requests, the prioritized requests, that came up from each division, and I'm happy, and Provost Gibson, I'm sure as well, to take feedback back to the President. Or, you know him as well as I do: He's open to emails directly from people.

What I thought I would do is just share what the requests that came through, so everybody can see what the requests were that came up from the Vice Presidents. The number on the left is not a prioritized order, its just a line number for easy reference. So, the number doesn't mean anything, other than what order it's in. It talks about the divisions and so on. On this particular side we've got the President's division and Academic Affairs, the department, the dollar request. If the request includes any addition to full time staffing, and that number is there, and a very brief description. What I've done for other meetings, is just pause here a few minutes, rather than read each line, is to let you look at it. If there's any questions about it, I'm happy to try to represent that request. The acronymns here under Compliance are Violence against Women Act, these are some federal

legislation, and I'm sorry I don't know all the acronymns. But a lot of its increase in federal regulation, that the compliance office says they would like another staff member to address. Any question on this slide?

Vice Chair Kidd: So the request for \$660,000 is for University Relations? It's a large increase in their overall budget.

Hager: It is. They asked for that. They also asked for \$250,000 to be reallocated within the institution. I believe \$125,000 of that reallocation is sitting in Student Affairs now, and Vice President Hogan agreed to have this as a permanent transfer over to University Relations. My understanding from Scott Ketelson, the Executive Director of University Relations is this moves us closer in line with what our counterparts are doing at other institutions, and our competitors are doing.

VC Kidd: Would that be for staff? Marketing?

Hager: No. the staff request is later on. One of the things you'll see here, and we debated about how to put this. You'll see some other lines that also deal with enrollment management issues. We talked about clustering them by subject matter, but we decided that some of them didn't fit necessarily; it was a little bit arbitrary, so we decided to present it by Division. Move to second page. See if there's any on here. This is continued Academic Affairs and my Divison, you'll see some requests. Tim, this line 13 is also a part of what I would consider enrollment management. There's been some concern with how we're dealing with data. So Dr. Kaparthi asked for some money to help fund a Data Access position. I should point out these numbers, that while we have \$1.3 million, the total requests were nine point some million, so not all of these are going to be funded—simple math will tell you that, and so that's why we're out asking for feedback on what should or shouldn't be funded. Or what should be given a priority or things to consider as the President makes his decision.

A couple, just because I have the perogative, with the power plant, we do have some –this is a 50% request—we have some money from utility savings that we’ve done with some lighting upgrades in different buildings. We have some infrastructure needs in the Power Plant. The Perkins loans software has to do with Social Security number issue for students. I’m feeling fairly confident this one might get approved this coming year. Any other questions on there? If not, we can move to the third page. We can come back to these, obviously. A few more from Administration Finance and Student Affairs, which is what the SA stands for. Tim, here you can see some more of the admissions positions. Right now there’s four positions that are funded with one-time money. They’re requesting base money. All of this is base appropriations. There’ll be one more slide at the very end that talks about one-time requests that have come in thus far. I thought there was an acronym. Career Services: that NACElink is just some kind of job career board. I’m not quite sure what the NACE stands for. Any questions here?

Heston: We have an LGBT center?

Hager: Yes, its new. Up in the addition of the Union, when they remodeled with the International Student Center, they put in a little LGBT center.

Heston: I didn’t know they had their own center; that we have our own center.

Hager: And then the last slide: This is the Advancement Division, and there are some expenses covered as Institutional. I don’t know if you can read “institutional” there. Building repairs are carried as an Institutional Expense and then there were some general requests for, again, for some more enrollment management. I think some of these are probably some redundant requests. Just by the way the process worked, they all rolled up.

Peters: Chief Enrollment Management Officer there, is that the position that's being hired for now, that's titled, like Assistant to the Vice President, or something like that?

Hager: Yes, I think its an assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management.

Peters: Is this person, maybe you can't speak to this, because I suppose its either VP Hogun or President Ruud's decision, but do you have a nose up, is that person replacing the Director of Admissions, or is this a supplemental position?

Hager: No. Its replacement. Its my understanding that its replacing the Director of Admissions. So I'm not sure, in light of that, I'm not sure. This is before that decision was made, these requests were made before the end of January, so I don't know. I'd be surprized if that full 100 was needed for that position because there are salary savings to be contributed to that.

Smith: More slides or more questions?

