

4-25-2011

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 25, 2011

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©2011 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 25, 2011" (2011). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 65.

[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/65](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/65)

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 Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

**Offensive Materials Statement:** Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**04/25/11 (3:18 p.m. - 5:15 p.m.)**

**SUMMARY**

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy announcements included no press present. Provost **Gibson** offered comments on the budget situation. Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered no comments. Chair **Wurtz's** comments included a reminder of this Saturday's informal meeting in CBB 9:00 to noon to discuss reorganization issues.

2. Minutes approved for: 04/11/11 (**Neuhaus/Gallagher**)

3. Docketed from the calendar:

1076 974 University Budget Committee for Discussion, docketed in regular order (**Smith/Neuhaus** with 1 abstention)

1082 980 Request that mid-semester occur at end of 8<sup>th</sup> week both semesters, referred to the Educational Policies Committee (**East/Terlip**)

4. Consideration of docketed items:

1081 979 E-Learning Migration to BBLearn9 alert (**Funderburk/Smith**), request to fund additional training, failed

1079 977 Consultative Session with Athletics Director, Troy **Dannen** (**Soneson/Gallagher**), completed

1077 975 Emeritus Status Request for Virginia S. **Berg**, Biology (**Breitbach/Funderburk**), passed

1078 976 Emeritus Status Request for Fred **Behroozi**, Physics (**Breitbach/Funderburk**), passed

1080 978 Emeritus Status Request for Rheta **DeVries**, Curriculum and Instruction (**Breitbach/Funderburk**), passed

5. New Business

Election of 2011-2012 Faculty Senate Officers

Chair Jeffrey **Funderburk**

Vice Chair Karen **Breitbach**

6. Adjournment at 5:15 p.m.

---

**MINUTES OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
04/11/11  
Mtg. #1696**

**PRESENT:** Megan **Balong**, Karen **Breitbach**, Phil **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Julie **Lowell**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Jerry **Smith**, Jerry **Soneson**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

**Absent:** Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Doug **Hotek**, Michael **Licari**, Michael **Roth**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:18 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

Press were not in attendance.

## COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Provost **Gibson** wanted senators to know that a letter would be released to campus later this week from President **Allen** regarding the budget situation. Each Vice President has received their letter regarding the FY12 budget. She noted some assumptions.

1) That the State appropriation funding will be reduced by an estimated 4%. UNI cannot wait to hear on the certain amount to plan. The House is saying 9%. The Senate is saying 0%. The Governor is saying 6%. UNI officials think it will be in the middle range, so they have chosen 4% as an assumption. It could be less, and it could be more. This reduction to the General Fund is about 2.7%.

2) That enrollment for FY12 will be 13,350 students.

3) That the Faculty Financial Aid, the Early Retirement, and the SIS Project were removed from the base budget before determining the pro-rated amount for the budget deficit. These things were held harmless.

Based on an estimate of a 4% cut of State Appropriations, UNI faces a deficit of \$3.6 million. President **Allen** did allocate the budget reductions differentially, rather than by percentage. This did help Academic Affairs somewhat. The President has allocated some one-time money as bridge money in each case. The amounts are:

1) The President's Office cut will be \$145,000 with a bridge of about \$40,000.

2) Student Affairs' cut will be \$215,000 with a bridge of almost \$60,000.

3) Administration and Financial Services' cut is \$690,000 with a bridge of a little more than \$191,000.

4) Academic Affairs' cut is \$2,550,000 with a bridge of \$708,000.

Bridge money, again, is one-time funding, and the newly drawn-up budgets must show the entire cut assessed for long-term planning. These figures will change if the assumptions change--a different percentage, more or less, in State Allocations, or if enrollment is different.

Based on these assumptions and figures, Provost **Gibson** will make an Academic Affairs budget showing a full cut of \$2.55 million, and she emphasized strongly that the greatest percentage of Academic Affairs' budget is in salaries. Senator **Smith** asked roughly what per cent of her base is that \$2.5 million, and **Gibson** said she could get him that information. She asked, in a spirit of transparency, if there are faculty from the Faculty Senate who are willing to be a sounding board to receive information following council meetings. Decisions will need to be made, and many faculty are not available during the Summer. She will need to let the President know during May how she plans to meet her deficit. She is asking for help and suggested that those willing e-mail her saying they would be available to sit in on discussions. **Smith** clarified that **Gibson** has some ideas in mind but is welcoming other alternative ideas. **Gibson** agreed and reiterated that the cut is \$2.55 million and that the biggest percentage of the budget is in salaries. **Wurtz** and senators agreed that they appreciated the update.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON**

No comments offered.

#### **COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair **Wurtz**'s comments focused the informal session to be held this coming Saturday in Curris Business Building from 9:00 to noon. She will bring homemade cinnamon rolls and will provide coffee. Room to be announced via e-mail.

## BUSINESS

### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

The Minutes for 04/11/11 were distributed electronically for approval for posting. Motion was made to approve the minutes as distributed (**Neuhaus/Gallagher**). Nuss reported receiving no corrections electronically, and no senators today had additions or corrections or discussion. Passed.

### CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

#### Consideration of Calendar Item 1076 974

#### University Budget Committee for Discussion

This Committee's earlier report was returned to the Committee which has submitted a revision of its information for Senate discussion. Motion was made to docket in regular order (**Smith/Neuhaus**). No discussion. Passed with 1 abstention.

#### Consideration of Calendar Item 1082 980

#### Request that mid-semester occur at end of 8<sup>th</sup> week both semesters

Motion to refer to the Educational Policies Commission (**East/Terlip**). No discussion. Passed.

### CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

#### DOCKET #979, E-LEARNING MIGRATION TO BBLEARN9 ALERT

Faculty Chair **Wurtz** reminded those present that the request the Senate received specifically was for a motion for funding for extra training for faculty changing from the present system to the new system. Senator **Funderburk**, who made the motion to docket this request, pointed out that he felt that perhaps the request had some factual inaccuracies, and therefore he wanted ITS to come to the Senate to clarify things from their perspective.

Guest Shashi **Kaparthi**, Director of Institutional Research and Chief Information Officer, thanked the Senate for the invitation and thanked the faculty who use E-learning and wanted to encourage those who have not yet used it to give it a try. He admitted that all software has its downsides, which includes changes due to advancements. The current version of UNI's E-learning software has been used at UNI for 4-5 years, and now there is a newer version with advanced features and where the framework itself has been changed. He then introduced the other ITS guests who accompanied him: Jason **Vetter**, Instructional Designer and Technology Coordinator in Educational Technology Services; Marilyn **Drury**, Director of ITS-Educational Technology; and Jordon **Dierks**, Applications Administrator for UNI's Learning Management System. These 3 and others have been doing many things to help the process of migrating to the newer system, including a series of workshops.

**Drury** noted that quite a few communications have gone out since November 2009 about the upcoming transition. They have been working on the timeline, the transitioning of faculty, testing the system, looking at the new features, the benefits, and so on. They have also been working with LMS Administrators and support staff who have provided feedback on the timeline and the transition. Those decisions have been made as a group to continue on. The license of the current version of CE8 can continue through the next academic year (2011-2012), and then it will expire. At that time the system will not be supported by BlackBoard. As in the past, when the vendor no longer supports the product or software, they begin planning the necessary changes a couple of years in advance. They conducted an online survey as well as a verbal survey of faculty to gather input.

**Vetter** described one of his main jobs as working with the new technology and learning the new technology so that he can teach faculty how to use it in workshops. The faculty migration workshops have begun recently with 4 completed and about 50 faculty attending. From feedback, the workshops have been changed from using a "dummy" course to attendees working on the faculty member's own course. The goal is to complete the transition of at least one personal course by the end of the workshop.

A new Quality Matters rubric is being used so that faculty and students moving from one course to another can easily find standard things in particular places. These are recommendations that should help everyone using the software find it easier. Nothing is dictated, but an example of a recommendation is putting the syllabus in the "Start Here" folder. More workshops are offered in May and June. Enrollment is low presently, but as those workshops fill up, more will be scheduled throughout the Summer and into August. Faculty can attend more than one workshop, especially if they have more than one course to migrate.

**Kaparthi** noted that self-help is available online also for those who prefer or who cannot attend workshops. There is Quick Start or Quick Reference material available. Also a video of one of the workshops can be found online. The link for this Help material may be found at:

<http://www.uni.edu/its/support/technology-and-training/elearning-support-videos>

**Funderburk** asked for clarification that the WebCT E-Learning now being used will be available all next year? **Dierks** replied that the current system, Campus Edition 8 (CE8), will be supported by BlackBoard through January 2013. An academic tail follows the systems from semester to semester. There is never a clean change-over of systems. It is expensive to run two systems in tandem in terms of personnel resources, machine resources, and licensing. BlackBoard permits two systems to run for 1 year. He primarily wants to be considerate of students so that they will have knowledge of the system the faculty chooses. During that year, each semester will have its chance to migrate to the new system as needed. Also, the information will be available for inquiry for that year on grade issues, assignment submissions, and gradebook data. Also, Continuing Ed. Guided Independent Study students in non-semester courses will have time to complete their work under the same system. However, all courses with a Blackboard component(s) that are taught in Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 will need to be taught with the new Blackboard Learn 9 environment.

**Funderburk** asked again to make it perfectly clear that the faculty have one more full year from now to complete the migration of all their courses, so there is no crunch that all this must be done by Fall term. **Dierks** replied that, yes, until June 2012 they will continue to provide public access both to



staff and faculty to WebCT CE8. And they will maintain a WebCT system on campus for many years to come.

Senator **Neuhaus** asked if they had a sense of what proportion of faculty are currently using the CE8 system or will need to migrate courses to the new system? **Drury** replied, "About 40%." **Wurtz** asked about the response rate on their website to the survey available there? **Drury** said that less than 100 faculty responded. **Dierks** added that those surveys had two objectives. The first survey was a broader educational technological survey that was released through MyUNiverse applications, so it did not specifically target E-learning faculty. It was for all faculty. There was a 6% return rate on that survey. It did not give them the density they were looking for, so they followed up the electronic survey with telephone canvassing where they contacted 20% of the faculty that utilized the E-learning system. The objective with that telephone canvassing was to determine what they thought of the current products. They also mentioned to them the vendor timeline of the termination of support for WebCT CE8. They asked what other products they wanted evaluated.

Senator **East** asked if the current workshops were half-day workshops? They are 3 1/2 hours, replied **Vetter**, which is similar to time taken for other workshops. **East** noted that workshops in years past were all day, and he wondered how with lots of new features anyone could migrate a course to a new program in 3 1/2 hours and also learn about suggestions for standardization so students can have a common experience. This could lead to some faculty frustration, even when allowed to attend another workshop which might begin at the beginning again. **Vetter** noted that they do offer a little bit of individual time during the initial workshop and that after the workshop they offer workdays where faculty can obtain one-on-one help. It is not on the calendar because it is not a workshop. It is a workday.

Senator **Neuhaus** suggested that perhaps more faculty each year are beginning to use E-learning, so some attendees will be first-time users of such a program where a migration workshop would not be appropriate. **Vetter** said there will be a course for those brand new to E-learning which is not on the calendar just yet.

