

10-14-2013

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 14, 2013

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2013 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, October 14, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 33.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/33

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
10/14/13 (3:31 p.m. – 5:10 p.m.)
Mtg. #1741

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

Press present included MacKenzie **Elmer** from the *Waterloo Courier*.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** also had no comments today.

Chair **Smith**, during his comment period, first passed around a one-page article written by former Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Aaron **Podolefsky** who died recently. Former Senator Betty **DeBerg** made the article, titled *From General Education to Liberal Arts Core—What's in a Name?*, available for Senators as a way to honor Provost **Podolefsky**. [This was an editorial published in *Northern Iowa Today*, July 1, 2002, Vol. 28, #2, pg. 32 and available in Special Collections at Rod Library on UNI's campus.] [http://www.library.uni.edu/gateway/indexuni/full_record.php?id=148469]

Chair **Smith** also noted that he has reserved a table for the Faculty Senate at UNI Day at the Capital, February 24, 2014, and encouraged faculty to consider joining him to interact with State Legislators. Blake **Findley** [NISG Vice President] also noted that NISG will be coordinating some lobbying efforts and would welcome faculty participation.

As for committee assignments, the following were confirmed: Senator David **Hakes** for the Regents' Awards Committee; Senator Kim **MacLin** for the committee to review the performance of the Liberal Arts Core Director,

Deirdre Heistad; Senator Karen **Breitbach** for the Student Conduct Committee; Senator Jennifer **Cooley** for the Provost's committee to examine peer and aspirant institutions; and Senator Melissa **Heston** for the task force to consider Space Utilization and Class Scheduling.

And finally, it was decided that Chair **Smith** will call a special meeting on November 4th, and will reserve the date of December 2nd for another possible special meeting, both to take care of regular Faculty Senate business delayed due to consultative sessions this semester during regular meetings.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for September 23, 2013

****Motion to approve as distributed (Edginton/Kirmani). Passed.**

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1207 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert E. Lee

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

1208 Consultative Session with State Legislators

****Motion to docket at the head of the order for October 28, 2013 (O'Kane/Heston). Passed.**

4. New Business

None

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1203 1099 Request for Emeritus Status, Stephen **Fortgang** (regular order) **(O'Kane/Abebe)**

****Motion to approve emeritus application (Peters/Nelson). Passed.**

1201 1097 Consultative Session with President **Ruud** (head of the order 10/14/13) **(Nelson/O'Kane)**

**Discussion completed.

Motion to extend for 15 minutes (Hakes/Nelson**). Passed.

1153 1051 International Travel Safety Policy—Faculty and Staff
(regular order 10/14/13)

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/international_travel_safety_policy_faculty_and_staff_.pdf

Motion to endorse the proposal as amended by the EPC, to forward it with the EPC's recommendations for consideration by the Policy Review Committee, the Cabinet, and the President; and to note that the Faculty Senate strongly prefers this proposal to others that might infringe on the academic freedom of faculty (Edginton/Nelson**). Passed.

1198 1094 Performance Review of Senate Budget Committee in quasi-committee of the whole on 9/23/13, delayed (**Peters/Terlip**)

**Future business.

1202 1098 Request for Emeritus Status, Cherin A. **Lee** (regular order)
(**O'Kane/Abebe**)

**Future business.

1204 1100 Request for Emeritus Status, Donna **Raschke** (regular order)
(**O'Kane/Abebe**)

**Future business.

205 1101 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert H. **Decker** (regular order)
(**O'Kane/Abebe**)

**Future business

5. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn (Edginton/Hakes**). Passed.

Time: 5:10 p.m.

Next meeting:

Monday, 10/28/13, 3:30 p.m.

Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union

Full Transcript follows of 49 pages, including 0 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 14, 2013
Mtg. 1741**

PRESENT: Tilahun **Abebe** (alternate for Michael **Walter**), Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Francis **Degnin** (alternate for Jesse **Swan**), Forrest **Dolgener**, Chris **Edginton**, Todd **Evans**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Annette **Lynch** (alternate for Mitchell **Strauss**), Kim **MacLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Laura **Terlip**
(27 present)

Absent: Marilyn **Shaw** (1 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:31 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: Ok. I’m going to go ahead and call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And, as usual, I’ll begin with press identification. And I believe we have MacKenzie [**Elmer**] here from the *Waterloo Courier*. I think that’s our only press-type person.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Comments from Provost **Gibson**?

Gibson: I don’t have anything today. Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: From Faculty Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: I have nothing today either.

Smith: My goodness.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: Looks like I have to fill in the void. [laughter all around] I do have some comments beginning with a piece that I'm going to distribute [one-page handout]. I'll send this around. Hopefully enough copies. I got this from Betty **DeBerg**, a former member of the Senate, who felt it was an appropriate way of acknowledging the passing of our former Provost Aaron **Podolefsky** [1998-2005]. It's an article that he wrote some time ago about our general education program, liberal education in general, and I think it is a nice testimony, in essence, to his memory. So, Betty asked me to distribute that to the Senators, and I'm pleased to do that.

Another point of information, I've reserved a table for the [Faculty] Senate at UNI Day at the Capital, which will be held on February 24th next year. University Relations is coordinating the event. I'll let you know more details as we go along, but it's something you might want to think about as participating in as a faculty rep. I've agreed to do that. I know that Scott [**Peters**] has expressed a willingness to do that. Anyone else that would want to, that would be a good thing to do, but we've got to kind of figure out what we want to do and how we want to use that.

Blake [**Findley**, NISG Vice President], did you want to talk about your suggestion? It's related to this. Did you have anything to say about that? Just introduce it?

Findley: Yeah, I will say that I wasn't expecting to be here. I was at the NCBI training, and it ended early, so I rushed over here. So, if it sounds disorganized, it's because it is.

But, talking to my Director of Governmental Relations and Jeneane **Beck**, the State Relations Officer, we have talked about how it may be beneficial for faculty and students to kind of, like, do some co-advocacy efforts, kind of show like the united front to the State Legislature.

So, in short, I'm not sure the best way to do that. I know our Director of Governmental Relations will go down once or twice a week once the session starts. I don't expect anyone else to do that, but she is getting paid to specifically do that.

So, if anyone would be interested in like helping, coming up with some ideas on like how to do this, other than just like going down there and, like, lobbying together, which I think would be a good idea as well, or is just like interested in going and having someone else plan it, just let me know. Send me an email. My email is in the directory, or you can talk to me after the meeting.

Smith: Ok, thank you, Blake. Then again back to our recurring issue of the topic of faculty representatives on various committees. Got some good news. [Senator] David **Hakes** has agreed to serve as the faculty representative on the Regents' Awards Committee, and unless there are objections or other nominees, I would suggest that we agree to that and support him. Everybody on board with that? [heads nodding] Thank you.

We also needed a representative on the committee that will review the performance of the LAC Director. When I talked about this at our last meeting, it was suggested that this representative be someone who teaches in the LAC, and so I'm happy to report that someone fitting that description has volunteered, being [Senator] Kim **MacLin**. And, again, are there any objections to Kim's being our representative on this committee? [none heard] Then, take it, Kim; that is your responsibility.

We've got a couple of other appointments still outstanding—volunteers to serve, I need a volunteer to serve on the Student Conduct Committee, and secondly on the committee that will help the Provost examine our peer and aspirant institutions. Are there anybody volunteering for that—either of those positions right now? This is kind of the last call to the Senate exclusively. What I'll do is send out an email to the general faculty. Ah, Karen [Senator **Breitbach**]?

Breitbach: I'll volunteer to be on the Student Conduct Committee.

Smith: Ah, bless you. Ooh, Jennifer [Senator **Cooley**]?

Cooley: Not ready to volunteer, but I do have another question.

Smith: Oh. [light laughter around]

Cooley: What does that second responsibility entail? Is this preparing a written document? Is it just rolling the dice? What would it entail?

Gibson: There will be a small committee, and someone from IR, Institutional Research, will be on the committee to look at all the data and bring the data to meetings. So, you wouldn't have to do that, but to look at best practices for identifying peer and aspirant institutions and then to make recommendations. So, all you would do would be make recommendations as to what we might consider, because it's actually a Board [of Regents] decision. But to make recommendations that would then be vetted across campus a little more widely, and then I would eventually take those to the Board. So, peer institutions and aspirant institutions, and you know, right now they're not quite, some of them aren't quite right, so we do need to take a look, and the Board has asked us to take a look. So, the report, if you will, I mean, really is a list and maybe a rationale that you would submit to me, and the Board wants to take this up early next year, so I don't see this as a, you know, long-standing commitment.

Smith: Faculty Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Correct me. So, it's to reexamine maybe a different list of peer institutions?

Gibson: To actually recommend, yeah.

Funderburk: Right. And the reason I'm asking is because I'm fairly puzzled since we asked—I asked the President of the Board how he'd recommend getting a conversation started about our designated peer institutions. He said they [Board of Regents] don't do that, that we do it here on campus, and suggested that I take that up with our President's office. I just wanted to point out that this seems an odd discrepancy.

Gibson: Well, what I was told is that I would bring the list to the Board, and the Board would approve it. Now, I—so, that's what I was told. You were told something different. I don't

Funderburk: Ok. I don't doubt it.

Gibson: But we've got to start—we've got to start with a list no matter if we did make the final decision or the Board.

O'Kane: I got the impression it was pretty much rubber stamped, that whatever we decide the Board just says, "That's it."

Smith: So, with that description, is there anybody kind of chomping at the bits to serve on this really appealing committee [light laughter and comments].

Gibson: I mean, it is important because the list goes out pretty widely, and we're asked all the time for our peer institutions and our aspirant institutions, so, I mean, I don't see it as overly time-consuming, but it is important.