Peters: I don't know if it's a question so much, as general thoughts. Obviously there's a lot of different things it's hard to digest it all in a short period of time. But it seems to me that in terms of being strategic about spending new money, we have certain core needs of course, but then we also you have to make decisions for areas of growth, I would think. And that's true on the academic side of things as well as other parts of the university. So, we heard, for example that one of the rationales for devoting resources to Communication Disorders is that we think that's an area of growth that the university will benefit from tremendously because we turn down graduate students paying graduate tuition every year that we will now be able to admit. So, I guess if you look at something like university relations, \$600,000 is a huge request. Should it get all of that money? My gut says probably no, and yet it's possible that some investment in

university relations can pay off in terms of more students. So I'm sure these are the kinds of discussions you're having in the Executive Management Team. I see EMT and I think of something completely different. (laughter) But I'm sure these are the kinds of discussions you're having with the Executive Management Team and I think...I don't know how we participate at this stage, but it would be nice when the decisions are announced to get some sense of how those rationales broke down. You know what I mean? Yes, we've decided to spent a lot on this, but here's what we think we're going to get out of it, and how we're going to measure whether this was a good use of the funds.

Hager: This is exactly the kind of feedback that's helpful. This process right now is clearly inadequate and we need something better than this, but hopefully it's a step in the right direction in terms of how we ask for the input on this. Once the president makes a decision, it's his intention to clearly communicate those decisions and I'll pass along the rationale.

Cutter: I think having faculty participation like this policy proposal suggests is going to be key here because, I feel like it's very hard to sit here and evaluate these things reasonably at all, at this point in time. I think if we could get involved earlier in the process and hear about all of these rationales, it would help a lot.

Hager: I would anticipate, and somewhat on Senator Edginton's comments were, that we could develop some kind of calendar so that every year people know the request is going out to the departments on this week of the year, and then every year we could just call it up, and you should know that if you haven't heard something from your department head, you need to ask or call the budget and (ask) what's going on. That should be published and should be very transparent that at any point in time people should know where we are in the budget process. And I think we need to get that spelled out and a system in place, so everybody can see it and

understand the system and where we are in the system, and where their opportunities for input are.

Edginton: Adding to the comments, it seems to me that there should be some accountability built in to each of these requests so that for example, based on what Senator Peters offered, if we're going to invest \$660,000 we should be able to say, "that's going to result in 10% increase in number of students coming to the university." That benchmark should be established and then Scott should be held accountable for producing that outcome similar to the way that we are increasingly responsible for student outcomes. It should go through the entire process of budgeting.

Furthermore, its interesting when I think about the benchmarking, and how at Iowa and Iowa State they're benchmarking grants. For example, at Iowa, it indicated that faculty earn 20% of their salary and at Iowa State, the unit collectively, as I understand it, should generate a certain percentage of the entire faculty's salaries. We're in a little different configuration here, but there's no reason why in terms of community engagement and other elements that are important here at the University of Northern Iowa, we should be able to create similar metrics that will allow for that evaluation to take place; that accountability to take place.

Peters: Piggybacking right on that again, and I don't mean to pick on University Relations here, it's just the easiest one, because it's so big, but how many additional students does it take to get \$660,000?

Hager: I can come close. Every 100 students is about \$550,000.

Peters: So there's our metric, right? I mean if we don't see...you know what I mean. That could be one option. Or if we need more academic advisors, or we need more people in academic learning centers in order to help increase our student retention, then we should be tracking students who go through, and who are advised by the academic advisors or academic learning centers, how is their retention rate? We may already do

some of that, right? Right? So if we hire more people there, we would assume that's going to help the retention rate. And if we find out five years later that no, its not helping our retention rate, then we should be reevaluating it.

Gorton: I just want to make the same pitch I did at the cabinet meeting when I saw these numbers. And that has to go to the health & dental, where you're looking at \$1.1 million there of possible increases, right? And not listed on this is the possibility of an increase in the second half of the fiscal year, right? In health insurance costs. That's something that's out there as a possibility, isn't it? So I guess I would agree that a lot of us probably agree that when we start to prioritize, one of the things that we should put to the top of the list of priorities is to try offset any additional cost to faculty health insurance.

Hager: The assumed budgets already put in \$1.1 million, so if I'm hearing you correctly, Joe, you would say of the \$1.3 (million) left over, that more of that should go up to health care?