The main focus right now is to assist those who have been using it and who depend on it with their academic classes to move over to the newer system. Visually it is quite different, but the function of a lot of the tools is almost identical. They took the best of both BlackBoard and the UNI platform and migrated it into the new product. During the workshop, they draw a lot of comparisons. One of the more different areas is called the Grade Center now and is more Excel-like. Faculty seemed not to like the gradebook in the older version, and he noted nods from faculty present. More time is taken to show changes such as this, and it seems already much appreciated.

Senator **Balong** summarized that she understands that the general learning curve will vary with the individual user. She also noted that the request is really about more funding and asked if they at ITS thought they needed more funding, which drew laughs as to who would refuse additional funding. She tied the idea to the general budget situation today and asked if they felt this was a pressing issue of lack of funding. **Kaparthi** replied that everyone likes more funding but when staffing for things such as this they choose to staff for average demand and not peak demand. Given the circumstances, he feels they have enough funding to support faculty well.

Senator **Soneson** noted that the petitioner seemed frustrated by the workshop, feeling at the end that there was much work to do and that she would need student help to get it all done. He asked if faculty feeling this way might possibly take a second workshop or have a private session? **Drury** replied that an appointment can be made for individual help and that she felt the petitioner was reacting to the knowledge that one retirement will not be replaced. Two people can meet with faculty one-on-one throughout the Summer and into next year, depending on the immediacy of needing to migrate courses for Fall or for Spring. It also depends on the quantity of content in a course to be migrated. Large quantities of content do face more work.

**Wurtz** summarized the options and asked if senators needed more information. **Funderburk** asked to clarify that current workshops are not full and was told that there are empty spots. **Neuhaus** wondered if the one-on-ones will eventually cause undue pressure for them. **Vetter** admitted that this assistance with the changeover of this one system is only

one of the many things he does, so sometimes there can be conflict in schedules for assisting. They cannot drop everything to meet this need, but they strongly encourage faculty to take the workshop first for the basic skills needed and then to ask for one-on-one sessions for personal questions. These one-on-one can be face-to-face in his office or their office or even over the phone or by him logging remotely onto their computer through Adobe Connect. He gave an example where a faculty member came to him after the workshop worried that much work was needed for her migration, but when he looked at her course, he had suggestions that greatly simplified the process. Blanket workshops often cannot show these things well. He solved her problem within 15 minutes, and she felt very good about it.

**East** asked if workshops have ending evaluations to help them improve the workshop itself? If 40% of all faculty need this information, **East** said, that will be significant. **Vetter** admitted that after the first 4 workshops they did not have evaluations done but that they discuss this sort of thing in the one-on-ones. He will consider instituting a bit more formal process. **East** also stated that he would not recommend giving anyone more funding than they currently have, given today's budget climate. Typically, personnel simply cover for absent members or when work increases due to special circumstances.

Senator **Gallagher** called the question. Passed. **Wurtz** summarized the motion as a request for funding to provide additional training for faculty on the migration. Motion failed. **Wurtz** asked if anyone wanted to offer any other motion on this same issue. None heard. Thanks were given to the ITS guests for coming.

DOCKET #977, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH ATHLETICS DIRECTOR, TROY DANNEN

**Wurtz** stated that as a consultative session there is no agenda or motion in front of the Senate. She asked **Dannen** to just tell the Senate what they need to know, and then they will ask questions. **Dannen** then introduced two women who accompanied him today. First, Jean **Berger** is the Senior Associate Athletic Director who oversees every aspect of the Department

that deals with student services, which ranges from academic to compliance to sports medicine and strength and conditioning. She is here in case senators want to get into specifics as far as the academic support unit goes. They will also talk about NCAA certification, and **Berger** has been the point person for the Athletic Department. Cliff **Chancey** is the Chair, and **Berger** works with him on a day-to-day basis. Also attending today is Lisa **Jepsen**, a professor in Economics, who was appointed by President **Allen** to be the Faculty Athletics Representative when **Woodrick's** term expires July 1st. She has a couple of items to bring before the Senate, too. It was very evident, **Dannen** stated, that when the President rewrote the job description for the Faculty Representative that they both hold a strong belief that the relationship between the faculty and athletics needs to be better than it has historically been and that it is important for this person to truly be the liaison between the two. **Woodrick** did come to the Senate this year to report about her work. It is important that **Jepsen** actually be the voice of faculty within the Athletics Department. She will be involved in every search for every type of high-profile coaching and administrative position. She will work with the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee (IAAC). She will work with SAAC, the Student Athletic Advisory Committee. She will get involved in the Conference Office. The more she can represent the faculty, the better off and effective both will be. Her job description now specifically includes that she appear in front of the Faculty Senate.

**Dannen** stated that he has 3 things on his agenda for today.

- 1) Academics, and what they are doing as a Department. It will be a bit of bragging time.
- 2) Certification, and where they are with that.
- 3) Finance, and he wonders where to start with that. Laughter came as he said he would like to distance himself from the Provost's comments, so he will hold his on that issue until the end.

1) Academically. The invitation asked him to talk about what they are doing academically and what they are providing the students in the Department. First, the last two semesters they have had an accumulative grade point average in the Department of 3.19, the best they have ever had. This ties back to the academic advising support staff they have. When

he came to UNI, they had a 3/4-time academic advisor. The NCAA recommends one for every 50 students. They now have two full-time advisors and a graduate assistant. The gpa has gone from just under 3.0 to the 3.19 the last two semesters.