Cooley: Ok, I'm willing to do it.

Smith: Ahh!

Cooley: Because I knew Jerry would like that. [laughter]

Gibson: Thank you.

Smith: Thank you, Jennifer.

Cooley: You're welcome.

Smith: But, if that wasn't enough, I've got another one here. [loud laughter all around] Another one looms on the horizon.

This one is kind of—I think there might be some interest in this. At this morning's Cabinet meeting, a major topic of discussion was Space Utilization and Class Scheduling. A task force will be formed to address these issues in the hope that we can better utilize classroom capacity by offering a class schedule that's less focused on the Tuesday/Thursday 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. time slot.

I suspect that at least one and possibly more faculty representatives will be on that task force, and we were asked to put forward names to Phil **Patton** of appropriate parties, people who'd be interested and appropriate for serving. And so I wanted to put that out to you. Again, the first call is to the [Faculty] Senate. If we get Senate volunteers, great. If not, I'll end up going to the general faculty. And also, if you don't want to do it yourself but you know somebody, a colleague, that you think would be interested in this and would be good in serving on this, pass the names on to me or directly to Phil **Patton**. If you send them to Phil, copy me, so I can keep track of what we've got. Yeah, Steve.

O'Kane: Are we talking only faculty? Or are staff

Smith: Oh, I'm sure this will be—this will be Registrar's Office. It'll be Facilities Planning people. It'll be staff people as well in this group.

O'Kane: It sure seems to me the people who know this are the folks who have to sit down and make that schedule semester after semester.

Smith: Yeah. Yeah. So, I mean, it's going to be a fairly broad-based committee in my sense. And it's going to be doing—but it's going to be doing work that does affect faculty in significant ways. Kim?

MacLin: And the faculty perspective is important because, obviously, the faculty know how and when they teach, and they have understanding of other people in their Department and how and when they want to teach, because it—obviously it sounds like we want to make sure we're being as flexible as possible to students, but also, for example, I teach hybrid classes. But my only option is to reserve a room Tuesday/Thursday. Well, I only use my room on Tuesday typically, and so the Thursday goes vacant, and that's—and it looks on the books like it is full and being used. That's the—we're under-using our resource there. If I have a way to do a one-day a week scheduling, that's still the normal 3-credit class, and no one freaks out about the one-day a week scheduling. And so that that room could be used by other people, it helps us be more [others commenting]...and so faculty—I mean, the staff will have to do it. They know all the ins and outs, but the faculty perspective will be really important on this committee.

O'Kane: I also teach a course like that where the room is vacant, too, the whole 3 days—or 2 days a week.

Smith: At the meeting this morning, they were—it was—a lot was put on the table in terms of possibilities. The talking about taking some of the—offering one—you know, the 1 hr 15 minute classes on a MW or WF schedule for some of the normal MWF time slots. It may be early in the morning with that, because there—if there's a need or preference for more of 2 rather than 3 sessions a week, that would be one way of accommodating that. And they've also talked about trying to increase our scheduling for evening hours. In fact, in some schools, apparently, they're scheduling very late evening hours, because that's when students are awake and I'm asleep. [agreement and laughter around] But that—there is this kind of sense that this is really opening up, or they would like to open up in a great deal. So I'm sure it's going to be an important responsibility to ask you to think about it, and if you are interested, let me know, and I'll pass your name on to Phil as we, you know, once we decide to go. Melissa?

Heston: I will. I'm interested in that.

Smith: Good. Your name is first on my list.

O'Kane: Now you'll chair. [laughter all around]

Smith: Ok, very good. One more topic that I broached in the meeting preview email I sent out last week, an unhappy topic, our need to schedule extra meetings in which to do our work. I think this need derives from several sources. First off, it's a curriculum year. We're soon going to have to act on numerous curriculum proposals. I think we can do that fairly efficiently. I mean, I think there's a balance to be maintained between just rubber-stamping everything without looking at it, and on the other hand going way in too much depth on things that really don't matter. And I'm going to send out an e-mail within a week or so that kind of suggests how we might approach the curriculum matters when they come up.

There's also the fact that we agreed to schedule consultative sessions for most of our meetings this semester, including today. And, as a result, we don't have a lot of time to really do our business. The fact that because of—well, the fact that we currently have only one regular meeting scheduled in both November and December—and that's, I don't think, normal for us. We normally would have 2 in November, but as Thanksgiving worked out, it's the fourth Monday.

And finally the fact that, because of the change in University Administration, we have a lot of carryover business that couldn't be completed last year and can be now with the new Administration. So, we've got a lot of business. I don't believe we're using our time inefficiently or inappropriately. I think that, because of the reasons I just laid out, we simply don't have enough time to do the work we need to get done. So I'd like to schedule one, and possibly two, extra sessions. And I'd recommend having those on Monday, November 4th, the first Monday in November, and, if necessary, Monday, December 2nd, the first Monday in December. By doing that, it gives us—we're going to have periods where we've got 3 meetings in a row, but it would avoid—if we did it next week,

we'd have a period of 4 meetings in a row because we met last week, so, you know, those seem to be the best days for me. So if you are supportive of this, I'll try to schedule rooms and make the necessary arrangements. I've already found out this room won't be available on either of those days. Hopefully, we can get the University Room downstairs in the Union. If necessary, we might be looking at business building CBB 319 again, which we've used, but it's kind of small. Are you supportive of this? Do you agree with the need to schedule extra sessions? I know it's not something we enjoy doing, but hopefully we can do it. Ok?

MacLin: I think in this instance we probably do need the extra meetings, but I appreciated Senator **Swan's** commentary that we want to be mindful that we are not taking on too much that committees could be doing on our behalf.

Smith: Ok. Any other discussion of this? Thank you. I will go ahead and try and make those arrangements. Oh? Sorry.

Cooley: I suspect, in fact I know that some of us would have conflicts because there are meetings that run on those other Mondays, so I don't really know what the turn out will be like or how many substitutes [alternates] we may have.

Smith: Yeah, hopefully we'll have—obviously, we won't be able to do anything if we don't have a quorum. I think we should be able to, and, of course, since this is the most important thing you do [light laughter around], you'd resolve those conflicts in our favor. Ok. Now, next time—oh? One more, I'm sorry, Steve.

O'Kane: I'm just thinking out loud, but I'm wondering if we ought to try and shoot for just the December date because, and my guess is, Departments have a lot going on right now. Hiring people, that's happening right now. And, for instance, I'm on a PAC committee doing that.

Smith: If I—if we did that, though, and we ended up running lots of time, then we don't have a back-up, because we're—at least this semester we're kind of stuck because it's pretty much it.

O'Kane: I guess I'm kind of seconding Senator **Swan's** position that we've already had 3 extra meetings this year, and it is getting to be a lot.

Smith: Well, I guess, yeah. I can agree with that, although the meetings that we've had have been consultative sessions.

O'Kane: Oh, they've been wonderful. Absolutely.

Smith: Yeah. We haven't had meetings—extra meetings to do our base work, and I guess—the question I had or I guess the quarrel I had with Senator **Swan's** memo was that I didn't see anything identified where we were spending time inappropriately. It was like, “Oh, well, what are we doing that we should have been done by a committee?” I didn't see anything there. Potentially, that could happen with the curricula, but hopefully we can manage what we do with the curriculum to obviate those kinds of potential concerns. Yeah, but when I look at what we've been doing, I don't see anything that we could have handed off or that should have been handed off to any committee.

O'Kane: Agreed, but just thinking out loud.

Smith: Yeah. Well, ok, if we were to go to the 12/2 as our first extra meeting and we still had lots of stuff that we really felt we should get done this semester—of course, there is another semester [light laughter around], but we still have a lot of stuff, would you feel—how would feel about having—it's going to put us into Finals Week, if we had to have a meeting after that. How does that sit with you?

Nelson: I think I would rather have the meeting on November 4th versus an extra meeting versus Finals Week. [heads nodding]

Smith: Versus an extra meeting, yeah.

Nelson: I mean, it's still possible that we might still need that extra meeting, if something came up, but I'd rather have that be the option that we might not need.

Smith: Yeah. Any other suggestions or discussion here? I'm going to schedule some—yes, Francis?

Degnin: Can I suggest that you could perhaps have a vote on the two alternatives? Just kind of a--or is that—inappropriate?

Smith: No, we can have a straw vote. How many people prefer having a meeting—it basically comes down to—this is how it comes down to—we could have a meeting on 11/4 with back-up as 12/2, or we can have a meeting on 12/2 with back-up as Finals Week, which would be 12/16, I believe. How many prefer the 11/4 with back-up on 12/2? [hands raised] And how many prefer 12/2 with back-up on 12/16? [fewer hands raised]

Lynch: When you say “back-up,” then that implies that the meeting on December 2nd might not have to happen.

Smith: That's right.

Lynch: So, you are saying that if the meeting is successful on November 4th, you might cancel the meeting on December 2nd?

Smith: That's right. I'm saying, if we get enough business done and we're to a—we're comfortable with where we're at, then—and we do our meeting on--in the first week of November, then we may not have to meet in December.

Lynch: Well, I think that should go in the Minutes probably—you know, that the second one is possibly an extra.

Smith: Todd?

Evans: At the risk of people throwing things at me, what if we met on the 4th and extended it for a half an hour instead of re-congregating in December. Just stick around till we get it done or done enough to

Smith: Well, we might be able to do that.

Evans: because there's pick up from childcare and all those kind of things that are—and night classes and things pending.

Smith: And, of course, we've got very little slack in our schedule that would allow for the unexpected things that could come up that could throw monkey wrenches in like crazy, as Scott [Senator **Peters**] found out last year. Scott.

