

4-9-2012

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 9, 2012

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2012 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, April 9, 2012" (2012). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 49.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/49

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.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/09/12 (3:32 p.m. – 5:05 p.m.)
Regular Mtg. #1714

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments here.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** was absent.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comment time included some invited guests:

First were 4 Northern Iowa Student Government officers who introduced themselves—Spencer **Walrath**, outgoing NISG President; Ian **Goldsmith**, outgoing NISG Vice-President; Jordan **Bancroft-Smithe**, NISG President-elect; and KaLeigh **White**, NISG Vice-President-elect.

Then, Cathy **DeSoto**, President of United Faculty spoke regarding the current Budget Committee discussions and fielded comments and questions from Senators.

And finally, Philip **Patton**, University Registrar, spoke about UNI Fall enrollment projections and answered some Senators' questions.

Funderburk's additional comments included a reminder of the Retreat with President **Allen** and Provost **Gibson** on the Monday of exam week, March 30th, in the University Room of Maucker Union at 3:30 p.m., and of the additional Retreat for Senators that he'll provide more information to them about soon. He gave a brief update on the Budget Process Workgroup organized recently by Vice-President **Hager**. He then apologized for late revision to today's Agenda (the renumbering of items due to website

limitations). He also stated that he would request moving to quasi committee of the whole after docketed items were completed for discussion of the work the ad hoc committee charged with Bylaws revision is doing on the Senate Budget Committee.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for March 26, 2012, were approved by acclamation with no additions or corrections.

3. Request from Vice-Chair **Breitbach**: Vice-Chair **Breitbach** requested a volunteer to replace her for one meeting of the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee on Thursday, March 19th, at 3:30. She has an out-of-town conflict. Senator **DeBerg** volunteered.

4. Docketed from the Calendar

1132 1028 Motion to Discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science

Motion to docket in regular order (DeBerg/Smith**). Passed.

1133 1029 EPC recommendations: Academic Grievance Policy (previously 1085/983)

Motion to docket for April 16, 2012 (Breitbach/Dolgener**). Passed.

1134 1030 EPC recommendations regarding the petition on co-curricular activities policy (referred to EPC 12/12/11 as 1105/1003), EPC recommends amending Attendance Policy (1066/964)

Motion to docket on April 16, 2012 (Breitbach/Smith**). Passed.

1135 1031 LAC Review procedures for 2012-13

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

1136 1032 Report on Findings from the University Writing Committee

Motion to docket in regular order (Neuhaus/Kirmani**). Passed.

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1131 1027 Emeritus State Request, Annette **Swann**, Teaching Department, effective 12/21/11

Motion to endorse request (Terlip/Neuhaus**). Passed.

6. Old Business

Motion to move into quasi committee of the whole for discussion of the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and related issues (Swan/DeBerg**). Passed.

Motion to extend meeting time by 5 minutes (Peters/East**). Passed.

Motion to move out of quasi-committee of the whole (Dolgener/Roth**). Passed.

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 5:05 p.m. (Wurtz/Roth**). Passed.

Next special meeting:

Monday, April 16, 2012, Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April, 09, 2012
Regular Mtg. 1714**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Gregory **Bruess**, James **Jurgenson**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.: Ok, can we call to order, please?

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Press identification. I see none.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: I understand Provost **Gibson** has no comments at this point?

Provost **Gibson:** No.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Chair **Jurgenson** just e-mailed me. He's not going to be able to join us today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: I have invited a few guests to take part of the time for my comment area. So, the first was the—as I mentioned at the last meeting, the NISG Senate was kind enough to invite myself and Secretary **Peters** to visit with them, and I thought it would be nice to invite the [NISG] leadership to also come in and say, “Hello,” to us. Part of what we’re hoping is to maybe get a little more regular communication between the two Bodies and start understanding better how we go about handling things as we get issues, particularly policy issues, that we cooperate on. So I think I’ll just turn it over and let whoever wants to introduce themselves and say something.

Goldsmith: Well, my name is Ian **Goldsmith** [outgoing NISG Vice-President]. Hopefully, I might be a little recognizable since I have been coming here, but I just wanted to take the time to thank you all for allowing me to sit in and take notes and relay that information back to the Student Government and to chime in whenever I felt necessary. And did you want to say anything [to Spencer **Walrath**]?

Walrath: Hi, I’m Spencer **Walrath** [outgoing NISG President]. I’m on my way out with **Ian**. It’s been a pleasure serving the students, and it’s been a pleasure also working with many of you, especially with your Chair and Vice-Chair. **Ian** and I had the opportunity to meet with them a lot last semester, just trying to get to know each other better and make sure that there was some good communication going on. And looking forward, I mean I can say this because I’m on my way out, but I would hope that that would continue between our two groups, because I think there was a lot of good stuff that came out of that, and I think it would be helpful to keep it going in the future.

Breitbach: Including some of the committee work.

Students: Right. Right.

White: Well, I'm KaLeigh [**White**, NISG Vice-President-elect]. I'm on the way in as the new **Ian**, and I think I'll just tell you a little bit about myself. I'm a Sociology/Public Administration Double Major, and I have a Minor in Non-Profit Management. I'm just excited to plan to come and observe every week and sort of give my input like **Ian** did. So thank you guys for inviting me today.

Bancroft-Smithe: I'm Jordan [**Bancroft-Smithe**, NISG President-elect]. I'm the President-elect. I'll be replacing **Spencer** here in the next 6 days. [groans, laughter, and positive remarks from Senators and students]. I'm a senior Philosophy and Music Double Major from Waverly, so I've grown up around UNI and have been here at UNI hanging out and stuff for, I don't know, the past decade and a half. [light laughter around] I'm excited to work with you guys, and I hope to have communications with whoever your next faculty—or whoever the next Senate Chair is and Vice-Chair.

Funderburk: And then additionally, they also have a Speaker of the Senate. Is that determined?

White: Not yet.

Bancroft-Smithe: It got put up in the air. [laughter around]

Breitbach: Some type of difficulties.

Bancroft-Smithe: Something to do with procedure, yeah.

Funderburk: They have a Chief Justice as well.

Bancroft-Smithe: Yes, that's Dan **Jensen**, but he's on his way out. So we'll have a new one next year.

Funderburk: Very good.

Bancroft-Smithe: Do you have any questions for us?

Gibson: I think we should acknowledge their contributions, past and future.

Funderburk: Yes, absolutely. [applause all around] Thanks for coming in today and at least saying “hello.” We do appreciate it. The Senate thanks you very much.

[some students exit; others remain as observers]

Funderburk: Cathy **DeSoto**, the President of United Faculty, asked to say a few words today, so I’ll turn the floor over to you at this point, if it’s ok? They set you up a table. You can do that, or you can come up here, whatever you like.

DeSoto: Oh, I didn’t see that. I’ve got my own little name.

Funderburk: You even get a name tent.

DeSoto: Actually, I feel like I’m on the hot seat [sitting in front of everyone]. That’s what I feel like. All right. Well, thank you for having me here today. There are so many things that would be relevant to address, but I think that today I would like to only talk about one particular comment, and that topic which is the Budget Committee and the overall need for increasing faculty input into the budget process. To do this, there is a need for faculty who are both knowledgeable about all aspects of the Budget and who are willing to put the time into it to analyze it and to serve. I think that this should certainly not be any sort of a turf war. I think that we should all be united in the idea that we want people who have spent the time, who understand the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, the IPEDS [Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System] data, how to use the IPEDS data and that website, which takes a little while to learn, to look at the Supplemental Budget Report, to look at the Budget every year.

I think that the last thing that I want is to worsen the climate of UNI, but we need more transparency in the budget process, a lot more. You know, I

was concerned that after Howard **Bunsis**'s talk, or actually before his talk, information went out, a press-release went out from the UNI Public Relations to the press, a member of the press sent it, and said, "We would like to have a closed-door meeting with you after Howard **Bunsis**'s talk." That happened, and there was a guard at the door that would not let anyone in who had the e-mails from the press relations, and even students weren't let in. Now, what I don't understand is why if there was a problem with what Dr. **Bunsis** was saying it wasn't brought up with him in the room able to answer and acknowledge this?

So, again, we need people who are knowledgeable about the full thing, people who, you know, when there are things said like, "We have had an increase in faculty and a decrease in administrators last year," they're able to have the background and knowledge to say, "Yes, but over the past 10 years—and then there's that particular data, but there's also this data and this data and this data and the time trend overall, everything all together what's going on is really clear," so that you don't have someone who might have an agenda saying things like, "Those are not the numbers that you seek." I thought that would be funny. [light laughter around]

All right, so I think that we should all agree that this is a time for people who are able and willing to speak up and be transparent be on this committee. So I'm not understanding—and I don't—the e-mail exchange between Professor **Thompson** and Chair **Funderburk** is clearly sad, and I don't know the background to it, and I don't really want to get into the background to it, but I think that everyone can agree that Frank [**Thompson**] has tried hard to have input in the budget process for many years, and I am confused as to why, first of all, to be honest, why the Administration would have any say at all in who the budget representative should be on the Budget Committee.