Most everything else has remained the same. He has told his staff that with new dollars he will only address two places in the Department. One, anything that helps students to graduate, and the graduation rate in the Department is 75%. That is the 6-year rate. Campus as a whole has a 66% rate. So for the first time now, the Athletic Department is exceeding the campus as a whole. It will fluctuate in the future, but the important thing is that they are now meeting or exceeding the general student population. Two, he will invest in something that will generate new revenues. Since he arrived, they have worked to get off the General Fund as much as possible and still maintain a level of excellence to the degree possible. To do that, they need to generate extra monies. They have done that at a rate that no other peer school from an athletics standpoint has been able to do.

He passed around a document which traces back in a strong way growth and changes. They have a Student Athletic Advisory Council (SAAC) on which 2-3 student athletes from every sport sit and meet on a monthly basis. They advocate for themselves in the Department, and they also serve as the external component of the Department, getting student athletes out into the community, out into the schools, doing things that are not athletic. They represent the Institution positively. This document is a list of things that they have done in the last year, and he feels it is an impressive list. Student athletes do a lot more than go to class and play games. They are up for a national award as the most improved SAAC in the nation. They have done a great job with great leadership, basically bragging about UNI's student athletes and what they do outside the normal expectations of any student on campus.

2) Certification. They are currently in the last week before the certification report is done. They have had public hearings and a lot of input. They have involved folks from all over campus in the drafting of the certification. It looks basically at 3 areas.

a) Governance and compliance. **Jepsen** chaired that committee within the overall certification group led by **Chancey**. Compliance means NCAA rules and other rules and regulations. Governance means how the Department is put together and organized. For the most part, with some minor modifications, that has been a very positive report. **Jepsen** can share some specifics of that, he noted.

b) Academic integrity was also reviewed, which was a shining star for the Department in the reports. The changes within their academic advising program have gone a long way. He noted that had this report been made 3 years ago without the current advising staff, the report would not have been as good. However, they do need to utilize more of the available on-campus resources, he added. And they plan to create a reporting role directly into the Provost's Office for academic advising which will go into the map of academic advising on campus. They want to do things consistently with the way others advise on campus rather than being isolated.

c) Gender equity, diversity, and student athlete welfare. This has improved in the last 5-10 years, although they still have issues from an equity standpoint. The issues are not nearly as daunting today as they were a few years ago. But any growth or addition that is called for in the Department is in the interest in enhancing female participation and female scholarships, in general. **Berger** has worked very closely with that and may want to speak on that issue or any specific questions the Senate may have.

One thing that came out of the Governance report that he has asked **Jepsen** to talk about specifically is the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee. The philosophy of the NCAA is that Presidents have direct oversight of the Athletic Departments and that the Faculty run the University. So the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee is a group of faculty who meet on a monthly basis. It is chaired by Eugene **Wallingford** and is supposed to be that voice. One of the recommendations is to strengthen IAAC at UNI.

**Jepsen** began speaking and noted that her third hat today is as the Vice Chair of this Advisory Council. At their most recent meeting they approved a recommendation she wanted to share with the Faculty Senate. Later she

will find out the official procedure to bring it before the Senate for consideration. The Council recommended that there be one faculty representative on the appointed by the Faculty Senate. It could be a senator or other faculty member of their choosing. This would be to improve transparency and to enhance communication between the IAAC and the faculty/Faculty Senate. She offered to answer any questions from her three areas of responsibility: as the Faculty Athletics Representative, as the Vice Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee, or as Chair of the Subcommittee for Recertification.

**Dannen** added that the contentious nature between Athletics and the rest of campus has diminished in the 3 years he has been at UNI. He has a much better understanding today of central campus issues than he thinks Athletics did when he arrived. He asked that faculty take advantage of this because Athletics needs it. The voice that the faculty felt they did not have in Athletics governance is now being filled in these ways. And Athletics needs it because, in the overall certification report, they need to be in philosophical lockstep with the rest of campus in everything. He cited Ohio State and their current situation and stated that this divergence need not be further encouraged at UNI. So Athletics will jump at the chance to sit on any board or committee asked, and he hopes that the Faculty Senate will name a representative from within or without the Senate on the IAAC as well.

3) Finance. **Dannen** noted that he will meet with Tom **Schellhardt** tomorrow to find out what his budget cut will be. When he came to talk with the Senate last year, he talked about the Board of Regents' request from President **Allen** to develop a funding model that would substantially reduce or eliminate their funding from the General Fund. **Allen** put a proposal before the BOR which was approved by the Regents at the time. Three members on the Board have since turned over. The proposal called for the current level of about \$4.55 million in General Funds to be reduced over the next 4-5 years to what was a certain percentage of the Institution's General Fund. Long term, Athletics would never have a larger percentage than 2.5%, he thinks, of the Institution's General Fund. It might fall to less than that but cannot become greater. They are this year living with 3.67%. Step 1 called for a \$150,000 reduction next year of the some \$600,000 plus whatever ever else will be added. In addition, he added that the long-term

stability of schools similar to UNI has been the using of student fees to replace those lost from General Funds. A few months ago, \$170,000 allocated to Music has been transferred from the new combined College by **Haack** to Athletics in the General Fund. There was no net impact. It went from General Fund to Student Fees, which he feels the more of that that can happen the better off they are. Therefore, Athletics will be down at about 4.2 plus whatever other cuts he learns about tomorrow. The plan that went to the Board of Regents was their Fiscal 2015 target. They will meet their Fiscal 2012 target with just the cut. He noted that the reallocation likely will not fit into the Fiscal 2015 target, although it is arguable. So they are down nearly 10% next year in General Fund money. They are making it up by asking for approval of cutting 2 and maybe 3 positions. They are also holding every vacated position for 3 months just to recoup a bit of the salary. They are raising more money. The commitments to the Foundation for Athletics has gone from \$2.9 million to over \$11 million in the last 3 years. They have two multi-million dollar \_\_\_\_\_ that will happen \_\_\_\_\_ this summer. For them to endow athletic scholarships alone, the athletic endowment would have to be \$76 million, which exceeds the University's endowment right now. So practicality and reality right now are just what they are. They will do as much as they can possibly do. They have had a fairly successful competitive year. They have had a very good year academically. From a discipline standpoint, they put a Code of Conduct in after his first year here, and they have since had fewer Code of Conduct issues than ever before. Things could happen to change that tomorrow, but as of today things are good.