Peters: I would just suggest that you—if you call a meeting for the 4th and ask us to reserve the date of the 2nd, and you can make a decision, you know, later in November about whether we need to meet on the 2nd.

Smith: Yeah, that's what I'd planned to do, but—ok. So, that's what I'll do. I'll call a meeting for November 4th and reserve for December 2nd, if I get my dates right. And we'll see if we need that or not.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: Ok. Now, minutes for approval? We've got the Minutes from our last regular meeting on September 23rd. The Minutes from our special meeting on October 7th have been distributed, but they're not ready yet for the formal approval process, so they will be addressed at our next meeting. Is there—are there any additional corrections or discussion to the Minutes from September 23rd? [none heard] Then, if not, I would like a motion to approve those Minutes? Senator **Edginton** [who indicated], and seconded by Senator **Kirman** [who indicated]. Discussion? [none heard] And vote. All in favor of approving those Minutes, say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Minutes are approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1207 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert E. Lee

Smith: Now, consideration of calendar items for docketing the first of which is an emeritus request for Robert E. **Lee**. That's our Calendar Item 1207 which, if docketed, will be Docket #1103. Is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] Then I'm asking that it be docketed in regular order, and I need a motion to that effect.

Peters: So move.

Smith: Senator **Peters**. Seconded by Senator **Degnin** [who indicated]. Any discussion? [none heard] Vote. All in favor of docketing Calendar Item 1207 in regular order, say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] That is approved.

Calendar Item 1208 Consultative Session with State Legislators

Smith: The other item to be docketed is Calendar Item 1208, which, if docketed, will be Docket #1104. This is a consultative session with State Legislators, and I'll talk about it in a minute. But first, is there any discussion of the wisdom of docketing this item? [none heard] Then let me say a little bit about—well, let's first get the motion on the floor. Motion to docket this item, and what I would do—want this is to be at the head of the order for our next meeting on October 28th.

Heston: So moved.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Heston**. A second for that?

O'Kane: Second.

Smith: By Senator **O'Kane**. And let me tell you a little bit about this. It turns out that NISG is sponsoring a meeting with area State Legislators on the same day, October 28th, and they've been coordinating with us. They

are going to try and get the people that come to their events to come to ours. Even before we started that coordination, I had sent around to the local State Reps. and Senators. Had positive RSVPs from Senators Jeff **Danielson** and Bill **Dotzler**, with Representative Bob **Kressig** saying he'll try to get here in time. He's got a meeting in Des Moines that day. So, he'll try and be here, but in talking to the NISG person named Tori...?

Findley: Victoria [Tori] **Hurst**

Smith: She says that they've got some other—apparently some other State Reps from even, you know, the area more broadly, will be coming, so we might have more than 3 people. We might have a decent set of people here to talk to. So hopefully we'll have a nice turnout and productive session. Any further discussion of this motion?

Peters: I only have one question. The Budget item, the Budget Committee item [1198/1094] is still kind of lingering out there, so I'm just kind of curious before we docket this, how do you see that fitting into....?

Smith: It's—that's something that I think we'll have to get to on November 2nd [*sic*, November 4th]. That's when I'm hoping to get to it, because it—I think that item's going to take a bunch of time, and we just don't have—with our consultative sessions, I don't think we have enough time in regular meeting to do it. So, it's been moved and seconded to docket Item 1208 Consultation Session with State Legislators at the head of the order for our next meeting on October 28th. No further discussion? [none heard] . All in favor, say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] It passes.

NEW BUSINESS

[not mentioned today]

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Smith: All right. Now, we get to the major item on our agenda for today, docketed at the head of the order Item 1201/1097, a consultative session with UNI President Bill **Ruud**. He was asked to be here at 4:00 o'clock, and I guess he's got a pretty busy schedule. Understanding him, he might be a little bit late.

DOCKET 1099 REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, STEPHEN **FORTGANG** (REGULAR ORDER) (**O'KANE/ABEBE**)

Smith: So, if we've got time, I would like to have the opportunity to pick up on one of the emeritus requests. If we've got time and take those or any of the emeritus requests that we can. As is our practice, I sent—and assuming you are comfortable with this, this is going out of our order now. If there are no objections to that, I'd like to do that, and do whatever emeritus requests we can. As it turns out, I send these out. When I get the request, I send out to Department Heads asking them to produce or, if they'd like to, to draft a statement of support or testimonial, if you will, for their faculty. And I actually have one out of the 4 that we've got on our docket, and that's the one—giving the other Department Heads still a chance to act on this—I've got one I do have such a statement, and so I'd like to, if possible, act on that one. It is Calendar Item 1203 Docket #1099 Request for Emeritus Status for Stephen **Fortgang**. And so I'm proposing to put that at—right now as our business, and I would like a motion to endorse or approve his request for emeritus status.

Peters: So moved.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Peters**. And seconded by Senator **Nelson** [who indicated]. Any discussion of this?

Heston: I just wanted to make a comment about Steve's contributions. Steve's in the Educational Psychology, or was in the Educational Psychology and Foundations Department, and for many years taught a course called Schools in American Society and another course called Core Knowledge. And from my perspective his real claim to fame was the work he did with a

group called Kappa Delta Pi, raising scholarship money. He worked for many, many years, raising large amounts of scholarship money through student efforts, working with these students. So that contribution will be particularly missed. And he gave loads and loads of hours to students. I mean, he was truly invested in their education.

Smith: Yes, Melissa [Senator **Heston**]'s comments are echoed by the statement that I got from the Department Head of Educational Psychology, Rob **Boody**, and I'll read those into the Minutes here. [quoting] "Dr. Stephen J. **Fortgang** arrived at UNI in 1975 after earning his B.A. from the University of Chicago, teaching in public schools, earning an M.A. and Ph.D. from Syracuse University, and teaching in higher education. Steve made an immediate impact in the new Educational Psychology and Foundations Department in the new College of Education. Steve notably contributed to the redesign of, and taught in, the UNI teacher education program.

"As a teacher or colleague, Steve was not always comfortable. Although quiet, he was tenacious. Any time I talked with him I felt my head had been pulled out, twisted around, and then stuffed back in more spic and span. I've seen him teach, and I think the students felt the same way.

"In some ways, however, Steve has left his largest legacy in his work with Kappa Delta Pi (KDP), an honor society for pre-service educators. Before Steve came, being faculty advisor for this group was something no one wanted, so it ended up with the newest junior faculty member. Steve took it on, instead, as an important service activity—and has done so consistently for 36 years. The ideals of KDP are fidelity to humanity, science, service, and toil. Steve has certainly lived up to those ideals. KDP offers many different programs. I've probably heard most about the annual Chicago Trip, an annual event that sees Dr. **Fortgang** toting a large van-load of KDPers to see what urban Chicago schools are really like instead of what the media and myths portray them. Steve has invested himself for 36 years, and the students have reciprocated. At his retirement party last year I saw the scrapbooks, the photos, the notes, the newspaper articles, documenting each year's activities for 36 years. Steve is still in touch with literally hundreds of former Kapdelpians; their graduation did not end the relationship.

“We wish Steve all the best in his retirement. As a department, we strongly support his application for emeritus status.”

Again, that’s from Rob **Boody**, the head of Steve’s Department. So, unless there is further discussion, I’d like to vote on this. [none heard] All in favor of supporting Steve **Fortgang**’s request for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “Nay or No.” [none heard] That motion carries.

Then still lacking a President [light laughter around], we’ll pick up another one, if you allow me to do this.

Edginton: Jerry, he just walked outside by the windows. He’ll be here very shortly.

Smith: Ok, should we just wait for him then? We’re going to waste a minute. I hate doing it. [loud laughter all around and comments from Senators] Well, we can tell stories about Homecoming Weekend, I guess.

DOCKET 1097 CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH PRESIDENT **RUUD** (HEAD OF THE ORDER 10/14/13) (**NELSON/O’KANE**)

Smith: There’s the man. So, gonna backtrack a little bit. The major item on our agenda for today, docketed at the head of the order, is item #1201/1097, a Consultative Session with UNI President Bill **Ruud**. He’s the man with the red tie down at the end there. So, taking up that item, I will give the floor to President **Ruud** for his opening statement, after which we’ll have questions and discussion.

Ruud: Thanks for having me. So far, so good. A month and a half into the semester, I congratulate all of you for all the hard work you’re doing in the classroom, all the hard work you’re doing outside the classroom. Congratulate the students [recognizing Blake **Findley** sitting next to him] for raising their hands and raising issues and working hard. And I continue to look forward to some enrollment advantages. I continue to look forward to

our positive work on the Budget. And with that, I—it's \$330 at Iowa State. We'll tell you that story later. And I'll just open it up for any kind of questions or concerns or suggestions.

Smith: Ok, then I will just, you know, gently manage the discussion, but it's pretty much yours. Senator **MaLin**.

MaLin: Hi, I just have a quick comment that I wanted to make. I wanted to acknowledge our great nationwide press that we've received on our crowning of Steven **Sanchez** for the Homecoming Queen. And this press coverage has been incredibly positive—*New York Times*, *USA Today*, *The Advocate*, all the local statewide affiliates. And I also wanted to draw attention to something that people may not have seen, which was Lihn **TA**, who is not here today, I don't think, but she did a documentary short that's on YouTube that chronicles that evening for Steven. [see: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/14/steven-sanchez-transgender-homecoming-queen_n_4098305.html]] And in particular I wanted to highlight, since you're here [to President **Ruud**], that he very gratefully acknowledges how proud he was—I'm sorry this is emotional for me—how proud he was that you congratulated him. He was thrilled to death, and he just, repeatedly in the news coverage, has talked about how welcome he feels here at UNI. And I just love to see this kind of coverage, obviously, of our institution nationwide. And it's been such a pleasure to get these links all week long from all of these outlets and not one negative thing has been—it's not been about a negative thing. So, I know that you didn't plan it. It wasn't something that you had in mind [President **Ruud** chuckling] to make UNI look good, but it certainly was a spontaneous reaction that was really, I think Blake [**Findley**] can attest to, really appreciated by the students and by Steven in particular.