And what I understood from Jeff [**Funderburk**], and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but you talked about multiple conversations with various administrative folks about this consultation and that including anyone in this initial work group who is actively- and locally-involved in the current United Faculty presentations would be a non-starter. And this is troubling

to me because, as United Faculty is charged with negotiating the contract, it is going to be people on United Faculty who are most involved who are going to be very knowledgeable about the Budget. And if you start with like that this group is something that the Administration prefer not to work with--this is supposed to be a Senate group and not a United Faculty group, I mean--that's going to present a false choice, which I think should be rejected. What we want on the Budget Committee is the people who have spent the time and are most knowledgeable.

So I am eager to understand more about this and to clarify why the persons active and vocal about the Budget in United Faculty might be seen as less-than-welcome on this Committee. That's it.

Funderburk: Ok. Are there any questions or anything for our guest?
Senator East. **Senator Gallagher.**

East: I assume we can make comments?

Funderburk: I believe so.

East: Ok. I think I can respond at least from one point of view about what you said, because I suggested in the message to the Senators that if we're going to have a truly consultative and have faculty truly involved in making budget recommendations that those faculty need to be—they have to be—both parties have to be willing to work together, and that there are some faculty on campus who would be—whose efforts in the past would make them, I think, ineffective on such a committee. However, we have been talking about two different kinds of committees—a Budget Committee for the Senate where we would have people making recommendations to us; maybe people making recommendations to whatever University budget-making process there is, and that on that Budget Committee we would certainly want those people who are or have an agenda. We would want them thinking about how to best support recommendations for that, but we wouldn't necessarily want somebody on whatever process is involved with the Administration in making recommendations and doing the process that ultimately leads to a Budget. That comes from, in my own personal

case, a belief that it is the Administration's responsibility to produce a Budget, and assuming it's their responsibility—based on that assumption, they need to be happy with whatever process is involved in order to produce that Budget.

I also happen to believe—I think it's the Jeffersonian Ideal of "Truth will out." that an Administration is wise if they actively include all points of view in the budgeting process, in particular ideas coming from faculty and staff as well as from upper administrators who may or may not have access to the perspectives of faculty and staff. And I think that those people need to actually be represented in the process and be members of the discussion in the process, not just somebody who's putting a note in a suggestion box and allowing—and then never seeing whether anybody reads the suggestion or hearing their responses to it or being willing to argue for it or argue against somebody else's suggestion. And I don't think that kind of participation is encouraged or is going to happen if we're not careful who's involved in the process. People who know me and have heard me speak at the Senate I think know I'm not a shill for the Administration. I raise issues, and I say things as I believe, and I think that's who we want on this Committee.

And I agree, we certainly want knowledgeable people, but I think it's most important that we work in a non-confrontive way to establish procedures for cooperation and planning in budget priorities, budget planning, and that we do so in a way that's transparent. I think that the people in the planning process should receive input from all over campus. They should as much as possible make that input public and their ultimate decision about it public, and so I think transparency is very important.

The Senate has put forth a number of ideas and not heard whether they were thought to be good ideas or—people on the Senate, on the Senate itself—people on the Senate have put forth ideas and have not heard whether those were reasonable ideas, unworkable ideas for some reason, etc. And that's not useful in the consultative process, and it's not useful for faculty as a whole to think that the process is open. And so I think we need an open process, but in order for that to happen, we have to have people

on the Committee who are comfortable working together. They don't need to be yes-men or yes-women, but they need to be comfortable working together, and so I think we need to be careful about who is named to any process where the Administration's asked of budgeting—it doesn't sound right, but then for me to say, "Where they let us in the building," but it's sort of their job. And I think what we're hoping is that they will see that they can do a lot better job if they have input from the campus as a whole. So that's my perspective on it.

Funderburk: Ok, thanks, Senator **East**. Senator **Gallagher**, Senator **Kirmani**, Senator **DeBerg**.

Gallagher: A little clarity. The way I understood you is that somehow this Committee would serve the Union and the Senate?

DeSoto: No

Gallagher: Is that not—ok, because that's kind of what I was thinking you

DeSoto: Well, no. Should I try to clarify?

Gallagher: Yeah, I wish you would.

DeSoto: That this Committee should have the people from the faculty who are most knowledgeable about the Budget, and those people may well be people from United Faculty or the faculty on United Faculty.

Gallagher: Ok, well, I guess my concern is that the role of the Senate and Union in my mind are different. They may intersect at times, of course, but there is a role for the Senate that does not overlap with, and should be, I think, strengthened. And so I don't want to see that sort of meshing.

DeSoto: May I address that?

DeBerg: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you what you just said in your last sentence.

Gallagher: I just think that the role of the Senate needs to be more defined, and it's not an appendage or an extension of the Union, and so I think this Committee is completely a concern of the Senate.

DeBerg: Thank you. I just didn't hear.

Gallagher: I'd like to see more clarity in those boundaries being drawn.

DeSoto: I think it's a really important thing then to have United Faculty come here on a regular basis to speak to that issue. I think that United Faculty is very clear about where the boundaries are and where there should be support for both sides. So I think that one of the roles of United Faculty as an AAUP chapter is to strongly and vocally advocate for the Senate oversight and the Senate role in decision-making processes. When we sat at the table over Article V, we even said out loud—we've said in writing, we've said many times—that the program closure question about which programs are going to close is a Senate thing, and we're the wrong Body to talk to about that. That should be the Senate. I think that we really have very little place whatsoever in that topic. I think that for the Budget that if you want to have the most knowledgeable faculty members on this Committee, that it's not going to be the kind of thing where you can say, "Well, we don't want United Faculty on this." That's my concern.

Gallagher: Well, that's been said.

Funderburk: I'm going to allow 3 more quick comments since this is a "comments" section not a discussion.

DeSoto: Oh, I'm sorry, **Jeff**.

Funderburk: We are going to be discussing Budget later. So I have **Kirmani**, **DeBerg**, and then **Peters**. Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, first of all, I did not follow the exchange of e-mails between Frank [**Thompson**] and Jeff [**Funderburk**]. They appeared too long for me.

Frankly, I just deleted them. I have no idea what they were. Secondly, so far as the Budget is concerned, I personally don't care about the intricate details of the Budget as long as the Budget reflects the priorities of this Institution as determined by our Mission. So we have to agree on the priorities. Each and every item in the Budget is kind of irrelevant. So that is my main concern. We just agree on the priorities, and then the Budget should reflect that. We don't have to worry about each and everything in the Budget. So that's my point of view about the Budget.

Funderburk: Thank you. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I would like to make this comment now because I won't be able to stay for the whole meeting, but I think the Senate Budget Committee should be elected and let the faculty pick who they want on this. I am appalled by an idea that the Administration would tell us who could be on our Committee and who couldn't be on our Committee. So to that point I agree with **Cathy**, and I wanted to also thank you for being here today. But I think that the idea that there is some kind of try-out period with the Administration for our Budget Committee is the wrong way to go on this. I think we should elect it.

Gibson: I'm really confused. I don't know. I mean, are you talking about a committee from the President's Office, or—I don't know what committee you're talking about. I'm sorry.

DeBerg: Well, the Committee I'm talking about was the one that was announced that is Jeff [**Funderburk**], Scott [**Peters**], and Hans [**Isakson**]. That's what I'm talking about.

Funderburk: Yeah, there are two committees. That's not a Senate Budget Committee. That's Vice-President Hager's committee discussing a new process. I'm suspecting that's the one Secretary **Peters** is about to talk about also.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok. Thank you.

Peters: Yeah, I was just going to point out that the way the discussion is currently going, and, **Cathy**, I think **Jeff** intended to devote some time in committee of the whole so we can work on this a little bit more, so if you want to stick around, by all means do.

The way the discussion has been going is that there are kind of two different functions that the Senate needs. The Senate needs information, such as information that UF has been providing over the years and Frank **Thompson** and others have been providing over the years. We need that information. We just need it in a more, you know, sort of consistent fashion. Not to criticize efforts in the past but that is to say, you know, that hopefully we can get this institutionalized in such a way that we don't only get these reports when there's a crisis, that we get this information on a regular basis.