**Wurtz** opened the floor to discussion. **Funderburk** asked if **Dannen** had the numbers in front of him for the number of student athletes and the average athletic scholarship. **Dannen** replied that there are 383 in the Athletic Department this year, give or take 1 or 2. The scholarship numbers are the same as last year which is about 170 receiving aid of some sort, and about 110-115 are receiving a full scholarship. The rest are partials with athletes paying the rest out of their own pockets. **Soneson** asked how much a full scholarship is. **Dannen** replied that it is "room, board, tuition, books, and fees." This amounts to about \$22,000 for an out-of-state student and about high \$14,000 for an in-state student. Coaches in football are allowed 63 scholarships and have to have 58 if they are going to play games against Iowa or Iowa State. It is required. They allow 32 full in-state



scholarships and 31 full out-of-state scholarships. This makes dollars go further, because of the increased costs. From a diversity standpoint, the Athletics Department is a very diverse-looking group of students, moreso than any other place on campus. The more in-state scholarships they issue, the less diverse they will be.

**Gallagher** asked, if, with the budget cuts, would student achievement support be cut. **Dannen** relied that, no, that is not on the table. Senator **Lowell** asked how much that extra academic advising support costs.

**Dannen** said that the two advisors each makes under \$40,000, so \$80,000 plus the Graduate Assistant position. He tries to hire GA's in each place they lose full-time staff, and they have had very good success with them.

**Gallagher** asked to what extent student athletes utilize the campus resources such as the Writing Center. **Berger** replied that the Athletics Department taps into all of those support systems, except that they do offer tutors. They have two kinds: both content/subject areas (psychology, math, science) tutors and life skills tutors for those identified with needing some extra help with time management, note taking, study skill development, and so forth. There are 1-2 tutors who help with those areas with a limited number of students. **Dannen** noted that with the very limited academic advising they had before, it was focused on the high-achieving students, for whatever reasons. The two advisors now focus strongly on those who are 2.0 and below. This has not hurt the strong students and has raised the success of the bottom 1/3 a lot. **Neuhaus** noted that in the areas which are underutilized by student athletes the Library might rank high. In the past, they used to do more for student athletes, and he wanted to extend that offer again. If they have less time for the high-achieving students, then the Library can help, but also with those struggling also.

**Berger** noted that in general they need to continue to tap into available resources more. An example is the Retention Council, and the work they are doing. During the athletic recertification assessment, it was noted that the UNI graduation rate for African American football players needs to be improved. However, the athletic graduation rate of African American football players is significantly higher than the African American male graduation rate on campus in general. But it is lower than for other student athletes, so they wish to improve that rate. And they plan to tap into the

work of the Retention Council more, as well as other types of resources available. Orientation is another area they need to take a look at. **Berger** thinks the link between the athletic advisors and the Provost's Office with some of those things will help by making that an intentional relationship.

**Neuhaus** noted that the goals of the Cornerstone project, now in its trial stage, would fit nicely with the goals they are mentioning today. It hopes to help students make those connections early to get them on the right track. He will pass along some information about that to the Athletics Department.

**Soneon** thanked the guests for coming to talk with the Faculty Senate about the Athletic Department. It is always good to know what is going on, what their thoughts are, and what they are planning. He also congratulated the Department on the success of the Women's Tennis Team. He is a supporter of athletics and thinks that what they do at UNI is important. At the same time, he would like to hear a bit about **Dannen's** justification of athletics in light of what is now clearly a fiscal crisis at UNI. They have just been told today that the academic side of campus will be short \$2.5 million, and this will probably mean there will be faculty cuts over the next 2 years. It is very disheartening news and is a shrinking of what the University does as an academic institution. He acknowledged that athletics will shrink a little bit, too, but faculty are now at a point of thinking about what kind of institution they want to be in the future. One possibility would be to drastically reduce athletics in order to preserve academic programs. If athletics is kept where it is now, then it would be at the serious expense of academics. In that context, **Soneson** stated that this is the appropriate forum for such a discussion and invited **Dannen** to talk about why the University should continue to support athletics at its current level with the anticipation of cutting academic programs.

**Dannen** replied that when he arrived, UNI was in budget crisis mode in Fiscal 2009. It has continued in Fiscal 2010, in Fiscal 2011, and now in Fiscal 2012, so he sees the environment as not being any different. There has been a crisis since he walked in the door. His approach is not academic but from a business viewpoint. The University has an academic component and a business component. He made the decision to drop baseball his first year instead of taking a little bit here and a little bit there. His philosophy is to

keep as much strong as possible--to quit cutting fingers off and instead cut off the whole arm. He is surprised that that thought process and philosophy is not more pervasive across campus. We settle for fingers.