Ruud: Oh, I think Steven said it best in his own words upon receiving the crown that he felt so good about "UNI as a place where you can be you." I think that's great.

Lynch: I was proud of Steven, but I was also proud of all the students who voted for him. I thought that was great.

Ruud: Absolutely. Steven won because he was Steven. Period.

Smith: Other questions, comments. Criticisms. [light laughter]

Ruud: Suggestions. [more laughter] Concerns? Issues you want us to take up that we haven't.

Smith: Again, when there's a void, I will step in.

Ruud: Sure.

Smith: I've got a couple of questions about the management structure you intend to use at UNI.

Ruud: Sure.

Smith: I think we're all aware that President **Ruud** has expanded the Cabinet now. So there was a Cabinet meeting this morning. It was like 40-some people. It's kind of the main venue for everybody across campus to kind of share stuff. And then above that kind of is the Executive Management Team that directly advises President **Ruud**. But I have a question regarding the Enrollment Council which is an existing body that had been set up, I don't know, several years ago to deal with enrollment issues. And then another one following that, Do you anticipate continuance of the Enrollment Council?

Ruud: Well, I'm going to defer to—I'm looking at Gloria [Provost **Gibson**]. I think we're continuing the Enrollment Working Group.

Gibson: Right.

Ruud: Yeah. Ok. Which is different from the Enrollment Council, ok? And I think the conversation was is that the two were mixing each other up and that there was much more work being done at the Enrollment Working Group than there was at the Enrollment Council. Having said that, as we look forward to hiring our Enrollment Management professional, I think we leave it open, as we talked this morning, to allow us to adjust to what are

we—for those of you that weren't there, we had a very nice presentation by the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management from Arizona State University, which was very enlightening. We have—several of us talked because we—many of us weren't aware that Arizona State had a challenge recruiting students. We thought everybody just showed up down there. Their high school—the 12th grade enrollment's flat, and so they're very much working hard to get outside of the State of Arizona to recruit. We learned how complex the enrollment management business is, and we really learned, I think, that the suggestion by our presenter was that we have to build what enrollment management and enrollment management support is best for us, but it was clear to our presenter, and I think it's clear to me that the cross-pollination has got to increase and the silos have got to come down in terms of enrollment management. It is no more Academic Affairs or Student Affairs or Finance Administration or of the faculty or of the students, it's "of the University." And it's something that I think we need to work hard at and allow—you know, the core piece of enrollment management has really still got to be Admissions, the Registrar, and Financial Aid, probably some Career Services, probably some Communications and Marketing, but really let that structure evolve such that we're effective as a University, not because it's Arizona State or because it's the University of Iowa or because it's the University of Minnesota, but because it's the University of Northern Iowa. So I think for now, Terry **Hogan** [Vice President for Student Affairs] and Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] are co-leading the Enrollment Working Group and that the Enrollment Council is something that potentially may re-emerge, but if it does, it will likely be in a different kind of a framework.

Smith: And I have a related question.

Ruud: Sure. [the President vocally agrees frequently with "yes" and "sure" as various speakers talk]

Smith: When you were at Shippensburg, you used a Planning and Budget Council as part of the budgetary process. Do you envision having a similar body here at UNI, and if you do, would that be a vehicle by which faculty could provide input into budgetary decisions and university financial management?

Ruud: Yes and yes. Well, I think Scott [Senator **Peters**] is working with Michael **Hager** [Vice President for Administration and Financial Services] on formulating what that would look like and what it would best look like. Yeah, we find it very helpful, and I would find it very helpful here that we—most folks want input into the budget process. They don't want to necessarily make the decisions, although everybody wants more resources, including me. But I think the process that I envision here is one that is a more earlier onset, discussion, lots more information that comes out, lots more information that goes out to the constituent groups, and then a process by which there are multiple pieces of input. So, individual faculty, staff, and students can input. Units can input. Faculty Senate can input. United Faculty can input. Colleges. Divisions outside the academic side of the house can have input, so that we get the best picture of where we should go, what the money should be, what the money should follow, and try and get to a point where we can make decisions sooner about with budgetary items and don't have to wait until even now some of the decisions that we're making even for this year, which is again one of the challenges when you have \$10 million of one-time money. It's sensitive in terms of what do you spend one-time money on? Do you spend it on permanent things? Do you spend it on part-time things? Your screen [projected] went out behind you. I don't know if that's a good thing or a bad thing. It went off. But, yes, I mean back to the original question. Yes, I envision us having a more transparent and open and data-driven budget process, and, yes, I think that we'll want to formalize it so it's not helter skelter, but, yes, I think everybody should feel comfortable that they will have an ability to have a part of the budget process, make suggestions, albeit some of them might work and some of them might not work, that people should be comfortable to make suggestions as we do it and that in this business that we may have to leapfrog things. We may come up with a great idea that's a good idea this year that we know we might not be able to implement it until next year or the year after next, because the funding just may not be there, but get people in the queue, get people in line so that we know that appropriate funding is going to come to appropriate projects.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I have a follow-up on the Enrollment Management. You, I think that I'm correct in saying that you've made a decision to hire a Vice President of Enrollment Management. So that's correct, right?

Ruud: Right

Peters: At the Vice President level?

Ruud: Right. That's one thing we'd like to do.

Peters: So I was wondering if you could—if you could talk a little bit about, you know, why a Vice President and how that fits into the existing structure of Vice Presidents, and then also do you have anything in mind in terms of how you're going to evaluate the success of that person in terms of like was it worth it to hire it at the Vice President level?

Ruud: Oh, that's a great question. I think the issue is pressing enough for us not only in a growth mode over the next 5 years, it seems important that we grow back to the 14, 14½ number. The subsequent challenge is then how do we manage the enrollment at a point in time when we want to be—I won't say "no bigger," but we were—we feel good about the 14½, 15,000 number. I don't envision us growing to be 30,000. I don't envision us to be growing much past 14½ or 15,000, and it takes somebody to both manage the growth of the enrollment but also the sustainability of excellence within that. The gentleman who presented this morning talked about the ability for both Departments to be rewarded for growth and development of Programs but also for excellence within a Program. So if a Program is sustainable, it keeps doing a good job, there ought to be opportunities for that. So I think we have to go back and look at those metrics. I think it's going to create a double as we separate those three Units away from Student Affairs, we're going to have to look back at our Student Affairs Division and look more perspectivevely [*sic*] at a student's success, student engagement in terms of the Units that are left within the purview of Student Affairs and rethink how Student Affairs and that Unit is measured as well. Because they're not going to have Admissions. They're not going to have....go ahead.

Peters: So what were the 3 Units? You said that

Ruud: Generally, when most people look at enrollment, the enrollment management function, you look at Admissions, you look at Registrar, and you look at Financial Aid or financial support—so those three core pieces. But I think as you look at the Vice President evaluation and we get away from the silos, we're going to have to evaluate our VP's not only on their success within the discipline of what they are—Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Student Success, Student Engagement, Enrollment Management advancement—but also the cooperative effort in terms of moving the entire University forward. So, I think, as we said, metrics for planned growth, planned enrollment increases, the assistance with Colleges and Units to develop their growth. The assistance in developing reward modeling, so as you look at a Department that says, "Hey, we're good at—we have 200 majors. We're good. We want to—don't want to grow beyond 200 plus or minus majors." How do we continue to allow that Department, again through the budgeting model, the appropriate funding so that they can maintain excellence, and I think that keeps going back to us being supported as a University by an appropriate allocation funding model in terms of differences and at what level should we be brought up to speed so that we can not have to have the argument of Student Support Services out there because that was the first thing we cut when we got—you know, as I think as we cut the Budget, we probably tried to protect the academic arena first. We probably tried to protect to the best of our ability jobs and benefits second. As you do that, you cut—of the—and 70% of the operation is academic, so you start cutting big chunks out of the 30%, and you don't realize you're cutting 20 and 30% out of the 30% piece. You're cutting a lot of stuff that now doesn't exist anymore in terms of tutorial support, travel support, IT support, telephone support—that as you get back to it, we need a certain level of base funding that keep us operating and functioning. And lest we have, you know, second year in a row of tuition freezing, if we don't get the 4% in terms of the Budget on that, it causes us some angst. So, I think, back to your original question, Scott [Senator **Peters**] is kind of a double set of evaluations. You want to evaluate on the metrics of sustainable enrollment growth, sustainable enrollment management, the enrollment plan—we should have an

enrollment plan that fits into the organization—and then what are the metrics that allow us both growth of program, development of program, and change of program, as well as sustainability of excellent programs that—and, again, I know some of you are in cohort programs where your friends from accreditation come down and say, “Hi, we’d like to have 30 students in a cohort, but can only have 25.” And that often is a challenge in terms of, you know, you might be willing to take 30 students, but if accreditation says “25,” you have to balance that and figure out how we move forward. So, I hope that answers your question.

Smith: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I have a couple of questions.

Ruud: Sure.

Kirmani: This 14,000, 15,000 target that you have. Is this a final target or what is the timeline?

Ruud: Right now, I—again, I think that’s going to be part of the new enrollment management person’s helping us to get there. Five to 7 years maybe? It took us 5-7 years to come down from the 14,000. We have the capacity for 14,000. I’m not saying that’s ultimate magic, but I’m saying to me that’s more of an ultimate top. I’m not sure—I’m not sure—I would suggest to this group I’m not sure we want to get much beyond 14½ or 15,000 students.

Kirmani: Now the second question which I had is that I personally think that there’s a big need for very aggressive fundraising at UNI.

Ruud: Absolutely.

Kirmani: And a lot of alumni have told me that in fact they have never heard from UNI, that UNI never made any requests from them, so do you have any plans to reform the Foundation or whatever is needed?

Ruud: Well, I guess two things. Number 1, I would tell you that fundraising and contacting our alums and friends is always an ongoing intensive person-to-person challenge, ok? I will also tell you that last year we raised \$36 million, which for an institution of our ilk and our caliber and our size and our nature is pretty good. To be able to raise \$36 million in one calendar year is a pretty good fundraising operation. Number 2, we raised \$158 million on a \$150 million goal and ended—and were able to complete that one year early, so I think that’s great. Number 3, I’ve already set out—and I did at the Foundation Board Meeting over the homecoming weekend—I’ve set out the umbrella of the year 2026. 2026, for those of you who haven’t followed what I’ve been talking about, is the 150th anniversary of the institution. And 150th anniversaries are—100, 125, 150, 175, 200 are always ones you want to celebrate. It’s hard to celebrate the 137th birthday. [light laughter around] You know, it’s easier for us celebrate our 37th but hard for the institution. The other piece that comes in very nicely with that, it also turns out that 2026 is the 100th anniversary of the Campanile. The Campanile was built in 1926. So there you have 2 numbers that are targets.

I appreciate the question because I think the reality is, in order to raise more money, we are going to have to spend some more money to raise that money and hold the Advancement area accountable for raising enough money that can assist in paying their freight . The other piece that’s going to happen very shortly, we’re in the final stages of recruiting and hiring a new Director of Alumni Relations. We have been basically without a Director of Alumni Relations for about the past 4 or 5 years, and so we have had some of the programming that might have been more valuable not in place. I hope to—I hope that we can reinstitute that, and I think the issue is just going to become a continued, ongoing opportunity and presence in us reaching out to our alumni and friends and laying out as many fundraising opportunities as possible that fit within the time, talent, and treasure of the individual’s ability to give and be able to carefully identify our alums and friends who are very successful but at the same time recognize our alums and friends who are very successful in their own way. And that may mean a \$100 gift. That may mean a \$150 gift. It may not mean the \$30 or \$40 or \$50 or \$100 million gift that we always hope for, the transformational gift that is always very, very important. And I think it’s going to be a half-way

to the wall effort. I think the reaching out and talking to our alums and engaging our alums and engaging that activity and making sure that they feel comfortable that they've been contacted is going to have to be a multi-faceted program driven by Alumni Affairs, driven by the _____ but with the help of everybody around this table and everybody who's not around this table of just making sure that we continue to make sure that we just don't lose sight of our alumni as they leave this institution.

Kirmani: Thank you. Yes.

Smith: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: Yeah, I'm excited by the energy you bring and the optimism and a lot of things you've said. I know we're trying very hard to recruit right now.

Ruud: Right.

Degnin: One area that I still wanted to raise a question on because to some degree we're swimming upstream now in terms of costs

Ruud: That's right.

Degnin: in terms of costs, and so they—like the community colleges advertise very strongly, you know, “We'll pitch you your Liberal Arts Core, for example, for very cheaply.” They may lose some quality in that process, too. There's—I mean, there's a lot of documentation that if you start at a 4-year institution, you're much more likely to be successful than if you go to a 2-year first. And there's other issues, too, like we charge a lot of money per credit, and then we stop charging when they get to 12. And that encourages students to take sometimes 18, 20 credits while they're working almost fulltime, and they start to confuse the getting a piece a paper with a real education. You know, so one of the things that I would like to see would be to stop charging a flat tuition rate and start charging a lower amount per credit to make us more competitive and to kind of reflect those things in budget neutral. And that was studied a little bit by the last administration but nothing was done. I guess there's other ways of looking

at this, too. Let's say that, you know, you might say that if you start your freshman year, and you stay for 4 years, we'll freeze tuition at all 4 years so you won't go raises. Are things like that being looked at? Because as good as we can do for recruiting, we've still got the issue of why parents the first thing they're looking at is, "Well, ok, this is—community college is cheaper." And especially if someone wants to go part-time, we're very expensive.

Ruud: Yes, all of the above. I mean, I think the issue is #1 we're—in a relative sense, in terms of a 4-year undergraduate and graduate program across this country, we're a pretty good buy. And I think, again, we need to make sure we sell that, and we need to make sure we sell what the opportunity is associated with that so that most families and most parents of traditionally-aged students look at the quality of education that they're going to be able to get and what the opportunities are during that education and post that education. Secondly, I think that we've got to work harder to partner with our community college friends and get out there and, you know, partner with their honors programs, partner with their degree completion programs, partner with their place-bound programs, so that you can look at Kirkwood and DMACC and NIACC and are there things we can do that cause those students to come here but also reach out to the million people that sit in the Des Moines area, Polk County area? How can we reach them in their home? Because at 5:30 in the afternoon, lots of folks in Des Moines are not going to say, "Oh, boy, I want to drive up 35 to 20 and go to a couple of classes up at UNI and then drive back." But, if there's an opportunity there either hybrid, in person, online....

Cost-wise, yeah, I think there are a lot of things you can do in lieu of tuition increases to relook at the structure of how tuition is set up. I mean 1 hour and 2 hours here pay—all is the same price. I mean, so we're actually out of the box 2 credit hours costs the same as 1. So, in some ways we're losing money. Having said that, we have to be careful that we don't price ourselves out of the market. That if you look at the nationwide—you know, the nationwide standard of a great degree is 12-15 all pays the same and that you begin to pay a premium over—not a premium, but you continue to begin to pay for credit hours over 15: 16, 17, and 18. We had that challenge in Pennsylvania where we even got to the point of talking about

just flat tuition by credit hour. If you want to look at part-time versus fulltime students, a fulltime student taking 15 credit hours basically gets 3 credit hours free for 8 semesters, so they pay for 96, and they get 120. A part-time student, taking 9 credit hours or 6 credit hours a semester, pays for 120. So you have to raise those questions in an open, honest conversation about where we are going, what are we doing, what's an appropriate—I prefer the word “investment” rather than “cost”? And I think we need to tout that it is an investment in the next 40 or 50 years in their life, but I think it's appropriate that periodically we raise the issue about not only allocation models, funding, what should tuition be, how do we charge tuition? And there are some schools that have gone to the stock freeze or the class freeze, if you will, so if you start in the Fall of 2014, your tuition is \$7000 a year for the next 4 years. And if you graduate—that may be an incentive to graduate in 4 years—so if you graduate in 4 years, your tuition never goes up. For the Fall class of 2015, maybe that tuition then goes to \$7250, and for those 4 years. Now once your 4 years—the controversy comes as once those 4 years are over is how close to you are finishing, ok? “But I only need one more credit hour. Can I still get in at the \$7000... ?” So—but you raise those.

I think those are very good, fair models. You develop programming at our level. We devote bachelor's degree programs at our level that maybe mandates an AA completion to get in so that we can support the community col—you know, one of the challenges of the community colleges is that they have a lot of challenges with completion, 2-year degree completion. And one of the ways we can help our friends at the community colleges is as we develop programs that we believe are good programs that partnership with what they're doing, is we say, “Hey, yes, you can get in, but the requirement is to have your AA or AS degree on the way in the door.” Their completion rate goes up. We get a completer as a student who's, again, more likely to stay and graduate. So, yeah, we—yeah, those things are all on the table. We have to talk about that stuff and be aggressive but understand that some of those may get thumbs down from some folks because maybe we're not doing a good job of explaining or maybe it's just not the right time.

Smith: Senator **O’Kane**.

O’Kane: Over the years this Body has occasionally visited the link between the General Fund and Athletics, how much money Athletics is getting out of that General Fund. And given what you said earlier about the Budget, and given things like the Library has a flat—has been flat for, I don’t—for several years, I don’t know how long.

Ruud: We’d like to get that information out with our more-open Budget process.

O’Kane: Yeah. I’m curious your thoughts about the proportion of the General Funds that do, in fact, go to Athletics.

Ruud: I think there’s been a pretty good model that’s been put into place, a recommendation by the Athletic Department in conjunction with Student Government, that an increase of \$25 of student fee over the next 8 years? I guess it’ll be over the next 7 years, counting this year. Or is it 6? Are we 2 into it?

Findley: Yeah, we’re at 2 into it.

Ruud: We’re 2 into it, so that there is a replacement, if you will, where there’s more Student Fee money that will assist in the development of support for Athletics. I think there’s got to be a balance. I mean, I think the challenge with a balance—you know, you go places like Iowa State and Iowa, and they say, “Well, there’s no Athletic Fee.” Ok? Except if you want to go to a football game, then you pay \$250 for your student season tickets, and if you want to go to basketball games, you pay \$250 for your student season tickets. The nice thing about UNI is the students can really see that they are getting an opportunity, and I noticed this guy [**Findley**] told me, very excited about his opportunity not only in athletics but in the fine and performing arts where all students get a free ticket each semester to an event over at Gallagher-Bluedorn.

So I think there’s got to be a balance. I think—I’m a big fan. I always have thought there have always been two windows on the world to most

universities—one is the fine and performing arts and one is athletics—that brings people onto campus that wouldn't otherwise come to campus. Then it becomes our obligation to help them to get to understand campus more. But I think it's got to be a balance at our level, at our FCS level in football, the kind of offerings that we have, the diversity we're able to garner in terms of the Athletic Program. And please know the success, the APR success rate of our student athletes is about 10 points higher than the average student population. So, I'm not sure in our lifetimes if the whole challenge of what should be the balance for the auxiliary opportunities of a uni—what makes a university place opportunity whole in terms of the library, athletics, fine and performing arts, student groups, student activities, the student union, the facility we sit in? So I think we need to have a balance, but I think there's an—I think that—I look at it right now as a nice gradual program that can help shift some of those costs over time and therefore restore some money to the General Fund Budget.

O'Kane: Thank you.

Smith: Senator **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Well, this is on behalf of Senator **Peters** who had to run, so it was about your statements about the BAS Degree, asking if you would talk about that and specifically how you view your role in leading faculty to develop curriculum in areas and how you view this as strategically important to the University.

Ruud: Well, the curriculum part's easy. The curriculum's always been and is the purview of the faculty, so I start out right there. I've always believed that as a faculty member. I still believe that. I think the issue from our perspective is "Can we add to the success of Iowa with a BAS/AS program that a lot of other states have utilized that allows a lot more technical AAS degrees to be converted into Bachelor's Degrees in appropriate areas?" And I would say that right up front. I don't want anybody to think that we're going to have this massive automatic BAS program. I mean, we've talked, Jeff—I don't think a BAS degree is an appropriate degree in a Music program, for instance. I don't think you can probably develop a BAS program in Accounting. But in several areas—Fort Hays State has done it.

In Kansas, Emporia State. Northern Arizona University has done it. But, again, Northern Arizona University has a pretty well-developed BAS/AS program. They only have 8 programs.

O’Kane: What’s a BAS?

Ruud: Bachelor of Applied Science, ok? Instead of an AA/AS leading to a 2+3 or a 2+4, an AAS with some Liberal Arts Core component and a BAS, ok, that are paired together, you can do into a 2+2 in appropriate areas, i.e., AAS in Farm Management/BAS in Technology Management. AAS in Police Science, Fire Science/BAS in Criminal Justice. AAS in Robotics or Advanced Manufacturing/BAS in Technology or Manufacturing Management. So it’s a window that allows a pairing. The ultimate stacked program that you see across the country is nursing. LPN as a high school student, you can either go to the workplace or continue in school. An RN in the first 2 years of a community college, go into the workplace, continue in school. A BSN at a 4-year school, you can continue or go back in school for an MSN/BSN. And some people at the 2nd degree will—you know, there’s a lot of people with a robotics degree from a 2-year community college who are going to say, “I’m done.” But I really do look to the faculty. I look to Departments.

Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] and I had a conversation just this afternoon that we’re going to—her suggestion is that we really engage conversation and are there places that are ready to go? I mean, this makes such logical sense. Let’s go. Let’s try it. Let’s do some pilots. In my listening tour of Iowa, I really heard a lot of the rural manufacturing facilities say, if—I’ll tell the story that I’ve told. I went up to Elkader, Iowa, which by the way has a beautiful opera house--if you haven’t been, you should go—and I went to a Cat—Caterpillar manufacturer. They’re making buckets. And 98% of the buckets they make are from scratch. They’re making them out of flat steel, and they’re welding them, bending them, making them into buckets, shipping them out—and 150, 200 employees. And the General Manager, I said, how—you know, “I’m from the University, how can I help?,” right? And he said, “I don’t need welders anymore.” And I thought, “Oh, my goodness. How are you going to make buckets?” [laughter around] And he just smiled at me, and he says, “No, no, no. I need welders that can think. I need welders—welders,” he says, “my welders come in. They weld.

They do a great job. They go home. Tomorrow they come in. I tell them what they need to weld. I need welders that are thinking about the company. I need welders that eventually want to be team leaders. I need welders that eventually want to be supervisors. I need welders that will eventually understand the business, maybe want to buy-in the business and that we can keep in rural Elkader, Iowa, for the next 35 or 40 years.” So a BAS/AAS Degree, we have an AAS in Welding and a BAS maybe in Technology Management or Supervisory Management or something of the like, may be of great value to—and I think it’s safe to say we can pilot some stuff, see how it works, see where it goes, see if it helps not only curriculum-wise but also helps opportunity-wise for students, opportunity-wise for place-bound students, opportunity-wise for students who want to complete their degree.

So, that’s kind of the thinking, but curriculum-wise I defer. I defer to your wisdom. I defer to national trends. I defer to regional trends. You know, if a BAS Degree hasn’t ever existed or really doesn’t show up on the radar screen for your discipline, no, I’m not going to come down and say, “By golly, we’re going to have one of these by Friday.” But if there are a half a dozen other states or 10 other states that have engaged in this, then it would be worth our while to look at it and say, “Hmmm, that makes some sense. We can build different kinds of programs.” It’s a different yardstick. There’s a different yardstick. There’s a 120 credit hour yardstick for a BA Degree, a BS Degree, a BBA Degree. A BAS Degree is still 120 degree—or credit yardstick. It just may look different, and we have to look at us as a regional comprehensive university. Is that one of the things we can provide? Some of it may be online. Some of it may be a hybrid. Some of it may be in person. Some of them may—we might look at it and say, “Can’t do it. Don’t want to do it. Shouldn’t do it. Not a good idea.” Tell Dr. **Peters** I answered his worry.

Smith: Other questions? Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: We recently had a very pleasant visit from the President of the Board of Regents.

Ruud: Yes.

Cooley: And he made some mention of an efficiency study that they are planning to administer to the 3 State Institutions.

Ruud: Oh, administer. That sounds hard. [light laughter around]

Cooley: It does. Can you give us any idea about how that might unfold on our campus? Do you have any information on that?

Ruud: Probably not much more than he gave you, but thanks for asking. I think it's a good question. There are 2—I'm going to look at Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] now. There's another efficiency group in the Legislature that is meeting, that are talking about some—I think are directed mostly at the community colleges—that may be talking about some efficiency stuff. This efficiency study, I understand the Chair is going to be Larry **McKibben**, who is a UNI alum from Marshalltown. He's an attorney. And my understanding is that they would like to partner with an outside consulting firm to look at everything being on the table, I think, clearly in my sense with Bruce is help with some of the obvious. Are there—I mean, he uses the example of the Actuarial Science Program that many have wanted ISU to start, but they have generally directed their students down to us, so that he's looking at overlap. He's looking at redundancy, but he's also looking at the efficiencies and the other parts of the University. Is there stuff we're doing that we are noticing? I mean, some of the obvious stuff—bulk purchases, computer purchases, printer purchases, copy machine purchases. Are we buying—janitorial supply purchases? Are there things that we would be empowered by buying not only just with the 3 Universities in Iowa, but I know the Midwest Higher Education Consortium up in Minneapolis has some purchasing opportunities not only for technology but other things? So I think, in general, most people don't care if there are bulk efficiency agreements that allow us to buy power, to buy janitorial supplies, to buy computers, especially if we have the local purchase option. I think a lot of these things are if you can buy it cheaper locally, you can still go ahead and do that. I think it's incumbent on us to not be shy and be proud about what we're doing, so if somebody comes in and says, "Why are you doing it this way?" that we don't take offense, but we take the offense if—do you know what I mean?

Cooley: Sure.

Ruud: And be able to say, “Hey, this is why it’s.....” You know, somebody comes in and asks the obvious question, “Why are there cohorts of 25 in the particular program based on accreditation?” And I don’t think the answer, “Because of accreditation,” is going to be a solid answer. I think there are much better pedagogical delivery, supply, support arguments that can be easily used to say—to get people to understand, “Oh, ok. I got it.” Ok? Especially in the hard equipment areas, especially in some of the music areas, science areas where—I mean, you can only get so many physics students in a laboratory. You can only get so many chemistry students in a laboratory. You can only get so many social work students into a conducive environment to do things. But I think it’s incumbent upon us throughout the University to look at power savings, administrative savings. I would say everything’s on the table, as it should be, and for us not to be worried but for us to understand that efficiency is of the business these days in terms of how we do things, how we get things done. You know, I love to tell the story about 1850’s Iowa. In 1850’s Iowa, if you didn’t have a windmill on your farm, your neighbors probably looked at you like you were crazy, because you weren’t taking advantage of the free power that was probably pumping water out of the ground to take care of your crops and your animals, and probably it was a failing. Today as soon as we put up a windmill, it’s like, “Oh, my god. That’s ugly.” Ok? And so we even weigh into that. Should we have—should there be more wind farm power? We’ve got 900 acres. Should we have some more windmills out on the other side of campus? We’ve got a parking garage, a parking deck that feeds power back into the grid. Our Athletic Director is very proud of his dual home purchase out on—where is it? Viking and Union Road where he bought 3 or 4 acres of land, and it’s got a windmill, and the windmill actually provides power back to the grid, so his electric bill and power bill is significantly lower in terms of running his home. So, all that stuff’s gotta be on the table. That’s all I know. I think there’s an RFP. I’m pretty confident there’s going to be an RFP. Whether that goes to a local Iowa company or someone national, don’t know. I’m probably guessing that our piece of the pie will be of the 40/40/20, although the 40/40/20 may not always be the

distribution of the appropriation. I hope I said that appropriately. [light laughter around]

Smith: Said it quietly.

Ruud: Yes.

Smith: Any other questions, Senators? Senator **Cutter.**

Cutter: Hi.

Ruud: Hi, Barbara.

Cutter: How's it going?

Ruud: Good.

Cutter: All right. So I was wondering if you can just talk a little bit about what you see as the place of graduate education in a regional comprehensive?

Ruud: That's a great question. A) Yes, it has a place. I guess I should start by saying that, ok? That regional comprehensive universities I don't believe were meant to be undergraduate only. If they choose to be undergraduate only, I think that's of their choice, rather than of their force. So I think A) it's a very, very important part. Secondly, I think we've evidenced it in areas that—is "void" a good word? In areas that others aren't doing. It's clearly appropriate, you know. And thirdly, I think in areas that we've led the way, especially in education, especially in counseling, but also especially in different kinds of master's degree programs, especially that aren't necessarily leaders to the Ph.D. A lot of times in an R1 university, the master's degree is the logical hook to a Ph.D. I don't have a problem with graduate education and regional comp. being a leader to a Ph.D., but I also think we have that option of the applied, things like an MBA, a Masters of Applied History, other kinds of—I don't know, things like an MFA. What are those other degrees that are graduate-appropriate for what we do. And then as we've evidenced, maybe selected areas in the doctoral

environment, and those truly probably have to be—most of what I’ve seen across the country, I experienced it in California where there was a big fight over allowing the ED.D. degree to come into the regional comprehensive universities, and the UC system fought it tooth and nail for years, even though they weren’t offering the ED.D. degree. “If we can’t have it, you can’t have it either.” So that fact was broken about 4 or 5 years ago, I think, where the ED.D. has come in. I came from a state where applied doctorates through conversation with our Board of Governors were allowed and are now being approved. Things like, Doctor of Science in Nursing, Doctor of Audiology, potentially other applied doctorates, Doctorate in Counseling maybe. So I think we have to be careful. I think we have to be proud of those that we know work and know will continue to work. I think we have to make sure we have entrance strategies and exit strategies as those programs evolve. I mean, it used to be that the PharmD degree was not a requirement of the profession. And now the PharmD degree has pretty much negated any master’s level performance in pharmacy, that if you want to go be a practicing pharmacist you need to do that. So—and then maybe a little bit on the cusp, a little bit on the cusp of—I’m not opposed to trying some things, and even if they’re in partnership with others, see how that works. And, of course, we’re in the year 2013, so what kind of graduate programs can we offer jointly with universities both inside the State of Iowa and outside the State of Iowa, especially if we have the expertise. I have no problem having core groups of faculty that may not offer the degree but offer the expertise either in person, online, or hybrid.

Smith: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I appreciate the importance of focusing on enrollment management and to move the institution forward, but I’d like to hear from you a little bit about how we might go about enhancing the intellectual vitality of the institution, and that’s a kind of a broad question, you know, without a lot of specificity, but have you given thought to if we get to 14,000, where are we going to go beyond that in terms of intellectual vitality?

Ruud: Well, I haven't—thanks, Chris, that's a great question. I even think about as we get to 14,000 we have to—I think one of the things that we need to do better is more periodically reexamine where we are, rather than waiting to getting to someplace and then deciding we either should or shouldn't be there. I would like to make sure that as the world changes that we are looking carefully at ourselves to change the make-up and the delivery and the content of the academic offerings that we have, so that we don't fall into a place where it's 7 or 8 years down the road, and we've had 1 graduate in this particular program. I think as we evolve, we've got to eval—we have to evaluate as we evolve. I haven't given an awful lot of thought of once we get to 14½ to 15 other than I just—my stomach and my heart and my head just tells me, I would just rather not get to be bigger than that, because I think once you get bigger than that, you lose the face-to-face, you lose the ability that you folks are so good at and that's engaging the students one-on-one inside and outside the classroom. I think—what I think of often is building a program to make sure that we are intellectually challenged ourselves. You know, as to a holder of the Ph.D. degree and a master's degree along with my bachelor's, I think maybe I fall into the trap that I learned it all, and then maybe I don't need to develop. And I think the challenge to all of us is continue to learn and develop and what's new and what's old? I have no problem putting the old idea up against the new idea and having the old idea win. I have no problem with that. But I think we need to continue to encourage people to be active in what they do in terms of undergraduate education, learning, and appropriate graduate programs. I think we need to encourage to be active in what I call *intellectual contribution*. I'm not a big fan of teaching, research, and service. I'm a big fan of teaching, learning, intellectual contribution, and engagement. And in a regional comprehensive university you have to measure people differently. If I'm in the Theatre Department and I've had 20 appearances on Broadway, I would think that's a good thing. However, we don't necessarily teach ourselves—if I'm a Management professor, and I'm basing my intellectual contribution on refereed journal articles, I have difficulty evaluating my colleague in the Theatre Department when they've only had 20 appearances on Broadway, and I've been to New York 5 times, so that means they've only got 15 more than I do. [light laughter around] So, I think we need to understand that better, but I think we need to press ourselves to continue our own learning,

education, getting out su—the University needs to support us going to places where we present our intellectual contribution, but we also need to get in the habit of just flat out professional development so that we could learn more about—I mean, the World Congress that you had in World Organization that you had in town is clearly a one-of-a-kind, and the ability to get more—I’d love to see that room 5 times the size it is with other people engaged in and understanding what you’re doing, so as we move forward with all of our centers, with all of our auxiliary programs, that we work hard in terms of what we do.

The other things that I’d really like to start pushing and figure out a way how to do it is—that is to make undergraduate student/faculty research a signature program of the University of Northern Iowa. That doesn’t mean everybody has to do it, but I think one of the abilities of a comprehensive regional university is to afford—and what Dr. **Kidd** [Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect] has told me that’s ringing in my ears is to afford the undergraduate student at a regional comprehensive university an opportunity that is not always present at a research 1 university. And to make or to be able to say, “If I’m a chemistry or biology student, it’s easier for me to get into the University of Iowa Medical School or the Iowa State University Vet School through UNI than it is through Iowa State or the University of Iowa.” But to be able to have a student—and I think of Blake [**Findley**] right here—Blake needs to go to his interviews for graduate school, Teach America, the Peace Corps, or a job not having to make up stuff but to be able to give answers that he knows are unique because of his experience at the University of Northern Iowa. And undergraduate student/faculty research is one of those. Simple projects funded by \$500 or \$1000 with poster sessions with potential presentations are valuable, and, of course, I’ll leave you with my favorite story of the young man who came to Shippensburg to sell us technology, and we were telling him about our—this is 2 years ago—we had 500 students and 100 faculty in our day-and-a-half long, undergraduate student/faculty symposium, and he said, “Wow, I wish I would have had that opportunity as an undergraduate student.” Naturally, it begs the question, “So where did you go to school?” And he went to Johns Hopkins. [light laughter around] And I think—I’ve talked to a lot of employers. I’ve talked to a lot of graduate deans, and for a student to come in to an interview for graduate school to be able to say, “Hey, I did this research,

while I was here,” and by doing that I think you automatically push the intellectual vitality and refresh the intellectual vitality, not only of the students, but of the faculty, because it’s hard to—some days it’s hard. Some years it’s hard. You fall into a rut.

Edginton: Would you—you mentioned biology and physics and chemistry

Ruud: Right.

Edginton: in terms of preparation of individuals for medical schools. Be sure to throw in Athletic Training also

Ruud: Oh, absolutely. Well, and

Edginton: because they have placed multiple students in those.

Ruud: And the med schools and the vet schools are also now placing a big handle on psych, soc, anthro, the bedside skills that don’t necessarily get pushed that direction.

Smith: Last call for questions. [some joking and laughter about something]

Hakes: Half of one. More of a statement than—yeah. Having been in Iowa a long time and being familiar with both Iowa and Iowa State, I think we’ve benefited historically in our enrollment by their indifference toward undergraduates, and it seems as though they’ve upped their game a great deal so that the atmosphere that we’re operating in now is completely different than when we were at 14,000 before. Are we recognizing that? I mean, are we paying attention to the fact that it’s a tougher—am I correct?—a tougher game out there now that if they are seriously interested in undergraduate education, where I don’t believe they have been in the past? How tough does that make it for us in our being prepared to work around that?

Ruud: Right, well, I—oh—the answer to the last question is yes. The answer to the first part was really eloquently presented this morning at Cabinet. I think Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**] can share some of that

with you at a later date, but, you know, if Arizona State is engaged in the enrollment management business and worried about getting Arizona kids to come to Arizona State as well as out-of-state kids, then, yes, the answer to the question, “Yeah, it’s a tough—it’s a tougher world.” Demographics have changed the world in terms of where—you know, when a State like Iowa is growing and we were the “teacher’s college,” it was easy to send people to go to be at the teacher’s college. Now that Education is maybe 20%, am I close, Gloria [Provost **Gibson**], 21%? I think the marketplace is different, and it’s not just Iowa and Iowa State. It’s Wartburg. It’s Coe. It’s Cornell. It’s Grinnell. That we need to work hard, and especially west of I-35, is telling and selling the story. There was a suggestion that just resonated with me this morning—was the suggestion he had—Arizona State University has hired an admissions officer who does nothing but deal with high school counselors, ok? So you’re selling to the middleman or the middlewoman, ok? “Please know what an excellent program we have at the University of Northern Iowa, so that when moms and dads and students come in to see you, you don’t just automatically default to something else.” I saw it at Shippensburg. I saw it when I was at Boise State. I saw it in California.

The nature of the business—again, we’re not in the admissions business anymore. We’re in the enrollment management business, not only to grow and craft enrollment but to stabilize enrollment, to figure out what we can do. We don’t have the luxury, unfortunately, that a lot of these private schools have. Dickinson College—I’m sure you’ve all heard of it—was 8-10 miles north of Shippensburg, had the luxury in their process the year before I left of lowering their enrollment from 2600 to 2400 and limiting their freshman class from 600 to 500 by the nature of the assignment they placed on the qualifications. Through the Regents’ formula, through who we are as a regional comprehensive university in a State University, we don’t necessarily have that luxury, but I think we have a lot of opportunity to tell and sell that story better.