And so we're kind of moving down one track to revamp the Committee that did that in the past, and that effort is not aimed in any way at targeting anyone in the past, but there appears to have been a broken process. At my very first meeting here in the Senate last Fall we were supposed to look at a report that that Committee produced, and the Committee would not come to discuss that report. We had a recommendation in front of us from the Committee on Committees to eliminate that Committee in an effort to streamline faculty committees. **Jeff** tasked a group that had already been appointed to recommend some Bylaws changes. That was Karen **Breitbach**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Jesse **Swan**, and myself. **Jeff** then tasked that Committee, which had already been appointed, to also look at the committee restructuring issue. And so we had this recommendation in front of us from the Committee on Committees to eliminate the Budget Committee.

We also had a Budget Committee which wouldn't show up to defend its own report or clarify its own report, so we were about this far from eliminating the Budget Committee when we decided that's really not the right thing to do. That's not a very smart thing to do right now. And we decided to take another stab at it to try to get a Budget Committee proposal through in some form. And that's what we talked about last week, and that's the Committee that's kind of headed down the road of

being an advisory committee to the Senate with a clearer structure and a more clarified charge.

The other thing that's going on is that the Administration seems open to developing some process where faculty members, possibly among others on campus, would participate in the budgeting process in some way, and so we are exploring that with them. Initially, we were going to use our Budget Committee proposal to sort of—and “demand” might be too strong a word—but to say if faculty want a seat at that table, the Administration's now approached us and said, “We want you to have a seat at that table,” and so we're exploring that option right now with them in a small group to figure out what we even need to do. We are going to summarize each of the meetings, put them out, distribute them. I mean, as far as I'm concerned they can be distributed widely across campus. Vice-President **Hager** said—in fact, his first words to us when he opened the meeting were, “President **Allen** and I want to decide a more-inclusive and transparent budgeting process.” So that's kind of what's going on right now. There's no qualifications or requirements. There's no telling what that process will look like at this point, and there are no qualifications or requirements of who can and can't be on it.

The last thing I'll just say, sort of along with your comments, is that I have heard President **Allen** say, I think most directly in a breakfast meeting that he had with some Senators and some other folks on campus last Fall, that for whatever reason—I mean, I don't know the reasons, I suspect it's advice from legal counsel, but I could be wrong—that when you get into issues where the Budget would be discussed to a level of specificity of benefits and salaries and things like that, that this is for the collective bargaining process and that it can only take place in the context of collective bargaining and bargaining on the Master Agreement. And so for that reason he thinks this should be done through the Faculty Senate, not through UF. “This” meaning any advice on the Budget. That's kind of what I can report.

DeSoto: Ok, I have to address that point.

Funderburk: I'll give you about 30 seconds, and then we need to move on since observations of the President's feelings are the President's feelings.

Peters: I can just tell you that's what I heard—I understood him to say. That's all I can really say.

DeSoto: Well, the way that the law is, of course, is that, yes, there are certain mandatory topics of bargaining that cannot be bargained from people who are not the certified collective bargaining agent. But as far as that precluding members of United Faculty—active members of United Faculty—from being on the Committee, that would actually follow in the opposite direction. So, if there's concern that you're going to be touching on things that might be collective bargaining, then it would only be helpful, and not the other way, to have someone from United Faculty knowledgeable about those boundaries be there. That's all.

Funderburk: Ok. Great. There will be plenty more Budget talk, as Secretary **Peters** mentioned. We're doing that as well. Thanks.

DeSoto: Thank you for allowing me.

Funderburk: Also, I asked Registrar **Patton** to join us to talk about where we stand with recruiting for next year and early signing of contracts and things since there's been a little chat around different places on campus. I want to thank him very much for agreeing on exceedingly short notice this morning to join us. I don't know if you just want to say something first, but welcome back.

Patton: It's good to be back. It's nice to see all your familiar faces. If you don't mind, I did put some notes together pursuant of what **Jeff** indicated in his e-mails, so I thought I'd just do that first and then open up to any questions you might have.

First of all, I will talk about enrollment forecasting, which is one of the things that **Jeff** mentioned in his first e-mail to me, and I wanted to indicate to you it is a very inexact science, but it's based on factors such as the gross

applications—that means total number of applications received; the admitted applications—those of that gross number that are admitted; housing contracts; orientation registrations; and, of course, advanced registration of current students. Forecasting tends to have more clarity as these various elements kind of come into confluence, and that tends to happen about in the period of mid-May to the first of June. That’s when we get housing contracts. We’ve gone through advanced registration, so those various factors come into play at the same time.

Influences on enrollment vary from year to year, but they can include such things as recruiting and expanded or new emerging markets. Obviously, the National and State economy, curricular additions and deletions, academic and athletic success, faculty efforts in recruitment and retention, public perception based on media coverage, public perception based on off-campus community and educational involvement.

I’ll give you some information as of April first, which is when some of this information was first pulled out. Freshman and transfer applications are tracking right on line with historic averages, with the exception of 2011. Two thousand eleven [2011] has what’s called a “bounce effect” into it. Some of you may remember that in 2010 the basketball program had quite a success. Those kind of things create a national exposure and very typically create a bounce effect in applications in the next year. So if you take that number out, or that year out of consideration, the lines are almost tracking exactly on top of each other in terms of transfer and transfer applications over the last several years.

Admitted freshmen, as of this year, are ahead 481 over last year. And they are ahead of our final number of students. They exceed our September 1st count by 306. Admitted students of all types are ahead by 191, as of this date. Admitted graduate students are down from last year but likely reflect, at least I feel to some extent, on the delay of awarding graduate assistantships. Graduate enrollment of full-time students is, of course, very dependent on the awarding of assistantships. Forty-nine [49] undergraduate students were admitted to programs that were curtailed. All of those students have been contacted, and most have expressed

interest in changing to alternate academic programs. Advanced registration of currently enrolled students is one week ahead of last year, and therefore I have no comparative data to give you. We're just into that process. As you all know, we're basically right in the middle of the juniors right now. But that process started a week earlier this year than last year.

As of today, our enrollment forecasting models show an expected Fall enrollment between 13,150 and 13,225. Our enrollment last year was 13,168, so we are right in the middle of that number. That forecast changes on a daily basis, based on number of applications received, those admitted, registration, and several other factors.

What can you do now to have an effect upon and potentially impact Fall enrollment? 1) Continue to assist your students with their registration for Fall. 2) Be in contact with your admitted students for the Fall, supporting their interest in attending UNI, and provide information to those students about admission and enrollment and the majors and minors and the availability of class spaces. Just some general comments about where we stand in forecasting. With that I'll just open it to any questions you might have and see if I can answer them.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: What was the size of the 2011 bump in terms of students who actually came—converted students?

Patton: The conversion did not take place.

DeBerg: So we had no more students?

Patton: The bump was there in applications but not in enrollment.

DeBerg: Ok. Thanks.

Patton: That's not unusual either, if you think about it. You are getting a bump based on people in a lot of cases who don't know you or have not

been in your traditional markets, but you've gotten that national publicity, so they show an interest. But they're not in historical trends that equate to actual attendance in the end.

DeBerg: Thank you for clarifying that.

Patton: Sure, **Betty**.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I was wondering if you see over the longer term a trend of concern because of the demographics in the State, the declining population in high schools? Do you think that's going to be a significant issue say 5 years out? Do you have any sense of that?

Patton: Well, you're running on trends that peak at about that 5-year period actually, **Jerry**, in terms of declining enrollment. About 5 years out, it starts actually going up a little bit. But what you have to look at is, of course, your yield of admitted students. You have to look at things such as what is the number of students in high school who go on to college? If that percentage is increasing, then your market share is higher, ok? So now you have to look at your market share against that population. Our primary competitor, as you know, is Iowa State University, so as we work or battle with them on in-state yield, what we do in recruitment and retention of those students is very important, so all you need to do is increase your market share a little bit and you've made up that gap. Of course, you also know we're doing expanded efforts in out-of-state recruitment, particularly in some neighboring states like Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois. And we have expanded efforts in International students as well.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: So the projection is based on things like deposits, housing deposits, things like that? And based on what you've seen so far, they're in line with last year?

Patton: That's right. This model takes into those considerations of applications, admitted, housing, etcetera. And it's tracking right now that our enrollment would be someplace very similar to last year—slightly down, slightly up, a plus or minus 50 or so area. Now, I say that with one admonition that I have to give to all academic departments, to Admissions, and to everybody else. There's still a long ways to go until we do our official count 10 days into the Fall semester, and some of the things that will influence that final count is what we do now in terms of working with our current students in advising and course availability and what we do with our new classes of students coming in, working with them in terms of advisement, encouraging them to continue with their interest in UNI right through to the actual start.

Peters: Actually, I thought of one more thing. I've heard a couple of people around campus talking about Iowa State's having a model of financial aid where they, within 48 hours of admission, they have a financial aid package ready to go, and when people that are on campus talk about that they always talk about it in the context that this might be an advantage they have over us, that our system isn't set up to give financial aid packages that quickly. Can you talk a little bit about that? Is that true? Has Iowa State shifted in that direction, and are we finding that difficult to compete with?

Patton: To be very honest with you, I'm charting into unknown waters for me, ok?

Peters: Ok.

Patton: But the 48 hours has to do with admissions not with financial aid. See? Because remember financial aid is very dependent upon federal cycles as to when you file your FAFSA [Free Application for Federal Student Aid], your free application for financial aid, as to when that all gets awarded and verified. Typically, awarding goes out usually by most colleges starting someplace in the March time period, so that applicant in November may have heard within 2 weeks that they were admitted. It's still probably not likely to get their true financial aid package until after they've filed their

federal income tax, etcetera, and you get the expected family contribution information from the federal government. True in admissions. Not so true in financial aid.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Patton: Hi, **Deb**.

Gallagher: Hi. How are alternative models such as high school students taking community college classes, the students who do their first two years at the community colleges, and online education programs affecting this? And how do you see that trending?

Patton: Oh, boy. That's really a toughie. We continue to see more and more high school students taking college credit. I won't say any percentage, because whatever I say will be wrong, but it's increasing every year. Primary focus, we have State initiatives sponsored by the State to push for early completion, so we're seeing what's called Senior Year Plus, which was the legislation a couple years ago, actively encouraging community colleges to be teaching more onsite in the schools or providing online education. Online gets to be a more prominent environment both for profit and for not-for-profit institutions, just as we work to engage more online education as well. Enrollment in community colleges oftentimes is very dependent on economic issues, and as the economy continues to sputter, to be flat, or to improve, will help influence students as to whether they feel they need to stay in their local community for a year or two and get their associates degree and then transfer or feel they can come to a Regents' University immediately upon high school graduation. I would anticipate from what you said the only trend that I think I could probably say with some reasonable level of confidence is that we will continue to see more and more high school students coming to universities with credit they have earned while they are still in high school.

Funderburk: Any other questions or comments? Senator **East**.

East: So what do you do? Do you or Admissions forward applications to departments where people have expressed an interest in students who have expressed interest?

Patton: At the graduate level. At the undergraduate

East: So, you said what we could do is contact applicants and advise them of classes, etcetera. Are you talking about graduate students only there, or undergraduates, or....?

Patton: It's a mix. The graduate students that you have that probably might still be in the application stage, that's one group that haven't been formally admitted through your Department, encouraging their—if you're still interested in looking at them, and that when you invite them to make decisions and when you are going to be awarding scholarships, all that kind of stuff. Very encouraging. As you know, graduate students are far later applicants than the undergraduates. Undergraduate students is that you may have some information about people who have expressed interest that some departments are a little bit more active than others in working with Admissions in getting lists of prospective students. But also the list of students you may have now who have been admitted to the University who have interest in your academic field, that you can contact them now and say, "Here we are as faculty. We know that you've been admitted to the University. We know you've expressed interest in our Department. Here we would like to reinforce what we as a Department can provide for you."

East: Ok. So there's a difference between people who apply and those who are admitted.

Patton: Correct.

East: Those who are admitted. You have some notion of where they're interests lie?

Patton: Yes, what they've indicated on their application.

East: Those are available or are automatically forwarded to or what, to departments?

Patton: It all depends a little bit on the department. Some departments have routine communications with these groups of students, and others don't. But you can have that communication at any time by contacting the Office of Admissions. They can provide you that information.

Kirmani: So the Office of Admissions will give us the list of those?

Patton: Absolutely.

Kirmani: I see.

Patton: And happy to do so.

Gibson: Do you have any information on transfer students, because I know last year our number of transfer students went down a tad? Do you have a sense of how that's looking?

Patton: All I've seen so far is the application of transfers, and they are trending on a flat line in comparison to the last 2-3 years. So, at this stage we would say they would be about the same numbers.

Funderburk: No further questions? Well, thank you very much for joining us today. [other voices expressing thanks]

Patton: Thank you. You're welcome. It's been nice to be here.

Funderburk: I appreciate it. The information will help. I have a few brief comments since our "comments" got fairly long-winded already. A reminder about our Retreat with President **Allen** and Provost **Gibson**. That's Monday, April 30th at 3:30 in this room. That's the Monday of exam week. The other Retreat is in the works and pretty well solidified. I'll be sending you stuff on ONLYSenators.

Nuss: I think it's in the University Room [on the 30th].

Funderburk: Ok. As I said, it's in the University Room [laughter] on Monday. As long as you get close to here, you can figure it out from there. The meeting last week of the Budget Process Workgroup that was alluded to here, organized by Vice-President **Hager**, was a very good meeting. I might note that two out of three of the faculty members representing the Senate were, in fact, UF members. We covered a great deal of ground and agreed to meet again in approximately 2 weeks. The discussion was entirely related to creating a process that would be more transparent and offer more opportunity for faculty input.

My apologies for the changes to the Agenda for today. There were some issues with getting all materials available on the website that were easier to resolve by creating new numbers [calendar and docket], so hopefully these caused minimal confusion. In the end, the items are still being handled in the order they were posted and should be easier to track in the future on the website. We have limitation of only 4 attachments to any one petition item, and I hit that unfortunately and couldn't find a work-around.

One other change for today, which is what Senator **Peters** alluded to. At the request of the ad hoc committee charged with Bylaws revision, following the regular docketed items, the Chair will entertain a motion to move to a quasi committee of the whole in order to discuss the work they are doing on restructuring the Senate's Budget Committee. The ad hoc committee would like additional input from the Senate. So, those are my comments for today.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Do we have any additions or corrections on the Minutes of March 26th? Sherry [**Nuss**] had nothing. Is there anything from the floor? Hearing nothing, we'll assume those are accepted by acclamation.

COMMENT FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Breitbach: May I make a comment?

Funderburk: Yes, go ahead. Sorry. I didn't think you had any comments.

Breitbach: It's not really a comment, but next Thursday I have to be in Mason City at NIAAC for the Iowa Academy of Science Annual Meeting. I'm on the Board. I have a meeting, but I also have the Facilities Planning [Advisory Committee] meeting that afternoon at 3:30. Is there a Senator that would be willing to go in my place to that meeting as the Senate representative? They meet usually in Sabin in one of the conference rooms. They usually last about an hour. Free cookies.

Edginton: I'm also a member of that Committee. I haven't been able to go to that Committee as a representative of the Senate because of the conflict.

Breitbach: Yeah. I've missed two meetings because of other conflicts, and I don't like skipping meetings when I'm a rep.

DeBerg: I'm out of town. Otherwise I'd do it.

Terlip: What time is it again?

Breitbach: At 3:30. Ian [**Goldsmith**], you're on that Committee as well.

Goldsmith: Uh huh. I believe we are actually touring the Commons that day, so we would be meeting in the Commons to tour their facilities to look at the _____ renovations and _____.

Breitbach: I didn't know that, because I was unable to make the last meeting because of another meeting.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Did I hear you correctly it's on a Thursday?

Breitbach: It's next Thursday, not this Thursday, but next Thursday. [voices clarifying the date] The 19th, at 3:30. I would forward the Agenda and the Minutes from the former meeting, if you can do that.

DeBerg: I'll do it. I can do it.

Breitbach: Thank you, **Betty**.

DeBerg: I used to be on that Committee. I kind of miss those guys.

Breitbach: It's very, very interesting. I love seeing what's going on around campus. It's a great Committee, great people, and I feel bad that I've had to miss a couple of meetings.

DeBerg: Where do they meet?

Goldsmith: Usually in Sabin. Next Thursday, we're meeting actually in the Commons, though. We're taking a tour of the Commons.

Breitbach: Thank you, **Ian**.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1132 for Docket #1028, Motion to Discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science

Funderburk: Ok, so moving on ahead to Items for Docketing. 1132, a Motion to Discharge the Advisory and Liaison Committee to the Department of Military Science. Do we have a motion to docket?

DeBerg: I'll move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg** in regular order. Second Senator **Smith** [who indicated]. Discussion on docketing this item? All those in favor, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [one heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Motion passes.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1133 for Docket #1029, EPC recommendations: Academic Grievance Policy (previously 1085/983), request docketing for April 16th

Funderburk: 1133, EPC recommendations regarding Academic Grievance Policy, previously Calendar Item 1085, Docket 983. The request for docketing is for the 16th on our EPC Day. All the policy you want all the time. [laughter around] Senator **Breitbach** [who indicated]. Do we have a second for that?

Dolgener: Second.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**. Any discussion?

East: Regular order?

Funderburk: No, it will be on the 16th.

East: On the 16th.

Funderburk: A week from today. That’s when we are doing all the policy issues so they can come here in force. Ok? All those in favor, say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Motion passes.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1134 for Docket #1030, EPC recommendations regarding the petition on co-curricular activities policy (referred to EPC 12/12/11 as 1105/1003), EPC recommends amending Attendance Policy (1066/964), request docketing for 041612

Funderburk: 1134, EPC recommendations regarding the petition on co-curricular activities policy. We referred that to the EPC on December 12th as 1105/983 [sic, 1003]. The EPC's way of dealing with this was to make a recommendation that we amend the Attendance Policy, and they also request we discuss that on the 16th as well. So, do we have a motion to docket on the 16th? Senator **Breitbach** [who indicated]. Second from Senator **Smith** [who indicated]. Discussion or questions? All those in favor, "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [none heard] And abstentions? [none heard] Very good.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1135 for Docket #1031, LAC Review Procedures for 2012-13

Funderburk: 1135, LAC Review Procedures for 2012-13. As you recall, we voted to suspend LAC reviews, so the request was to come in for a discussion about what the plans are on how to proceed the following year on that. Is there a motion on 1135? Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Regular order.

Peters: Second.

Funderburk: Second, Senator **Peters**. Discussion or questions on that? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, the Director of the Liberal Arts Core is going to come in to discuss that, is that right? And is there now further material on the web?

Funderburk: There's none on the web yet. I understand that that will be forthcoming.

Swan: So, before the discussion occurs, there will be the appropriate material that we are docketing?

Funderburk: There will be—right.

Swan: And then the Director will come in to discuss that.

Funderburk: And with these later ones, I had to warn people I'm not really sure that they will get to us this year. So if it's important, I told them to go ahead and submit something so we can get you in the docket line-up at least.

Swan: So, if the material isn't forthcoming and we've docketed it, what happens?

Funderburk: The material will be forthcoming, I'm sure.

DeBerg: We could always table it.

Funderburk: The issue is it's still in works. It could be set now, but if it's not going to be for a month, there's no real point. If it's not going to be taken up until the Fall, we don't want to put things up there that aren't fully ready yet. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I'm not sure that there would be a ton of material related to that. I suspect that the Director of the Liberal Arts Core could actually talk us through the proposal and what's been done.

Funderburk: And there is some verbiage up there about this already.
Senator **Swan**

Swan: That sounds like a consultative session, which would be a very good thing perhaps to have for this, and that might be a better way to proceed, especially if material isn't prepared already.

Funderburk: I believe that's in essence what is intended by this without using the actual word.

Swan: Well, I'd rather schedule a consultative session.

Funderburk: I'm ok with that. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I just have a question. If it is a consultative session, then would we need to formally approve whatever comes out of that, or does the Senate approve the LAC Review Procedures?

Funderburk: My assumption is that in large part they are trying to communicate more information to us so that we know going forward what the new way of doing the LAC reviews will be prior to the LAC Committee's getting involved in doing. So, as I've understood it, it will be more in relation to some possible review processes, student outcomes numbers, and getting those processes working.

Terlip: I was just curious if since it is an important curricular matter whether we approve that or not.

Funderburk: I think we do, but I'm not sure. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I think DeeDee **Heistad** will be asking the Senate to kind of endorse—similar to what we did last year—endorse kind of the next step forward in revising the Review Procedures and particularly the development of outcomes assessment and the way that's going to incorporate into it, and I think she wants—and, again, this is something that's a transitional thing—I think she wants us to kind of—she wants to make us aware of what the LACC is doing and in this transitional stage as we move towards enveloping much more adequate outcomes assessments and potentially down the road making revisions in the program itself.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: And that's my understanding of what I read from what's online right that the Director has asked whether or not we do typically approve or not. The Director is asking us to endorse something. That something, though, isn't there, and she does want to talk to us, and that's why I think the consultative session is better, and I'm understanding Senator **Terlip** to say, but then we won't be endorsing anything out of a consultative session. It would be forthcoming after that. Or we will get the material that she is asking us to endorse ahead of time; we could study it; have the regular time and vote whether or not to endorse it. But she is asking us to endorse something whether or not that's a typical procedure.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I think given the conversation we had a couple of weeks ago about outcomes assessment and the concern about establishing some of those goals and things, the Senate needs to weigh in on that before—I don't want to approve procedures before we have the goals that we're trying to assess.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**

Smith: I think the procedures are to develop the goals. I think that's--the next step forward is working with people in the different categories to actually develop goals for the categories that will then drive the assessment process within the category. So the procedure that's being done is actually—what she's, I think, going to present is, "Here's the way we want to go to do this. Are you comfortable with this? Are you onboard with it and happy with it?" And get the Senate's ideas on whether there should be something changed or not.

Funderburk: Any other discussion? The motion was made and seconded to docket in regular order. All those in favor, say "aye." [ayes heard all

around] All those opposed? [one heard] Abstentions? [none heard]
Motion passes. Docketed in regular order.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1136 for Docket #1032, Report of findings
from the University Writing Committee

Funderburk: 1136, the Report on the Findings of the University Writing Committee. Do we have a motion on that? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Regular order. Second? Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. Discussion on this one? All those in favor of docketing in regular order, say “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Motion passes.

East: I have a question.

Funderburk: Sir. Senator **East**.

East: Do we have any notion of how far we’re going to get next time at this meeting?

Funderburk: On the 16th?

East: Yeah. For instance,

Funderburk: Well, given the stamina of many of our speakers, I really don’t. [loud laughter around]

East: What I’m wondering is—I mean, I presume that we might want to inform the LAC folks and the Writing Committee folks that some amount of time, some perhaps unknown amount of time, will be taken up on

Funderburk: I've told both of them that I find it—I mean, it's even remote that we'll get to them this year. So I have alerted them that I hope we'll get that far, but I don't anticipate us doing that next week. The policy issues before us are pretty big. There's 3—well, because we already docketed another one on the 16th, if you'll recall that.

Peters: And the Budget.

Funderburk: And then we have the Budget as well on that day, so we have a Grievance Policy, Academic Ethics Policy, the Attendance Policy, and the Budget Committee.

Terlip: What about the President's Review?

Funderburk: The President's Review is on the 23rd. It should be drying on the 16th. Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I just had one question on 1133, and I finally realized what I needed to do to get that to show up up there [on projection screen]. Had we already docketed the Ethics Policy, so this is just the Grievance Policy?

Funderburk: The other one was already docketed. Right. The materials when it came to me, I thought they were new, and then when I looked in fact it was the same thing we had already posted and already docketed.

Peters: Thank you.

Funderburk: Ok? Are we all clear on that then? But, yes, I am going to warn them not to plan to be here on the 16th, or if so, to come very late.

East: Is there any way to also sort of put that on the Agenda so that other faculty who might be interested know that?

Funderburk: Well, my intention with that Agenda was only to list the EPC and the Budget things, because we have 4 things for just that date. And

then whatever new shows up this week, especially because technically that's a "special" meeting that week.

East: Ok. Right. Great. Very good.

Funderburk: Good. Good questions.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1027, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST, ANNETTE **SWANN**, TEACHING DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE 12/21/11 (**TERLIP/SWAN**)

Funderburk: Ok. 1131/1027, Emeritus Status Request from Annette **Swann**, Teaching Department. Motion to endorse? Senator **Terlip** [who indicated]. Second Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Discussion? Testimonials? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: My acquaintanceship with Professor **Swann** was actually she was teaching my son in arts in elementary school, and it was the first time he respected what a dissertation was, because she showed him slides from her dissertation in art in the Elementary Ed. class. And so he learned a big word that he then applied. [laughter around] So, she worked very well with the kids and was active there and should be recognized for that work.

Funderburk: Others? Those in favor of endorsing the application for emeritus status, say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok.

OLD BUSINESS

Funderburk: So, the Chair will entertain a motion to move into a quasi committee of the whole to discuss the Budget. [voices moving] **Swan** and **DeBerg**, I'll call it that way. All those in favor, "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Very good. Senator **Peters** or one of the others, do you want to kind of

start the discussion on that? I think everyone received the note on the ONLYSenators list about some of this discussion, correct? I'm seeing some acknowledgement, so I guess it did get there even if not everybody looked at it.

Peters: Sure, I guess I can try to summarize things. As I mentioned earlier when Professor DeSoto was here, given the Senate's discussion last week, there seemed to be pretty broad agreement about two different needs of the faculty and the Senate regarding budgeting: the need for the Senate to get information so that it can effectively do oversight, and the need for some kind of increased consultation participation in the budgeting process. And it certainly seemed at last week's meeting like a lot of Senators felt that those two functions perhaps couldn't be fulfilled by the same body.

And, of course, since we first made this proposal—I mean, it's been probably 6 weeks since the thing went up to be docketed, other events have occurred. Most recently, this being approached by Vice-President **Hager** about devising a brand new budgeting process for the University, and he wants faculty input in that, so as our [ad hoc Budget] Committee met last Friday, we felt that the consultation and participation part is maybe being explored. We're kind of looking into that on one angle, and so maybe the Senate at the moment while keeping apprised of what's going on there, obviously, and being fully informed about that, with this Budget Committee Proposal we should focus on the oversight/information function.

And that led to 3 different things that the [ad hoc Bylaws Committee] wanted feedback on so that we can try to craft some language that we could get passed next week. First, the existing [Faculty Senate Budget] Committee, which this [new Senate Budget] Committee would replace—I guess, would update and replace—the charge for that [original] Committee is vague. The current charge is: “Develops University Faculty Senate positions on University Budget issues.” So, one thing we would like to know is what do we want this Senate [sic, Committee] to do? Is there specific information we want? What do we want this Committee to do? Excuse me. Is there specific information we want from the Committee? Do

we want the Committee to report to the Senate on a regular basis? Do we want the Committee to report on specific things? Are there specific goals that the Senate wants to pursue? I attended Professor **Bunsis**'s talk. Are there specific goals in terms of shifting a larger share of the University's expenses to academics, for example? That's just something that came to mind, but is there some goal like that that we want to focus on? So that's one thing that we want feedback on in terms of the Committee's charge.

So we want to just go question by question?

Funderburk: That's fine. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I assume we're talking about the oversight, what I would call the "communication/explanation function."

Peters: Yeah.

Smith: First off, I'm not sure that that should even be a committee. It seems to me that that role could be filled by an individual, who in essence was a liaison between the faculty and the Administration on budgetary matters. I mean, very much the same way, for instance you and I might have a liaison with the Legislature in Des Moines. You want somebody who is trusted by both parties and who can be relied on and understands—I mean, Cathy **DeSoto**'s right, the person has to understand things and so can be trusted to present to the faculty a fair account of the University's financial condition, a lot like what Mr. **Bunsis** did. Maybe he's a little more partisan than we want here, but somebody that both sides could trust to be giving--as an honest broker for information. And like I say, I'm not sure that that takes a committee. One person might be able to do that very well. And the key there is that the person would not be a partisan, that they would be trusted to understand both sides and communicate, basically to facilitate communication so we don't have the problem that we've had recently where faculty aren't really sure about the University's financial condition, and you hear this, "Oh, we could have—we didn't have to have any of those layoffs." And then you hear other things, "Oh, we had to do this, that, the other." We'd like to have somebody that really knew their

stuff and could say, “Yeah, here’s how it stands.” That at least is my view of things. “Here’s how things stand.”

And if there are questions, then that person could go to the Administration and relative parties and answer the questions. The person could also undertake analyses at the request of the Senate, to, “Hey, what do our peer institutions look like on some of these things? What could be done? Is this reasonable in terms of that there are shifts from faculty to administrative costs? What’s really happening there?” So, they could do special analyses.

In terms of annual reporting, I would think that that person could be expected to make an annual report on the financial state of the University and on how, you know, maybe budget things are developing based on what comes out of Des Moines, stuff like that. But, for me, the key is to have kind of an honest information broker. That’s what I would look for in that position. And, again, I don’t necessarily think it has to be a committee.

Funderburk: I’ve got Senator **Terlip**, Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Breitbach**.

Terlip: I agree we need information. I [don’t] agree it should be an individual. I think it should be multiple individuals, because multiple people look at the same numbers differently, and I think a committee would be more representative of various aspects of the faculty on campus. I think we can certainly find people who are qualified to do that. And I would argue that an annual report is not often enough. I would expect that we would have those folks talk to us on a more regular basis and that we could charge them with finding the answers to stuff if we needed it so that—that would be a lot of work for one person, and if you had multiple people who were capable to work on it, I think it would work much better. I also think it would reflect shared governance on our part better, so I would strongly want someone who knows what they’re doing and understands the numbers, but I want a committee.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I echo Senator **Terlip**. To me it would be a disaster to have it be a single person. I think it's always a good idea to not meet alone with Administration. To always take a second person in. And I think it's a lot of work. So I would like it to be an oversight committee. I would like it to be elected, and I would like them to give regular reports to the Senate and be open to requests for information that the Senate might have need of.

Peters: Can I just ask, elected by whom? Do you have a preference there?

DeBerg: It could be either the Senate or At Large. I guess I kind of like At Large.

Swan: Can I ask a question there?

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**, do you care?

Breitbach: No, go ahead.

Swan: Just for the committee's work, right? So, one of the things, and I don't remember who on the [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee was saying about election versus appointments, right? Because right now the Committee's suggestion is to have Colleges take care of the supply.

DeBerg: That would be fine.

Swan: And then if a College wanted to elect, it could elect. But if another College wanted to appoint, they could appoint. That is fine or not fine?

DeBerg: I don't know what the Bylaws say.

Peters: The proposal right now, I honestly can't remember at the moment if the current proposal says, "Appointed by the College Senate," or "Selected by the College Senate." That's going to be important to make clear. If it says, "Appointed by the College Senate," obviously that's one thing. If it says, "Selected by the College Senate,"

Swan: I think that the [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee was leaving it open because different Colleges operate differently and then that changes over time.

Peters: And we could certainly do that.

Swan: Would that be—in CHAS it would probably be elected. Probably, I don't know. But, in another College, it wouldn't. But you said "at large." And that's something—and we did talk about that, right? We said, maybe having all of the positions at large so that you could end up all one College represented, but that was an at large election, right? So we're trying to balance it out. I'm just throwing out some of the [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee discussion to flesh this out.

DeBerg: Well, I would like them elected, not appointed. I think appointing these really important committees is dangerous. I think they need to be elected so that there's no tinge of favorites.

Funderburk: So, to get back on track, I've got Senator **Breitbach**, Senator **East**, and then Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Can I just ask a real quick question as a follow-up?

Funderburk: Yes, very quickly. [light laughter around]

Terlip: Are there multiple-year terms and are they staggered? Is that built into the proposal?

Peters: The original proposal was 3-year terms staggered, but then the next thing we want to talk about is whether maybe we should just view this as a temporary thing for now, with the Senate revisiting it and making changes as necessary, so that would obviously change the length of the term.

Terlip: Well, I think the [new Senate Budget] Committee is going to continue. We need that continuity so they need to be staggered terms.

Funderburk: Senator **Breitbach**

Breitbach: When we talk about an “annual report,” the University’s Budget is enormous and covers everything from ordering toilet paper, you know, to..... I would like see the Senate focus on questions and issues that deal directly with curriculum. I don’t want to receive an annual report on the University’s Budget. I want information about issues that affect curriculum. I want us to focus some specific questions over which we want information gathered, and we want to look at trends and patterns that affect curriculum, because that is what the Senate, that is what the faculty should concern itself with, and I just ended a sentence with a preposition. It just doesn’t feel right when I do that. I just don’t want this big, huge monster annual report, I want us to focus it on what we’re supposed to be focused on—another preposition!

Funderburk: Senator **East** and then Senator **Gallagher** and then Senator **Smith**.

East: My understanding is that we indeed passed a resolution about the Budget Committee last time, right?

Peters: No, we tabled.

East: Resolution on the Senate Budget Committee, we didn’t vote on it and pass it? [many voices saying “no”] Ok. I thought we did. Anyway, of other comments, I have a question about what we refer to as “oversight,” when that was discussed. I don’t see what oversight there is here. It seems to me that that is a poor choice of a word. Oversight I associate with United States Senate committees that are charged with watching how people spend money. We’re not charged with watching out how anybody spends money. We have no authority to make any kind of difference in any of that. So I think it’s a report to the Senate rather than an oversight or a recommendation or something like that.

And with respect to curriculum, I agree somewhat with that notion that we want to get information that is useful that might have some effect on the academic part of the University, but it seems clear to me that spending trends, hiring trends, all of those kinds of things, whether or not we're spending more for toilet paper or less for toilet paper, all of it has an effect on how much is available for academic activity. And so while that's not something I would want to focus on, it seems to me that that's something that we would want to hear about in what's going on with the University Budget as well as money in Emergency Funds and all of those other kinds of things. That, if the University is collecting too much money for health insurance, as was said once upon a time, we should see that, and that means that that has something to do with something else that might be spent elsewhere. So those kinds of things I think are important to us. And I believe it would be useful to have a committee rather than a single individual, and this committee to me is the Senate's Budget Committee. It's not a committee that we worry about whether or not they're going to get along with Gloria [**Gibson**, Provost] because they don't—we're not interested in them getting along with **Gloria**. We do want somebody to get along with **Gloria**.

Gibson: Thank you. [laughter all around]

East: And we would like them to be involved in the budgeting process as much as she would allow them to be, but I think that's a different entity than what we're talking about here. So I think our [Senate] Budget Committee needs to have knowledge. They need to have credibility, and certainly they need to be objective as academics are supposed to be and should be able to not focus in on the single issues. So having the Budget Committee have a goal of addressing the issue about alternative—Athletics and all of those folks [voices offering the word “auxiliaries”] is if that's a task force not a Budget Committee that you have meet annually. But these people should recommend things to us. They should be prepared to recommend things to the Administration or whatever budgeting process they have. They may see something that others don't see, and so I think we should get information wherever we can get it, but it seems to me that

this Committee is a committee that we want to inform the Senate and to find out things for the Senate.

Swan: The [ad hoc Bylaws] Committee would like to ask Senator **East** something.

Funderburk: Very briefly. I've got Senator **Gallagher**, Senator **Smith**, and Senator **Wurtz**.

Swan: If you have a view, perhaps you don't, but perhaps you do, on electing versus appointing? Do you have a view on that Senator **East**? The [Senate Budget] Committee as being proposed, and we're really talking about the proposal that was postponed from last time, and right now it's being handled by each College. And so now in the discussion one thing that we're thinking about is appointment versus requiring that elections occur. Do you have a view on that?

East: I think the best form of government is benevolent dictatorship, which means you should appoint people who are going to be benevolent dictators and know what they're doing. But I suspect that that doesn't often work. So I suppose—what is it they say? Democracy is worse than all? Worse than all of the others or better than all of the others? [laughter all around] Well, anyway. It works. So we'll probably end up electing them.

Funderburk: Senator Egghead. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Is there a compromise in here somewhere that it doesn't get too big, maybe 2, maybe 3, because I understand, Laura [**Terlip**], your point about everybody sees things through a particular lens and all this talk of objectivity is nice. I think people who discipline themselves to be non-partisan. Not everybody does. But there's no objectivity anywhere, so, you know, it is important that we have multiple perspectives, but we can get to the point where, and I think we already have on this campus—I mean, Karen [**Breitbach**]'s problem with not being able to get to places. We've intensified things so that everybody's running pillar to post. Is there some

way that we can have a very well-informed—and we’re not going to find that many well-informed people who are competent in this area anyway. It’s not as if they are a dime a dozen. So, can we think about a [Senate Budget] Committee of 2 or 3 that reflects some sense of what Jerry [Smith] was saying? I just thought I’d ask.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**, Senator **Wurtz**.

Smith: Yeah, I mean, I think that there may be workload issues that might justify more than one person, but in terms of the advocacy thing, you know, again the assumption is we’re talking about two bodies here. One is communication/information/explanation. The other is advocacy. The other is getting into the budget process and putting what the faculty feel are its priorities for this University. On the communication/information side, if there is bias there—you try to pick somebody that is neutral—but if there is bias, that gets sorted out in the discussions between the Administration on one side and the faculty on the other. And if the Senate didn’t find this person to be an honest broker, they’d say, “Well, ok, fine. We’ll get somebody else to do it.”

Workload issues would justify having more than one person, and as Deb [Gallagher] says, it’s going to be difficult to find people who aren’t partisan to do this kind of stuff, who have the expertise but who aren’t partisan.

And so on the issue of appoint versus elect, I’d feel strongly about appoint because I think when you elect you go to—I mean, the language that was used is “Oh, we gotta let the different Colleges, the faculty from these different groups, do stuff.” That right away makes it partisan, almost automatically. You can tell people all you want that you want somebody to be honest, but there’s going to tend to be partisanship. I would trust this Body to be less partisan than the faculty as a whole, and that’s what you need for this position.

So, again, I still think that you could do it with one person as liaison if you found the right person. Maybe there isn’t such a person, but the key is to

have somebody who is trusted by both sides and who is not a partisan. Partisanship goes in the other group.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: Yes, I agree with Senator **East** that what we need is information, that none of us, or maybe one or two of us, right now are qualified to look at all of that massive amount of Budget information and know what it says. Many of us were at the presentation last week where there was just this hoard of information put in front of us, and even the speaker himself would say from time to time, “Well, we don’t really know what’s in that figure.” But he’d come to a conclusion anyway. And so if we need to know what’s in that figure, we need someone who will take the time to find out what was in that figure.

And there are reasonably non-partisan accounting standards and people can learn. We don’t necessarily have to bind the person or the 3 people, but if we are looking at setting up a group of people to meet our needs as a Senate for clarifying the understanding of “What does that number mean on the Budget? What’s counted there?” these people can be trained to be able to do that. So we’ll send 3 people off of our selection, because we really do have to pick people that care enough to go through the training. It is a huge workload, being able to look at Budget figures and know what was counted, and what are the different ways it could be counted, which way was chosen for this. That is a specialized body of expertise. We’re not going to find those people by just electing.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yeah, the more I think about this—and, of course, this was the Bylaw Committee that morphed into a Budget Committee that is sort of the Go-fer Committee, I think, now [light laughter] You know, but we’re not complaining too much. When I listen to some of these different arguments, and in one sense I incline towards Jerry [**Smith**]’s argument in the sense that this is a ton of information. If we could find an honest or even somewhat honest or--ok, just a broker, and we worry about the honesty at

that point—that's a huge, huge job. I mean, we have people right now—that person could be a full-time employee of this University, and they still might not get everything done. I'm trying to think what poor individual would—I mean, they'd have to have an ax to grind just to keep themselves going [loud laughter all around and voices commenting], just to motivate you, or they're not going to have that energy. They'd have to have full release. And then who's going to do that?

Part of this is going to hit up against just practical limits. If it's a big group, what will happen is that there will be that sort of "ball falls in fair between 3 outfielders" thing. "Oh, I thought you were going to do that." I mean, you'll get some folks that will do a little bit more work than others, but we'll lose it that way. If we go with one person, we need somebody who's ready for martyrdom. We need somebody that really was going to give up an awful lot, because there's so many different things we'd want to know. Just listening among ourselves right now, we've all got very different ideas of what we'd like these folks doing. And when we met in a smaller group, I think we ran into the same thing. It's like, "Wow, this is two or maybe three different things going on here." Even just the oversight or not oversight, brokerage, whatever, fact-finding, that's a huge, huge task.

So I think one of the things we walked away with as a[n ad hoc Bylaws] Committee was in the short-run maybe we try some experimental measures on this. I certainly think whatever we try, we'll be unhappy with within 6 months to a year's time, almost inevitably, because I don't think we're in agreement right now. I don't feel any agreement here. Let's see how this goes. Fact-finding, let's see what will work, unless we can find some money and then can say, "Hey, this person is our fact-finder."

And then these other sort of diplomatic things that are going on right now, they show some possibility, but to define them right now when we don't know exactly what we're after, I think that, too, has to be experimental. And I think Scott [**Peters**] did a real nice job of trying to put into words what we were trying to grasp—that there are a couple of different initiatives going on here that could possibly be linked together but not necessarily. Maybe linking them right now doesn't make sense. But to a certain extent

we're also kind of coming out of the wilderness on a little bit of this, and I think we've got to find our way on that, we've got to review where we're at, not annually, maybe fairly regularly.

But we're all real good at experiments. I mean, it's what makes us faculty. We like doing experiments, and I would advocate whatever we do here, this should be sort of empirical/experimental, but keep an eye on it. You know, don't start it and walk away and come back to the Bunsen burner 6 months later with "Woo, what burned up?" [light laughter]

So that didn't really end up going anywhere other than the fact that I think that this is a tough situation we've got here, and we could have a [Senate Budget] Committee, and they'll report back in 6 months and say, "Boy, that was insane. I don't know how you guys expected us to do anything." But we really have to be honest with ourselves. This is a tough one.

Funderburk: Ok, we've got 6 minutes left. I've got Senator **Edginton**. There's two more questions also for the meeting.

Edginton: I have a comment on the substance, and I wanted to make a comment on the process also. It seems to me that as I listen to Senators **Smith** and **Neuhaus** make their presentations, we're really talking about staff function, and that we need to be given access to staff resources to dig out the information that we need, and then we need a group of people who can frame whatever the appropriate questions are that need to be framed. So I'm just wondering, you know, in the substance of what you're drafting, Senator **Peters** and **Neuhaus**, that maybe what we ought to look at is something a little bit different in terms of configuration, that, you know, mandates access to staff resources to go in and dig out the information that we need. I don't want anybody working full-time to do this, and then individuals that can ask the critical questions that need to be asked to go in and to have the person dig the appropriate information out.