**Dannen** admitted that he does not know enough about the academic community, but he and **Schellhardt** talked about fiscal planning and what do we notice as different. Does the grass get mowed; do the sidewalks get plowed. He understands that it is more than that. Having something painted in the Department takes 6 months. He understands that. UNI has cut a little finger here and a little finger there but these cuts have not solved any of the fundamental problems. There are just fewer people spreading themselves thinner and thinner. They have caused their own problems by doing everything successfully by cutting off all those little fingers. Now an arm must be cut off. His decision about baseball he thought would just be the first arm cut off--that there would be other arms cut off, too. An academic program review said they would build up the best and eliminate the worst, but he thinks that never happened for the most part. So he said in a meeting with **Schellhardt** and **Allen** that he kind of regretted dropping baseball because nothing else ever happened. So now he fears that when it is time to cut arms off every place else, everyone will ask for his other arm. He feels the Athletics Department is ahead of the game.

**Dannen** noted that he does not believe in athletics in place of academics, but he believes athletics has a support role. He believes that 13,300 students at UNI would not be 13,300 without athletics. That decrease in student population, that tuition loss, would more than offset the General Funding that the Athletics Department receives. When he compares UNI with Upper Iowa, he finds nothing in common. But the general public says we have everything in common except that one is Division I and one is Division II. So we bring to the University an image as a thought process of where we rank.

**Dannen** continued with an example regarding supporting athletics at a certain level. There has been an assumption, he noted, that UNI does not have to be Division I. UNI can move to Division II. Minnesota Duluth won 2 national championships this year. They are Division II. Their budget is \$8 million. They generate about \$1 million. The other \$7 million comes from

the institution, student fees and general fund. That is more than is coming from institutions in our program, he noted. By going backwards, you cut off other sources of revenue. His argument has always been that it is either Division I athletics or do away with athletics. This is purely economics. He also thinks there is a net economic impact to the institution as a whole.

**Jepsen** added that she sees UNI losing diversity and excellence in the classroom when athletics are cut. She taught this semester a seminar-style class called Law and Economics, and it was very discussion-based. She had one student in the class not from the Midwest. She is the pitcher on the Women's Softball Team; she is from California; and she is a minority student. She provides a level of experience significantly different. Another example she offered was Josh Mahoney who won the Walter Byers scholarship last year which was the single highest academic student honor that an NCAA athlete of any Division can win. He would not come to this campus if we do not play FCS football, she stated. She is enthusiastic about taking on the Faculty Athletic Representative role in part because she wants that blend. She wants diversity in her classrooms and academic excellence that frankly she does not see access to otherwise. These come to her at a price, yes, she said.

**Dannen** said that he has never questioned backing up at a faster pace than anyone else backs up, financially, with General Fund money. Athletics cuts historically have been 2 to 2.5 times what academic cuts were. This is as it should be. It is like peeling an onion where the value of the onion is not in its peel but in its core. At the same time, he does not want the onion to rot either. He truly believes there is a place for athletics, and he believes there is an economic argument to be made but perhaps better made by an economist. He appreciated the opportunity to debate the issue and to give his position.

**Van Wormer** asked which sports are more expensive than others, say comparing football to the basketball? It seemed they made a lot of money for the University last year, but how did it sort out? **Dannen** replied that scholarships are the largest single line item in their budget, \$3.6 million. Football has 63 scholarships budgeted at \$1.2 million. The tuition increase cost another \$150-180,000 onto their bill to the University next year, so that is on top of the cuts they will have to make. If one produced a balance

sheet sport by sport, nothing makes money. Basketball looks like it makes money in NCAA reports because they can allocate NCAA basketball tournament reviews specifically there. But those monies come from the Conference to the Institution because UNI has a basketball program. Aside from the top NCAA schools and the obscene amounts of money football makes, nothing makes money here. It is just the magnitude of the loss. Athletics generates right now about 51% of their operating budget, scholarships included. UNI is the only school in their Conference, among their peers, that can generate more than half of its budget. Most schools generate about 25%. The difference is that most schools--that Illinois State is getting \$7 million student fee money and less than \$1 million General Fund money. We are reversed in that respect.

**Dannen** said that he will make football show a profit in a year or two when UNI plays Wisconsin and Iowa in the same season. Is that healthy for UNI? No. But there will be an extra \$500,000 in revenue from playing that extra football game. It may also be the beginning of the end of his UNI career as Athletic Director, because it is not a good thing to do. It is like putting Junior High kids up against Seniors. They may make a lot of baskets and may come close the first game, but eventually they will get beat up. That will happen to UNI. He will not put UNI's program in an unsafe position, but Wisconsin and Iowa have 25 more scholarships than UNI does. And the differences between their scholarship athletes and ours are about 3 inches and 30 pounds.

Senator **Smith** noted that he has always thought UNI's Athletics Department is a well-managed program. In some ways it is a model of what college athletics should be. And he agrees that on the Academic Affairs side of this institution, UNI has not done the retrenchment and really fundamental rethinking and reallocation that we should have done a number of years ago. Still, he has concerns with the Athletic program here, stretching to a broader concern. In this society, in general, faced with the kind of retrenchment that our country faces--the indebtedness that we face as a country--it is time to say we have to cut back on some frills that maybe at one time we could have but can no longer and certainly not to the same degree. He thinks that is true of sports in general in this country, and he certainly thinks it is true of sports at colleges and universities. There is just too much of it. It takes resources that the public is very loath to give to

public institutions--we see it with those budget cuts--and takes those resources and uses them on something that is useful but not as fundamentally important for the long-term success of our society, as is good education for our public. **Smith** continued that he thinks **Dannen** is doing a great job at something that is at an inappropriate scale and just needs to be scaled down and retrenched back on. The obvious way to do that at UNI would be to cut football. That is the big money loser, he heard. It is the big flagship program--lots of bodies, lots of scholarships, lots of money. Would he (**Dannen**) be willing to support that, if it came down to it, **Smith** asked? Is that something, if he were faced with the kinds of budget cuts that the Provost is faced with, that would be on his list of possible ways of dealing with that?