We’re going to work hard at the 2 weeks of the high school football playoffs, something we’ve not done before, to set up a mobile, recruiting Admissions Office over in the Dome so that as these folks play 24 games in 8 days that we’re not just going to talk to students, but our band is reaching

out to the individual high school bands who come and are going to be able to talk and recruit from that perspective. We're going to recruit our alumni who are superintendents and principals and teachers and invite them to events. We are going to recruit the moms and the dads and the brothers and the sisters. I already have a template letter in place where when it's announced who the 18 teams are that are coming to the play-offs, they get a letter. When 6 of those teams lose and 12 teams continue, 6 teams are going to—6 superintendents are going to get a "thanks," 12 are going to say "welcome to Round 2." When that's over, and we have 6 winner and 6 losers, 6 loser superintendents are going to get a "Hey, thanks. We really appreciate it." And six winners are going to get a "Congratulations," from me, ok? So I think we just up the ante in terms of it. And I went to a presentation—Kent **Johnson** [Dean, Continuing Education and Special Programs] had a great presentation today about continuing ed., and it was one of those "ah ha" moments that reminded me—and the woman presenting said, "One of the cheapest thing you can do is word of mouth," you know? One of the best ways you can tell and sell the story is to your neighbor, to your sister, to your buddy, to your college roommate, to somebody you run into in Council Bluffs, to say, "Hey, UNI's a great experience. Come on down and figure out...." You know, industries do that with reward mechanisms. It's a little bit harder to give students an iTunes card for \$50 by saying "Hey, they referred a student." You get into some legal stuff that way. [light laughter around] You know, some rules.

But I think—I apologize for going on, but I think we've reached an era in higher education where we get out of the Admissions Office—or admissions business into the enrollment management business. We will be able to be highly competitive with—because let's face it, we were #2 in the *U.S. News [and World Report]* rankings. We went from 22 to 13, all right? We were #2 in the publics, all right? We had #22 overall. We didn't pass #1. Ok, we didn't pass Truman State and go up from 22 to 13. That means we passed 9 private schools, ok? And we need to remind ourselves that we are able to sell against—you know, always say, you know, "You go to Wartburg, and it's 50 grand a year. They roll into your front—they roll into—they're willing to roll into your living room and offer you a \$25,000 scholarship and hope that until your son or daughter is a sophomore, you don't realize you're paying 25 grand out of your own pocket." You know,

we gotta say we're giving a good deal, good opportunity, a great thing, and then do that both centralized and decentralized, so we're not totally driving up from the center of the University, but we're engaged in the Colleges and the Units and the Departments. I know you guys are doing a great job, Tim [Vice-Chair **Kidd**—excuse me for picking on you—internationally and really reaching out and saying, “Whoa, there’s an international opportunity for physics kids to come to the University of Northern Iowa.” And Craig [Klafter, Associate Provost for International Programs, in audience] would tell you, “They’re full freight payers.” Pretty much, aren’t they, Craig? [who nods] That’s a good thing to have, so....

Smith: Final call for questions. [none heard] That would do it. Thank you very much, President **Ruud**. [clapping heard]

Ruud: I would just add, having known this nice gentleman who’s in front of you [on the handout], Aaron **Podolefsky** and I had paths cross many years ago, and a quality individual. I know he did a lot of hard work at this institution, and I know there’s an upcoming celebration of his life, and I encourage any and all of you to come. He left us way too soon. He was a great other-end-of-the-phone for me when he was in Missouri and when he was in New York, and we shared lots of stories, lots of lies, lots of tales. But it’s guys like this that made it easier for and easier for us to cause this University to be successful, so I hope that we all reach out and take an opportunity, even if it’s for 5 minutes, to celebrate what Aaron did, who Aaron was. So, I’m pleased to see that that’s out here. And thanks a million, and have a great rest of the semester.

Smith: Thank you for coming today.

Ruud: Take care. [leaves the room]

Smith: Now, we are past 5:00 o’clock, and we still have one item of business that really is important for us to do, so I need a motion to extend, and I’m thinking we can do that in 15 minutes. Could I get a motion to extend for 15 minutes?

Hakes: Yep.

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Hakes**. Do I have a second? Thank you, Senator **Nelson** [who indicated]. Any discussion? [none heard] All in favor, “Aye” [ayes all around, lightly voiced, causing light laughter]. All opposed, “Nay”? [none heard] Ok, we’ve extended for 15 minutes.

DOCKET 1051 INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL SAFETY POLICY—FACULTY AND STAFF (REGULAR ORDER 10/14/13)

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/international_travel_safety_policy_faculty_and_staff_.pdf

Smith: Our one more important item of business for us to transact today, Item 1153/1051, International Travel Safety Policy for Faculty and Staff. There is some urgency to this item, as I’ve tried to explain at our earlier meetings. Basically to avoid setting off an audit flag at next week’s Regents Meeting, the Administration would like us to be able to show that progress is being made on this issue, and it can do that if we move this proposed policy forward in the policy approval process with our recommendations. Now, Francis **Degnin** is here both as a substitute for Senator **Swan**, but also as Chair of the EPC. He’s able to talk about this, which has been reviewed by the EPC. And we have Associate Provost Craig **Klafter**, and you can take over President **Ruud**’s position right up there. I think we’ve got actually a table thing [name tent] for you. So, Associate Provost **Klafter** has drafted the proposal and is here to answer questions. I’d like to begin by asking Associate Provost **Klafter** to briefly summarize the proposal after which we’ll have Professor **Degnin** discuss the EPC’s review.

Klafter: Thank you. In drafting a Travel Safety Policy for a university, one has to strike a balance between the risk management interest of the Administration and the academic freedom of faculty to pursue their inquiry wherever it may lie. This Policy, as I have drafted it, the pendulum is much more towards the academic freedom side. It is mostly advisory. “You’re big enough to figure out the issues that are involved in going on international travel.” Where the Policy has key concerns, going to a country that’s on the U.S. State Department Warning List, and there it requires some steps be taken to do a risk assessment, deposit that with your Department Head, and if necessary, to take out war exclusion insurance to cover you in those circumstances. But there is also a provision

for waiving that provision and essentially go uncovered, if that's what you choose to do. So, in a nutshell, that is what this Policy is about.

Smith: Ok, Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: First of all, I apologize. I had thought I had forwarded this to Jerry [Faculty Chair **Smith**], and I guess I had not. I probably—I think I sent him an—I know I sent him an email saying we were done, and I probably forgot to attach. So, fortunately, the changes aren't substantial from the earlier draft that you got. Most of them are on page 2 [projected for Senators to see], and they are mostly just editorial, so minor things. So, as you see up on the screen up there, you see that there was a very, very awkward, difficult-to-understand sentence in our—in that first paragraph. So we just broke it up and made it much more readable. We did some nuancing changes. We took the export controls—it didn't seem to make sense under the insurance—and gave it its own section. As a whole, we thought the Policy was very, very well drafted already by Craig, and it really is very narrow in scope. And it really only affected international travel and really is only—the primary focus is if it's a place where it's particularly dangerous, what extra precautions need to be taken, and in some cases, if you are going there because the University thinks it's necessary to go, they have to pay for your extra insurance. The University cannot force you to go to some place on a State Department Watch List, but if you choose to go, and the University approves it as necessary for them, they pay for the insurance. If you choose to go on your own, but the University accepts that you're going, it could be either one—you could pay for it yourself or they. Or, if you decide that you're going to go, and you don't want the insurance, you simply have to file a waiver, you know, just saying that you're taking that responsibility.

One of the things that came as a surprise to me was the Worker's Compensation, and I had thought that when I—if I went to a conference, it would be covered from when I left to when I got there. It turns out, that's not so. I don't know how many people were aware of that. It's only there perhaps when you're actually at the conference, or there's some exclusions. Sometimes there's some travel, but I don't know how many faculty know that. But that's not controlled by this Policy. That's controlled

by State Law, and so a lot of our concerns that came up really weren't about this Policy. It was more misunderstandings of State Law. So, we thought it was very clean, and we had very little we had to do with it.

Smith: Questions or discussion? [none heard] Well, so my personal suggestion is that the Senate endorse this proposal as amended by the EPC, forwarding it with the EPC's recommendations for consideration by the Policy Review Committee, the Cabinet, and the President as potential changes that we would support. I'd also like to be able to say in the letter that I use to transmit this to Tim **McKenna** [University Counsel], who heads the PRC, I'd like to be able to say that we "strongly prefer this proposal to others that might infringe on the academic freedom of faculty," and there are other proposals that are more coming from the risk management side of things, a bit more—quite a bit more conservative and, you know, not as accommodating to faculty needs and in defense of academic freedom. So, I'd like to be able to give our strong support for this as opposed to others. And so, if you are on board with that, then what I would like is a motion to that effect, that the Senate endorses or supports this proposal forwarded to the EP—forwards it with the EPC's recommended changes and with our support. So, is there a motion to that effect?

Edginton: So move.

Smith: Thank you, Senator **Edginton**. Do we have a second?

Nelson: Second.

Smith: Second, Senator **Nelson**. Discussion? [none heard] We're ready for a vote. All in favor, say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No"? [none heard] It passes.

ADJOURNMENT (5:10 p.m.)

Smith: And we are just about out of time, and that's the only other thing that we really have to get done, so I think we are anxious to get done, which means I'm willing to entertain a motion to adjourn. [light laughter]

Thank you, Senator **Hakes** [who indicated] Seconded by Senator **O’Kane** [who indicated]. We don’t have to vote on those. They pass by whatever. Thank you all.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Monday, October 28, 2013, 3:30 p.m.

Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union