Second comment that I would make is that as we tabled this last week, there were two issues that were important in my mind. One was that this was a model that had been developed at Iowa State, and we were going to

check with people at Iowa State to see if it was satisfactory. And then second we were going to look for other models at our peer institutions. And so I think as we move forward with this, I think those two expectations are still in place. I'd like you to go to Iowa State. I'd like you to go to our peer institutions and find out what kind of models they're using, you know, to look at budget.

Peters: I may have misunderstood those comments. I took those comments to be more aimed at the part of the original proposal that was on the consultation/participation in the budgeting process part of our original proposal. And in that case, that is part of what Jeff [**Funderburk**] and Hans **Isakson** and I are doing with VP **Hager** and with Bruce **Rieks**. So we are doing that on that side of things. I guess I wasn't sure that we needed to do something like that with the question of just getting information for our Senate.

Edginton: Well, I wonder then if those processes shouldn't be separated completely, because what you're doing with the Vice-President really is not going to be something that's going to be endorsed or not endorsed by this Senate. We're going to have our own process that we're going to put into place.

Funderburk: Can I comment on that also?

Peters: Yeah.

Funderburk: Part of it is just figuring out what the process is and where we have opportunities to plug into that process. So that's where the interface, I think, comes as currently we develop this [Senate] Budget Committee. There's no obvious plug-in of where they can get the information, and so part of what our conversation was about was having this, "What's going on here?" And I thought we had determined this. The printed version of the University's Budget Process is online, and neither had seen it before. So we also need to figure out what the process is currently.

Edginton: Not that withstanding, I'd still like you to go back to Iowa State and make the inquiry, and I'd also like you to look at our peer institutions and see what they're doing, because we may discover that what they're doing is exactly what Senator **Smith** is suggesting.

Funderburk: We did actually specifically ask to look at Iowa State, so they're supposed to be pulling that information for us.

Peters: And so just to be clear, this proposal that we will make next week does, as you said a minute ago—I forget the way you said it—but separate the two issues of sort of consultation on the one hand and just providing information to the Senate on the other. And this proposal will be focused entirely on the providing information angle.

Edginton: At this time.

Peters: At this time. Yes.

Edginton: But we may come back with another one.

Peters: Yes, correct.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: In terms of checking with Iowa State and other institutions, are you guys going to try to actually contact like the Chair of the Senate there or something so that we get direct faculty feedback? Is that the plan?

Peters: We can definitely do that, yeah. I mean, we haven't quite gotten that far yet, but we can do that.

Terlip: I mean, I think you probably could just e-mail them, and they would be willing to share what they do.

Funderburk: Currently, what we're trying to get was the bigger budget process at Iowa State entirely, to get a feel of what that whole process was

over there. But, yes, we can also then go ask the Senate where they plug into it.

Terlip: Or if they have these sorts of committees.

Funderburk: In that sense, there's two different things. This [Budget Process Workgroup] Committee that we were involved in is looking at a bigger issue of Budget than just the Senate. But you're right. That's a good thought.

Terlip: Right, but in terms of they've got to get their information from somewhere, so how do they get it?

Funderburk: Well, the one complicating thing is—I've already had the conversation with them—is a lot of what they [ISU Budget Committee] get we wouldn't be able to get anyway, because we have this UF definition versus Senate, and they're all one. So the discussion about bargaining or anything else all happens with the President of the Senate. And, of course, here we've got this 3-headed government thing to deal with [Senate Chair, Faculty Chair, UF President]. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: One of the other things that occurs to me is that, you know, we can ask them "What is your budget process?" but, you know, if I asked you guys, "What's our budget process?" what would you tell me? [voices commenting and light laughter] Well, yes, but I mean to a certain extent that's an open-ended question in a way. I mean, it might not be. We might get some very different answers, and it certainly would be worth asking, but, you know, maybe part of this, too, is we need to really maybe define what's the parameters? In what sense are you asking, "What's your budget process?" We could ask it in the sense of, "Hey, we notice you have a union on your campus, so you might be a bit like us," and that might be a more useful group to ask. So how do these budget decisions get asked? But part of what we'll get back—maybe to use Phil [**East**]'s end of the business here—whatever we program in, whatever we ask on that, that's what we'll get back. If we don't have something specific, it's hard to know

what we'll get back. We could certainly put out those inquiries, but I'm just wondering what sort of information I get back if I ask all the Senate Chairs.

Funderburk: As the designated referee, I have to point out that we are out of time. So we either need to extend or call to adjourn.

Peters: I move to extend for 5 minutes.

Funderburk: Motion to extend for 5 minutes. Is there a second?

East: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **East**. The motion was made by Senator **Peters**. Discussion? All those in favor of extending for 5 minutes, say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Ok. Extension for 5 minutes.

Peters: Can we—if you don't mind, can we get a sense of the idea of a sort of sunset provision where we would have to—where the Senate would have to revisit this after—my suggestion here was 2 years. So, if we went that way and then I guess probably all the original appointees or electees, however we decide to do it, to the [Senate Budget] Committee would serve 2-year terms. And then at the end of that 2-year term, the Senate would revisit it, look at it, decide what's working/what's not working, look at whatever process has been created to get more involvement in the budgeting process itself and figure out how these things fit together and move forward from there.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**, Senator **East**, and Senator **Terlip**.

Smith: I was just going to suggest that once we decide on the charge, and I think we have the rough outlines, and again a key is getting information and presenting it in a very neutral, non-partisan way, that then we could just basically ask the faculty, ask for volunteers, solicit self-nominations from people. And if you had up to however many, get up to 2 or 3, or 3 if that's—and start out with 3. I don't have a problem with that. And if you

found out over time that it basically was one person doing all the work or only one person had to do it, then you could as part of this review process 2 years down, you could sure go back to

Terlip: You could find you needed more as well.

Smith: Maybe you would find that, that's right.

East: It's not at all clear to me that we're talking about the same thing. I thought at least Scott [**Peters**] and I were on the similar page, but he just talked about the Senate Budget Committee and then he said, "...and the consultation process." And to me, in my head, those are separate things.

Peters: Yes, they are. [other voices agreeing] But what I'm saying is that 2 years from now if, let's assume for the sake of argument—I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. I'm sorry, **Phil**.

East: No, go ahead. Clarification is necessary.

Peters: What I'm saying is that in, say, 2 years from now, let's say that something comes of this group [Budget Process Workgroup] that has only had one meeting at this point with Vice-President **Hager**, and it evolves into some kind of committee that allows faculty for true and meaningful input into the University's planning and budgeting priorities. Now, 2 years from now then maybe what the Senate needs, if that process has developed in that way, maybe what the Senate needs from a Budgeting Committee has changed. Maybe we need different types of information. Maybe we need—I mean, I don't know. And so we would revisit the Senate's Budgeting Committee and say, "All right. Are we still getting what we need out of this Committee?"

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Under the new Bylaws we just passed, we revisit the charge of each committee every year, so we don't have to really think about that.

Peters: That's true. The Committee on Committees is supposed to look at that, that's true.

Terlip: My preference would be to stagger 3-year terms in the sense that, even if you changed the charge, having somebody there that you could revisit the charge after 2 years, but you'd still want some people to continue with whatever and maintain that history. So I think staggered 3-year terms with maybe a number going off after the 2nd year would about be fine, but having folks who knew what worked/what didn't work and that sort of thing would be important.

Funderburk: I believe we are at time again. Do we have to move from [quasi] committee of the whole to adjourn? Or can we adjourn without? [someone indicated] That's what I thought also. Do we have a motion to move from [quasi] committee of the whole?

Dolgener: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**. Is that Senator **Roth** seconding? [who indicated] All those in favor of moving up from the [quasi] committee of the whole back to regular session, say "aye." [ayes hear all around] Opposed? [none heard] Abstentions? [none heard] Very good.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: Now, are there any motions' needs?

Wurtz: I'll give you a motion to adjourn, if the Nominating Committee people will agree to stay for 3 minutes?

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**, motion to adjourn. Is there a second?

Roth: Second.

Funderburk: Senator, whoever that was? [many voices and laughter] I'll call it Senator **Roth**, just because I saw him move anyway. All those in favor, "aye." [ayes hear all around] Opposed? [none heard] Ok. Thanks for another good meeting. See you next week. (5:05 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next special meeting:

Monday, April 16, 2012
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.