**Dannen** said that they brought a consultant in last Fall as they headed into the certification process. They looked at 4 things: 1) The level they play at. 2) The level Drake plays at, which is stripping scholarships but still playing football. 3) Eliminating it altogether. And 4) Move it up. That means going full scholarship, not being in the Big 10 as an institution but being like a Ball State or schools of that ilk. He agrees that UNI's Athletic Program is the most stable, the most viable of the college athletic businesses because of the way UNI plays football here. Football is a net \$500-600,000 deficit right now, when you take marketing income directly related to football, including scholarships.

**Smith** noted that cutting football would allow UNI to cut a number of women's sports which are used as gender equity to balance football.

**Dannen** replied that he has to keep 6 male and 8 female sports to stay Division I. If he drops the number of sports of either, then UNI would drop to Division II like Upper Iowa. The immediate danger would be no longer sharing in basketball revenues, a big outside source of income--the NCAA tournament basketball money. If a school is not a Division I school, you do not share those revenues. We would no longer be in the Missouri Valley Conference. Then it would become an institutional thing. If we are not Division I, who does UNI affiliate with as her peers, **Dannen** asked? Our academic peer group is not who we affiliate ourselves with athletically. Half of them play the bigger-time football. Some of them play Division II, but he thinks there are only 2 in UNI's academic peer group who are athletic peers. With fewer sports, the places to go for competition are the

Minnesota Duluths, the Mankato States, the Upper Iowas, the Morningsides. So that is the group UNI would then be identified with.

**Dannen** agreed that he looks at it with a different set of eyes than perhaps do general faculty. They will not look at it with an athletic eye. He will not look at it with an academic eye. He thinks it is harmful as an institution to be identified with institutions that we do not now measure ourselves against, when it comes to student recruitment, when it comes to admissions. **Smith** added that across all the institutions mentioned he still thinks there is just too much emphasis on athletics, and this needs to be scaled down across the board. He thinks, given the budget situation, we need to get out in front of that scaling down.

**Dannen** agreed that there is a day of reckoning that is occurring right now in athletics. UNI was one of the first to drop a program in this new modern area of budget cuts. He was all over the country in the media talking about it. Since then there have been 206 programs cut nationwide. (tape change) He noted California and Nevada and their budget problems. Where does UNI want to be the leader? We took that on when we eliminated baseball. But this is a much bigger issue than athletics. The Knight (?) Committee has issued all sorts of templates for reform, but until there is a mandate, nobody wants to be a one-man reformist. As an alum of UNI with at least 20 years of experience, he noted that UNI has not been the leader in reform in the past. It is not what UNI does well.

**Breitbart** noted that something that UNI does well is produce more teachers than all other programs in the State combined. As she listened to this conversation, she wondered what if the College of Education were able to offer those kinds of scholarship? What if we went out and actively recruited the best and the brightest and offered them a full ride? What would that do for UNI's education program? Yet, the Northern Iowa Student Government is concerned about education majors graduating and not being able to pay off their student loans working in education for the next 40 years of their life. That really concerns her. She has good student athletes in her classes and is a big supporter of the softball program, but student athletes do not graduate and become concerned about paying off their student loans over their lifetime.

**Lowell** clarified whether she heard that it would not be helpful financially if UNI dropped to Division II in athletics? Is that documented? **Dannen** replied that the net expenses to an Athletic Department that has Division II level are no different than ours. **Lowell** then wondered what about dropping NCAA totally, not getting rid of athletics, just getting rid of that organization and having athletics in some different way--a way that incorporates more students and takes less money from the academic side? **Dannen** said that that would be called intermurals, an expansion of intermurals. And **Lowell** agreed. **Dannen** said that that is basically dropping athletics intercollegiately--any competition against another institution. So the General Fund savings in doing that right off the top is \$4.2 million next year. But he would counter that by saying that the second part of General Fund here is tuition, as well as the State Appropriation. UNI is semi-private now, since we are getting more of the General Fund money through tuition. How much of that goes away? The athletic tuition bill only is about \$1.8 million. That tuition would go away. When they dropped baseball, none of those students stayed. They all went someplace else. **Lowell** suggested that there would be more money available to recruit students in other fields than athletics.

**Gallagher** suggested that there are intangibles hard to get your hands around. She self-identified as an academic who does not watch football, and she wondered how many students came to UNI, for example, after UNI beat Kansas last year. Can we know how that factors in? **Dannen** said that events like a major sports win create an awareness of the institution for people who did not have it. How do you measure that? The only measurement tool schools use, such as Butler who went to the Final Four, is Admissions applications. Two weeks after UNI beat Kansas, Admissions applications increased by 40%. But that cannot be traced necessarily to see how many actually attend. It is a trailing indicator, because those high school seniors in March had already decided where they were going to school. So it will be this upcoming year's class that the Sweet 16 placement might impact. He admitted that when he talks to groups off campus, such as Lions, he says that athletics is responsible for every increase in enrollment at UNI. He laughs a little bit about it, but he does hear anecdotal stories that indicate just that.



As the time approached 5:00 p.m., **Wurtz** asked for a motion to extend the meeting. **East** moved to extend to 5:15; **Funderburk** seconded. Passed with 1 nay.

**Jepsen** wanted to comment on how UNI would be different if not Division I. She was a Division III student athlete at a school where athletic scholarships were not allowed. It is different. A hundred people go to a football game. We would not be UNI, she thinks, if we were not a Division I presence, although she thinks debating the possibility is quite all right. **Gallagher** and **Jepsen** agreed that it is hard to quantify the differences it would make in the intangibles.