Gorton: I don't know, but we need to talk. I don't know what the projection is going out on the second half of FY15.

Smith: Other questions or comments?

VC Kidd: Is this only for Non Academic Affairs Divisions? I can't tell just from looking at the slide. One thing that, I'm not sure whether its true or not, but I've heard that supplies and service budgets for departments have been pretty stagnant for...

Hager: I've heard ten years, but I don't know whether its true or not.

VC Kidd: It seems like it should be more than just the \$150,000 that was talked about by the Provost, because in ten years, there has been some inflation.

Terlip: In a similar fashion, repairs to equipment, we don't have a repair and replacement fund in place like we used to.

VC Kidd: I really second that. Maintenance on equipment is extremely hard to get funded.

Gibson: We realized that the \$150,000 was woefully inadequate for S & S.

Smith: Other questions, comments?

Terlip: It seems that in addition to the kinds of things that Chris has talked about, it might also be interesting, or have you linked these to specific aspects of the strategic plan?

Hager: Yes. Each request—they're on the form that people had to submit and one of the line items there was "How does this relate to the strategic plan?" They had to cite the specific area. For space, we just didn't include it on this particular slide.

Terlip: I think it would be helpful for us to see that too, so we know what direction some of these (requests) are intended to go.

Smith: I did have a question for both Provost Gibson and VP Hager. I sent each of you a copy of the proposed policy #2.13 Faculty Participation in University Planning & Budgeting. It's the next item on the Senate's agenda. I don't know if you had a chance to look at that, but if you did, did you see anything in policy proposal as it's currently proposed? It hasn't been acted on by the Senate yet. Anything that would be problematic or in your opinion would need to be changed?

Hager: Jerry, I need to apologize. I did not have a chance to look through that. I had some other things come up that I was working on.

Gibson: I did too. I apologize.

Hager: I had looked at the previous version, and I don't know if it's similar to that previous version or not.

Peters: This one really deals with the academic faculty participation and it works through the departments and colleges.

Hager: I can't imagine, my only hope is that as we move forward, is that we include multiple opportunities for input for people across the campus. That's really what I think makes an effective budget, so that people understand going in that they may not like it, but they might understand it better, and then on the end the accountability, they can see the inputs and outputs. As long as those pieces are in there, I really think there should be some flexibility with how we do this.

Smith: If they are no other questions or comments, then I want to thank both....

Hager: There's one just more slide. I want to take time to go through.

Smith: Let's do that.

Hager: These are one-time funding requests. If there's one-time money available, and we took these at the time. We will probably go back if there is one-time money next year, we'll probably go back through this. So you can see this is all that brought forward at this point in time. A couple I want to highlight on here: The Master Plan consultant, the University's Master Plan dates from 1960's and we've really kind of run its course. Its probably

time to redo that for the institution. And the new person that's replacing Morris Mikkelsen has an excellent planning background. The other one that is interesting is East Bartlett. Do we have any East Bartlett occupants in here? Sponsored Programs is in there, STEM is in there, ITS is in there. One of the challenges we have in this institution is that we have a mechanism in place to deal with small building repairs, those things that are probably under \$100,000 or less. The large renovations, like Schindler Education Center, we're getting from appropriations from the Legislature. It's those medium-sized projects, that run between \$400,000 up to \$5 million, that we don't have a mechanism for. I'm told that back under President Curris, he used to scoop from funds, come this time of year, for the last quarter of the year, and pool those to do some larger projects at the institution. For whatever reason, we've gotten away from that. It could be there's no money to scoop. But we don't have a mechanism to deal with these medium-sized projects. In East Bartlett, if you're not familiar with issue, is the pipes are breaking. We've had at least two breaks last year, and so all the water comes in and it disenfranchises the people in the work area. On at least one floor. It's up at least one floor, so it's the people down below them. So we need some way to tackle that particular project because we're so far behind on some deferred maintenance issue with funding, that we get these into crisis mode, which is where we're at with East Bartlett. That one is on there as kind of an outlier, but it's also a legitimate issue. There's ongoing issues throughout the campus that will grow to this size if we're not able to deal with them. Hence, the request for more building repair money, and to try to be a little more proactive on the front side so that we don't get to this particular stage.

Peters: One comment and one question. To the extent that it's possible to improve the acoustics in the Great Reading room without messing up the beauty of the room, I would second and third that effort. Question: Based on this, I am inferring, so please tell me if I'm wrong, that in order to pay for the efficiency study by Deloitte, the Board of Regents is just foreseeing the three universities to pony up for it?

Hager: That is the mechanism for the Board to pay for things. The good news there though (thanks for asking that question) is that between the president and Kelly Flege, we can expect that number to be probably half of that. They aren't divvying up the expenses 40/40/20. We're only going to have to pay 10% of the expenses.

Chair Smith: Other questions and comments? Then, if I'm not mistaken, we are finished. I want to thank both of you, Vice President Hager, Provost Gibson, for meeting with us today. And we look forward to working you in the future on budgetary management matters. Thank you very much.

I'd assumed that our consultative session would exhaust all the time available. We're close. We could move on to the next item on our docket, which is quite related to this, 1232/1128 Proposed Policy #2.13 Faculty Participation in University Planning and Budgeting. Do you want to take this up now? (laughter) Okay.

ADJOURNMENT

Smith: Then I guess what you'd like to do now is adjourn. Boy, I like that.

Terlip: We could have done the Emeritus requests.

Smith: I'll leave that out. So, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Senator Walter

Second: Senator Strauss

Smith: Passed by acclamation. The good news is that we're going to have three weeks off til our next meeting. (sounds of elation) And that meeting will be held on April 14 in this room. So I hope to see you all then. Thank you very much. Meeting adjourned 4:48.

Submitted by:

Kathy Sundstedt
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting: Monday, April 14, 2014
Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 pm

Presentation by Provost Gibson


University of Northern Iowa


Consultative Session with Faculty Senate

Gloria Gibson
Executive Vice President and Provost
3/24/14


University of Northern Iowa

Savings from 2012

MPLS Budget in FY 12:	\$3,107,367	
Transferred to COE:	-\$2,140,200	
Transferred to CET:	-\$300,000	
MPLS Transferred to Provost:		\$667,167
ESIP Savings to Provost:		\$768,948
Initial Phased Retirement Savings:	\$270,210	
Rescinded Agreements:	-\$167,124	
Final Phased Retirement Savings to Provost:		\$103,086
Total Savings From MPLS and Program Closures:		\$1,539,201


University of Northern Iowa

Sample of One-Time Projects

Interior Design position (1 yr):	\$59,895
Renovations and Materials for Library:	\$380,558
Remodel of Int'l Programs Space:	\$120,000
Diversity (NCBI) 2yrs:	\$135,000
Cornerstone (FY11-14):	\$330,000
Sustainability (FY11-14):	\$175,000
Supplemental Instruction & Tutoring:	\$75,000
Pre-Tenure Summer Fellowships:	\$106,000
Capacity Building Awards:	\$180,709
IRB Support:	\$30,000
Level II and IV Field Experiences:	\$150,000
ITS Network Upgrade	\$170,000



Permanent Hires for FY 15 in High Demand/Need Areas

Assistant Prof, Educational Leadership:	\$93,170
Assistant Prof, Comm. Sciences & Disorders:	\$86,515
Secretary II, Comm. Sciences & Disorders:	\$68,126
Clinical Supervisor, Comm. Sciences & Disorders:	\$95,832
Assistant Prof, Family Services:	\$73,205
Assistant Prof, Interior Design (1/2 funding):	\$36,602
Digital Scholarship Services Librarian:	\$85,108
Museum Personnel:	\$148,475
Other Permanent Expenditures:	\$911,621

TOTAL: \$1,598,654



Academic Affairs FY15 Budget Requests

Provost:	\$1,395,935
CBA:	\$822,426
COE:	\$1,596,742
CHAS:	\$7,067,417
CSBS:	\$810,349
Library:	\$2,251,253
Intl Programs:	\$51,661
RSP:	\$425,230
ITS:	\$180,000

TOTAL: \$14,601,013



FY15 Academic Affairs Budget

Priorities

New Faculty Lines & Opportunity Hires:	\$559,020
Institutionalize Cornerstone Budget:	\$66,000
Student Success Initiatives – ALC:	\$100,000
Student Success Initiatives – Academic Advising:	\$100,000
S&S Budgets:	\$150,000
Library Materials Budget:	\$220,915
Building Repair Projects:	\$200,000

TOTAL: \$1,395,935

Redacted Presentation on FY15 Budget Requests

Budget Process

Undergoing a change - need a more strategic process, more campus input

FY2015 overview

- Requests were due January 31, 2014
- EMT reviewed the requests in mid-February, solicited feedback
- Meetings for input
 - Cabinet – March 2
 - P&S Council, Merit leadership – March 13
 - Faculty Senate – March 24
 - Open Forums – March 25 & 26 at 11:00, University Room
- EMT to review again in April
- President makes final decisions

FY2015 Budget – Working draft
Based on Governor's recommendation

Assumptions: Enrollment increase to 12,200
 4% increase in GEF funding
 \$4M increase in base funding
 UG tuition – 0% increase in resident, 2.5% in non-resident
 G tuition – 2.0% increase in resident, 2.5% in non-resident

University of Northern Iowa
 FY 2015 Budget Planning - per Governor's Recommendation
 General Education Fund 6 Feb 14

	FY 2014 Original Budget	FY 2014 Revised Budget	FY 2015 Changes	FY 2015 Budget Proposed
REVENUES:				
State Appropriations	\$ 83,222,819	83,222,819	7,728,913	90,951,732
- Appropriations one-time	6,000,000	6,000,000	(2,000,000)	4,000,000
- Appropriation for BAS	-	-	-	-
Interest Income	821,000	821,000	-	821,000
Tuition - UR	59,436,626	57,550,029	-	57,550,029
Tuition - UNR	9,956,334	12,333,414	308,335	12,641,749
Tuition - GR	5,278,047	5,414,771	108,295	5,523,066
Tuition - GNR	929,232	763,422	19,086	782,508
Enrollment Change	-	-	392,232	392,232
Reimbursed Indirect Costs	1,316,649	1,316,649	-	1,316,649
Sales & Services	608,393	483,393	-	483,393
Total Revenue	167,569,000	167,905,497	6,556,861	174,462,359

EXPENDITURES:				
DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTS				
Personnel Expense:				
Institutional Officials Salaries	2,357,844	2,357,844	53,051	2,410,895
Academic Admin Salaries	5,949,143	5,949,143	133,856	6,082,999
Faculty Salaries	47,135,389	47,135,389	972,715	48,108,104
Grad Assistants	2,169,269	2,169,269	48,809	2,218,078
P&S Salaries	23,424,813	23,424,813	527,058	23,951,871
General Svc Salaried	16,941,707	16,941,707	267,296	17,209,003
General Svc Hourly	357,753	357,753	6,924	364,677
Student Wages	1,738,770	1,738,770	-	1,738,770
Fringes - Salary Driven	19,288,219	19,288,219	406,966	19,695,185
Health/Dental	13,995,118	13,995,118	1,119,609	15,114,727
Other Fringe Changes	478,964	478,964	(239,482)	239,482
Dept Personnel Expense	133,836,989	133,836,989	3,296,802	137,133,791
Non-Personnel Expense:				
Supplies, Svcs, Eq	10,532,453	10,597,453	-	10,597,453
Library Materials	1,992,009	1,992,009	-	1,992,009
Total Departmental Accounts	146,361,451	146,426,451	3,296,802	149,723,253

EXPENDITURES:				
DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTS				
Personnel Expense:				
Institutional Officials Salaries	2,357,844	2,357,844	53,051	2,410,895
Academic Admin Salaries	5,949,143	5,949,143	133,856	6,082,999
Faculty Salaries	47,135,389	47,135,389	972,715	48,108,104
Grad Assistants	2,169,269	2,169,269	48,809	2,218,078
P&S Salaries	23,424,813	23,424,813	527,058	23,951,871
General Svc Salaried	16,941,707	16,941,707	267,296	17,209,003
General Svc Hourly	357,753	357,753	6,924	364,677
Student Wages	1,738,770	1,738,770	-	1,738,770
Fringes - Salary Driven	19,288,219	19,288,219	406,966	19,695,185
Health/Dental	13,995,118	13,995,118	1,119,609	15,114,727
Other Fringe Changes	478,964	478,964	(239,482)	239,482
Dept Personnel Expense	133,836,989	133,836,989	3,296,802	137,133,791
Non-Personnel Expense:				
Supplies, Svcs, Eq	10,532,453	10,597,453	-	10,597,453
Library Materials	1,992,009	1,992,009	-	1,992,009
Total Departmental Accounts	146,361,451	146,426,451	3,296,802	149,723,253