**East** noted that he does not care about athletics and mostly does not pay much attention to them. He does, however, strongly feel that athletics is probably the reason UNI has 6-7% diversity rather than 3%, and he thinks that is critical. As diversity would drop without athletics, fewer diverse people would want to come to UNI, and everyone would suffer for it.

**Funderburk** complimented **Dannen** on his efforts since coming to UNI. He feels the Department is more fiscally responsible and has a more logical way of doing things. However, he still questions the importance of a big win like Kansas. Data he has seen, such as the Noel-Levitts Report, puts the importance of the athletic programs as dead last for the decision to come to college. Also, the Athletics Department's own student attendance records for the last 2 years have not increased since the Kansas tournament. It seems they have stayed the same or gone down. It might be due to fewer play-off games or something, but there seems to be a small, passionate group of supporters, and the rest are in the middle and do not really care one way or the other.

**Ian Goldsmith**, the Vice President of the Student Body representing the Northern Iowa Student Government, wanted to put in his quick 2 cents worth. He wanted to add the student eyes to the academia eyes and athletic eyes talked about. Personally, both his parents attended UNI, which is how he knew about UNI. But the one thing that caused him to be interested in UNI is that his dad took him to UNI football games since he was 9. He had panther pride in UNI before he knew pride in his high school.

To this day he says he bleeds purple and gold. Football games made him fall in love with UNI, and that is why he ran for Student Body Vice President.

**Goldsmith** continued that he did not know what he wanted to study his first year and still is unsure about a career, but he is a firm believer that UNI has extremely good academics. He is a theater major and the opposite of an athlete, but he agrees that if UNI dropped Division I athletics or drop the NCAA standing, UNI would be a completely different school. Dropping that recognition means the school is instantly "not cool" in the eyes of students, compared to before. He gives tours as a Student Admissions Ambassador and sees high school students' eyes light up walking into the dome. Being a "fan" is one of his favorite parts of going to UNI. He realizes he is not "every student," but he does feel he speaks for many students and that a large majority of students would view UNI a lot differently without athletics. Therefore, enrollment would drop.

**Soneson** noted that athletics is not in compliance currently in regard to Title IX. He asked for explanation of the Athletic Department's plans to come into compliance and why UNI is receiving Federal aid while not yet in compliance. **Dannen** stated that there are 3 ways to measure compliance and that UNI is technically in compliance in one of those ways, a survey vehicle showing that they are reflecting interest on campus, meeting the needs of the study body. Prior to the Obama Administration, meeting this measure meant they were considered in compliance. There has been an edict now from the Office of Civil Rights that has taken away that prong of compliance. Going forward, the only way to come into compliance is 1) having a history of adding opportunities for the underrepresented gender, which UNI does not, and 2) meeting proportionality or quota, which is + or - 2% of the study body. So until athletics participation is approximately 55% female, because UNI is approximately 57% female study body, UNI will not be in compliance. **Dannen** said he often states that women are smarter than men. When women are on a team and are not playing, they find other things to do with their time. Two hundred guys would be on the football team just to say they are on the football team. So they are trying to manage roster numbers. They are trying to cap the men, and they are trying to get more women to participate on the existing squads. In the report, they will address this issue. They were at 19% imbalance when he came to UNI. Baseball had an impact on that. It was not dropped because

of that, but it had this effect. They are now down to 7% imbalance. To move from 7% to the required 2%, a plan in the new NCAA Report says we will either manage the numbers a little bit better or we will look at increasing opportunities for women through another program, another sport. The last report they submitted had said that we were going to correct that imbalance by adding a sport, but they never did. So now they have to justify why they did not do what they said they would, and in the eyes of the NCAA and in the eyes of the Federal Government, money is not an excuse. He does not want to say in the new report that they will add a sport, because they have already said they would and did not, and because he is not sure they will have to. It would cost \$250,000 just to add a basic sport with limited scholarships. He would rather hire another assistant swimming coach and build the swimming numbers up by 10, or hire another assistant track coach and build the track numbers up by 20. These will bring athletics to that 2%, and that is the plan currently to correct the inequity imbalance. When they do that with the numbers, everything else has to be in balance, too, such as scholarship dollars, recruiting budgets, etc. He does not fundamentally believe in cutting the men to balance. He has had to answer the baseball question several times because of this NCAA review. Baseball was a financial decision, but it was a decision they made when they had to make it because of the equity implications of dropping a women's sport. UNI will get within the 2%. **Berger**, he said, has been in the business for 25 years and has been through 3 of these certifications at other institutions. She is known nationally, and she has got UNI Athletics to where they need to be. She has laid the brick road to getting into compliance.

**Wurtz** thanked the guests for their consultation today. **Dannen** reiterated that he is always willing to come and appreciated the chance to talk and discuss.

DOCKETS #975, #976, and #978, EMERITUS STATUS REQUESTS—FOR VIRGINIA BERG, BIOLOGY, FRED BEHROOZI, PHYSICS, AND RHETA DEVRIES, CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

**Wurtz** asked for a motion to approve all three simultaneously as time is short (**Breitbach/Funderburk**). Discussion included **Breitbach** who spoke for all three, stating that their names are known nationally, that they all

have exemplary records, and that all have made huge contributions to this University. Passed.

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### **ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS FOR 2011-2011**

**Soneson** spoke for the nominating committee. The slate of nominees includes **Funderburk** for Chair and **Breitbach** and **Roth** for Vice Chair. After no nominations were made from the floor, the one nomination for Chair was accepted by acclamation, and paper ballots were declined. **Breitbach** recused herself from the meeting so that a hand vote could be taken for Vice Chair in interest of time. The hand vote elected **Breitbach** as the ensuing Vice Chair.

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Soneson** moved to adjourn. Second by **East**. Passed at 5:15 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,  
Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate