

10-10-2016

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 10, 2016

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2016 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa.

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 10, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 253.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/253

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

Regular Meeting #1782
UNI Faculty Senate
Oct. 10, 2016 (3:30 – 5:01 p.m.)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

No members of the Press were present.

Interim Provost Bass reminded members that the Library Director, Chris **Cox**, is up for his five-year review and that information will be sought from faculty as his position provides service to other campus sectors. The review will conclude during Spring semester.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** asked about the intention to fill Interim Dean positions without external searches due to budget cuts.

Faculty Senate Chair **Gould** had no comments.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript of September 26, 2016

**** (Burnight/Cooley)** Motion passed.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

- 1305 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (CSBS) Curriculum Proposal 2017-2018
<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-social-and-behavioral-sciences-curriculum-0> **** (Smith/McNeal)** Passed.
- 1306 College of Business Administration (CBA) Curriculum Proposal 2017-2018
<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/college-business-administration-curriculum-proposal-2017> **** (McNeal/Hakes)** Passed.
- 1307 Consultative Session to Lisa Baronio, Vice President of University Advancement and President of the UNI Foundation; and Mark Oman, Chair of the UNI Foundation Board of Trustees (October 24th, 2016 meeting).
<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-lisa-baronio-vice-president> **** (O’Kane/Cooley)** Passed.
- 1308 Emeritus request for **Sonia Yetter**, Russian and **Bill Stigliani**, Center for Energy and Environmental Education (CEEE).
<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-requests-sonia-yetter-and-bill-stigliani> **** (McNeal/Burnight)** Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1303/1198 Consultative Session to David **Harris**, Athletics Administration, and Elaine **Eshbaugh**, Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA. Scheduled first on the docket for October 10, 2016. <https://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/consultative-session-david-harris-athletics-administration>

** (**Walter/McNeal**) Motion to move into Consultative Session. Passed.

** (**Walter/McNeal**) Motion to rise from Consultative Session. Passed.

See pages 10 – 50 and addenda for information relating to the Athletics budget and financing, student-athlete financial support, academic retention, graduation rates, and G.P.A. Also, information relating to the impact of student-athletes on ethnic diversity and out of state recruitment.

5. Adjournment (Campbell/Hakes) Passed by acclamation. 5:01 p.m.

Full transcript of 51 pages with 2 addenda follows.

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting
Oct.10, 2016 (3:30-5:01)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Seong-in **Choi**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Karla **Krueger**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gerald **Smith**, Secretary Jesse **Swan**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**. Also: Interim Provost Brenda **Bass**, Associate Provost Kavita **Dhanwada**, Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**, NISG Representative Avery **Johnson**.

Not Present: Senators Aricia **Beckman**, Lou **Fenech**, Jeremy **Schraffenberger**, Gloria **Stafford**, Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**.

Guests: Elaine **Eshbaugh**, David **Harris**, and Beth **West**.

Gould: It’s 3:30 I’m going to go ahead and call this meeting to order. First, Courtesy Announcements. Do we have any press present? No press present. Next, Interim Provost **Bass**.

Bass: This week I just wanted to make the Senate aware that it is time for the Library Dean’s five-year review, so Chris **Cox**’s five-year review and I’m working with the Chair of the Library Faculty Senate to coordinate that review. Because of the nature of the Library, I’ve asked that the committee that she forms gather information about the Dean’s performance, not only from within the Library and within his peers, but from campus-wide from faculty because of the services that the Library provides campus-wide. But otherwise just be aware that that will be unfolding this year and will most likely be complete in the spring semester.

Gould: Thank you. Comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: I guess just a question, what we spoke about with the Dean searches. There's some interim deans, and their initial appointment was made due to---as an interim status---and now it appears there doesn't seem to be budget for an external search, which was the original plan. And so one thing I was going to ask you to comment now or comment via email is, how important is an external search to faculty for these kinds of positions? My opinion is that faculty have external searches and deans probably should, too. It's an important position, but I also acknowledge budgetary issues. If you have any comments, please feel free now, or I'll ask you through email.

O'Kane: It seems to me that if we are searching for the best leader at that level, that that search ought to be wider. That it should indeed be an outside search and that is not meant as a criticism of anybody in the deanship now. Quite the contrary.

Kidd: I agree actually. I totally agree.

Campbell: Responding though to your question, if we want external searches for the faculty, we should do it for the administration. There are no qualified--- I mean there aren't faculty to fill faculty positions---whereas they are competent people certainly, probably not the best, but then, who knows what we might get, and also we know them a lot better. But I don't think saying it's a higher level, because there are qualified people for deans, and there aren't qualified people to take faculty positions.

Kidd: I agree. I'm probably exaggerating a little bit, However, most state hiring laws require at least an advertisement of position to be filled. This to me is an issue.

Smith: You don't have to state hiring laws. To our own compliance laws and equity management, and positions are supposed to be advertised so that all that are interested have the opportunity to apply.

Bass: Can I make a follow-up comment, Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: You should. Yes.

Bass: So what has been presented to faculty, the Faculty Senates, within the College of Business & Humanities and Arts & Sciences, is because of budgetary constraints it would be very difficult at this point, and perhaps have negative implications for the Academic Affairs budget if we did a national search for either of the deans. And I will say I'm committed to treating both colleges equally, fairly, with equity, so I want to move forward with both of them in a similar vein, whatever that is and so what has been presented is either to extend current contracts, similar to what Chair **Kidd** is talking about, or a similar process, or the way I have been leaning is to do an internal search that advertises the position, has a search committee formed according to University policy--- I don't have the policy number memorized off the top of my head--- but it's within the policies, and conduct a real search, no matter what the number of candidates are, and there's the potential in both colleges that there'd be more than a single candidate for the searches. I understand the desire for national searches, believe me, I truly understand that and it is seen as best practice. But when there's budgetary constraints, that's the difficulty.

Kidd: Just to acknowledge that, the deans and correct me if I'm wrong. The salary for deans is coming out of the same pool of money as salary for faculty, at least full time faculty and so I think the only way to not have maybe, what's it—like five or six faculty lines would be exchanged for the new hire of a dean would be if somehow the Academic Affairs Budget was increased from other sources. That would be the faculty question to be posed really. It's a choice of either a reduced number of faculty hires we can make in the coming years, or finding money from outside Academic Affairs and transferring it into the budget, which is probably not a very easy thing to do.

O'Kane: Two comments. One is I want to be sure that the Interim Provost is aware that one of our people's retiring who is very long time in the department a long time, and presumably filling his position would be approximately half of his replacement, and I don't know if that's been taken into consideration. Another thing that maybe the Senate should be aware of is that the CHAS Senate rejected the offer of an internal search, as near as I can tell. They basically said, "We're not happy with this choice and we're going to let the Interim Provost know that," and basically lobbed it back to you to decide.

Bass: That's fair.

Burnight: That was not a comment upon the quality of the ...

O'Kane: Oh my God, thank you, John (**Burnight**) for bringing that up.

Burnight: They made that clear as well.

O’Kane: Thank you very, very much. The CHAS Senate made it abundantly clear that the current dean is more than perfectly acceptable.

Burnight: It’s was the principle I think.

O’Kane: It’s the principle.

Gould: I have no comments at this time, so I’m going to move right along to approving the minutes of September 26th, 2016 Senate meeting. Do I have a motion to approve? So moved by Senator **Burnight** and seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Anybody have any comments, questions about the minutes? All in favor of approving the minutes for September 26th, please say, “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes.

O’Kane: I think the last time we met we approved the minutes with the idea that there was going to be a correction. I think it was Senator **Campbell** that brought that up. Was that made, that correction?

Gould: Yes.

Campbell: I think I was just talking to David (**Hakes**) and I think that you all are operating that cosmetic changes are corrected directly to the Secretary, and need not be directed to Senate business. I wasn’t aware of that.

Gould: Yes.

Campbell: I won’t even mention it next time. I also had another cosmetic change this time which she is addressing.

Gould: Moving on to Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. The first thing that we have up is Calendar Item 1305, which is the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposal for 2017-2018 to be docketed in regular order. Can I have a motion to docket this in regular order? So moved by Senator **Smith**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Any discussion on this item, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposal being docketed in regular order? Hearing none, all in favor of docketing the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Curriculum Proposal in regular order, please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. Next up we have Calendar Item 1306, which is the College of Business Administration Curriculum Proposal for 2017-2018. Can I have a motion? So moved by Senator **McNeal**, second by Senator **Hakes**. Any discussion on docketing the College of Business Administration Curriculum Proposal in regular order? Hearing none, all if favor of docketing the College of Business Administration Curriculum Proposal please say, "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Sorry. It's Monday. [Motion passes.] Next up Calendar Item 1307 which is a Consultative Session to Lisa **Baronio**, Vice President of University Advancement and President of the UNI Foundation and Mark **Oman**, Chair of the UNI Foundation Board of Trustees. This would be docketed at the October 24th meeting in regular order. Can I have a motion to docket this in regular order? So moved by Senator **O'Kane**, seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Any discussion?

Campbell: I just don't remember. We had a bunch of stuff docketed in advance. Do we have anything else docketed for that meeting?

Gould: The only other things for that meeting would be what we just approved.

Campbell: The other things were docketed further in the future, then?

Gould: Yes. So the next meeting would have the two curriculum proposal packages and the Consultative Session. All in favor of docketing Item 1307, Consultative Session with Lisa **Baronio** and Mark **Oman**, say “aye,” opposed, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion passes. Last up, we have Calendar Item 1308 which is an emeritus request for Sonia **Yetter** and Bill **Stigliani**. Can I have a motion to docket this in regular order? So moved by Senator **McNeal**. Seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Any discussion?

Smith: Help me to understand. Four or five years ago as I understand it, all of our foreign languages were eliminated except for Spanish.

Gould: Right.

Smith: And now we have a request for emeritus appointment in Russian, and I thought that was all eliminated, so could you just explain what’s going on?

Gould: Yes. The attachment that I received which I scanned in... when Modern Languages and Languages and Literature merged in 2011-2012, somehow Sonia **Yetter**’s emeritus request got lost in the process. So they were coming back and asking if we could do it now.

Smith: Okay.

Campbell: Technical correction to your statement: They didn’t eliminate all languages except Spanish. They eliminated all the majors in all languages except for Spanish. If I’m correct they’re still offering courses in other foreign languages.

Smith: So do we still offer Russian is what I'm asking. Do we still offer that?

Cooley: There's no Russian offered at UNI. In fact, she left before the merger, so this is still puzzling, but I think we should entertain this.

Smith: Yes. I wasn't raising objection. I just didn't understand an emeritus if it had been eliminated four or five year ago.

Gould: That is what I was told. Any other discussion or comments?

Smith: So would the emeritus be in Russian or would it be in English and Foreign Languages?

Kidd: Does it matter?

Smith: Okay. It doesn't matter.

Campbell: I assume it would be whatever her appointment was, because even if she was in modern languages, her appointment might have been Professor of Russian, in which case...ask the Provost.

Gould: It's fine. Any other comments? All in favor of docketing the emeritus requests for Sonia **Yetter** and Bill **Stigliani**, please say "aye," opposed, "nay," abstain, "aye." Motion passes. So, moving on to the Consideration of Docketed Items, we have one today which is the Consultative Session with David **Harris**, Director of Athletics, and Elaine **Eshbaugh**, the Faculty Athletics Representative, and Beth **West**, the Associate Athletics Director for Business. Can I have a motion to move into Consultative Session? Moved by Vice-Chair **Walter**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Any discussion? All in favor of moving into Consultative Session,

say “aye,” all opposed say, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Okay. We are now in Consultative Session, and I will hand the reins over to David (**Harris**) and Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) and Beth (**West**). Welcome to Senate.

Harris: Thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity to be able to come and talk with you this afternoon. I’ve been here for roughly six months now and I’ve really enjoyed my time; having a chance to get around and talk with and meet with a number of different people, so I’m happy to be able to come in and talk with you all about the athletics program. For those of you who don’t know me or anything about my background, I’m originally from Baton Rouge, Louisiana and went to school at the University of Mississippi as a student-athlete there and got my degree in business and MBA there as well. I started working at Old Miss I guess right around 1995, working in the Admissions office. I did that for a couple of years and then transitioned into the Office of the Registrar, and then got started in athletics back in 1998. I started as the Director of the Academic Support Program there, and moved on from there to the University of Wisconsin. I was there for a four-year period in Madison, and then moved from there to Iowa State University, where I was for the past ten years as a Senior Associate AD in charge of Student Services. For the most part of my career started and then in many ways, continued on with student support; student-athlete support, academic support, life skills development, and then just sort of branched out from there into some areas of responsibility, to where at Iowa State I got into Sport Oversight and some other things. Then I accepted this position and started back in March of this year. So, the reason that we wanted to come and speak to the group today: Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) and I were having a conversation, as well as a few other people,

talking about a report that the Faculty Athletics Representative prepares on the Athletics Department. It was decided that this was a group that should have this information—should ultimately be able to see what the findings are from the Faculty Rep., and I also felt that because I hadn't had a chance to come to this group, that this would a good chance for me to come and introduce myself to the group. In future conversations, we were also talking about the budget. In talking about the budget with Beth (**East**) and with Elaine (**Eshbaugh**). And we thought if we were going to be coming to this session to talk about academics, we know that the budget and the finance of the Athletic Department is another area that gets a lot of discussion on campus, so we felt like this would be a good opportunity to combine these three things into one presentation. With the budget element of the presentation, we decided to focus specifically, not just on the revenue expenses of the department, but specifically, we get lots of questions about the General Education Fund and money that comes through the Athletics Department from that area and then Student Fee Support: How that money comes to the Athletics Department. So we could have chosen to focus on a number of different areas when you're looking at a budget, but we decided to take a lot of time to focus on that, to bring some information that is concise enough to give you in the time period you have here, and also give you a chance to ask questions so we can have a good discussion, and we can leave with you all feeling that it was worth your time, and that you had good information that was presented in this area. So with that, I'll hand it over to Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) to get us started.

Eshbaugh: My name Elaine **Eshbaugh**, and I'm an Associate Professor of Family Service and Gerontology in the School of Applied Human Sciences. I know many of

you, because many of us play multiple roles across campus. But one of the roles that I do play is the NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, and I've done that for over a year now. I'm going to talk today about some of the data that is part of the FAR Report [Faculty Athletics Report] that I put together each summer. What I'm passing around now is a series of graphs, tables that are taken directly out of the FAR Report (See addenda page 51) just sort of for ease of presentation. The FAR Report as a whole is 43 pages and you have access to that. Actually, it's online. Anyone has access to that, but just for the ease of presentation, I don't have everything that is in the FAR Report. If you do have questions, please ask. I want this to be a conversation. So in terms of being the FAR on campus, one thing that I think is important to realize is that I am appointed by the President. So I technically do not work for Athletics. I work with Athletics. I'm reappointed—if I'm reappointed by the President, I can't be un-appointed by Athletics. So I think that's an important distinction in terms of the role that I play. I work very closely with Athletics, but I am objective in trying to ensure academic integrity of the institution, and that is one of the most important parts of being the FAR. So I want to make sure that in the classroom, I want to make sure that our student athletes are given every opportunity they should get, but I also, on the other hand, I want to make sure that they are not getting opportunities that they should not get. In terms of fairness, it works both ways when we talk about teaching student-athletes. So, with the data that you have in front of you, I have a few slides. Some of the slides will be presented a little bit differently than the data you have in front of you. And that is simply because I tried to make things for ease of presentation, a little bit smaller so we could still read them here on the screen. One of the numbers that I pulled together with assistance of the Registrar's Office

is a number that compares ethnic diversity of our students-athletes, versus our general student population. One of the terms that I have to be careful not to use is non-student athletes. So every once in a while I'll say student-athletes and non-student athletes which is not what I want to use, because I want to define our non-student athletes, not by what they're not, but by what they are. So the terms I generally use are our "student-athletes" and our "general student population." Keeping in mind that our general student population may also be involved in things like music and theatre as well. With diversity on campus, we find that in a given year, typically the percentage of ethnic minority students that are student-athletes is about double or a little bit more, when we compare them to minority students as a percentage of all students on campus. For instance, in the previous year we did have 10% minority students on campus in our general student population, and then we did have 22% in terms of our student-athlete population. So we do find that that is a statistically significant difference. So our athletic program does increase diversity in our student population. And feel free if you have, questions, comments...yes, please.

O'Kane: Elaine (**Eshbaugh**) I'm wondering if we can get an electronic copy of this. I think some of our colleagues would really like to see this.

Eshbaugh: Just the handout? There is nothing in here that isn't in the whole report, so I will forward this to Gretchen and have her forward it to you.

Gould: And I will also have it appended to the minutes from today's meeting.

Eshbaugh: Absolutely. Perfect. Before I send this to you I will put a link on it to the whole report in case anyone does want to refer back to it. I should have done that here. I didn't think of it.

Swan: There's this asterisk. These are student-athletes who get financial assistance?

Eshbaugh: Correct.

Swan: What's the number of all?

Eshbaugh: I'm actually going to hold off on that because Beth (**West**) is going to talk in a little bit about the percentage of our student-athletes who are on full aid, partial aid, and then those who do not receive athletic aid. That's a fantastic question. We will get back to that.

Campbell: But that will not address Jesse's question probably about the ethnic composition of the non-aided athletes.

Swan: Or will it? That's very good. Will she address that?

Eshbaugh: No. I don't have data that has the student-athletes who are and are not receiving financial aid, in terms of minority student status, because this is what the Registrar's Office tracks by on this particular variable. I could ask them to see if they could run that. I'm not sure how easy or hard that would be. But now that I say that, I'm going to show you the next slide, and this actually is our residency composition. And we're here looking at those who receive financial aid, and those that do not receive financial aid. And in this case, we do find that

about three times the percentage that we find of all students that are from out of state, we find three times that percentage within our student-athlete population. We do find that sports help us to recruit students who are from out of state.

Swan: What does the walk-ons mean?

Eshbaugh: The walk-ons would just be student athletes who do not receive financial aid. So basically if I'm saying "those that receive financial aid and walk-ons"---that would be all of our student-athletes.

Swan: So that's what this is---the residency composition?

Eshbaugh: The residency composition is all student-athletes, correct.

Kidd: Just a quick question. Here you talk about recruitment from out of state, is that due to scholarships being offered or walk-ons?

Eshbaugh: My perspective on that is that it's probably a little bit of both. I think you'll be surprised when Beth (**West**) talks about how many of our student-athletes are on partial scholarships; partial athletic scholarship. So for instance, when you talk about a team like our track and field team, there's only I believe one student-athlete who might be on full academic aid, and the rest who have aid are partial. My perspective is we have quite a few student-athletes who come from out of state and maybe they are lured here by being able to play a sport and getting some financial aid. But I do think that when we look at walk-ons--- if we're giving someone full financial aid, my thought is they're more likely to come from further to take advantage of the offer. Would you agree with that?

Harris: Yes, and I would say that student-athletes come from out of state for a variety of reasons. Some of them come as walk-ons because they believe they'll be in a position to earn a scholarship when they come and show that they're as good a player as some of the ones that are on scholarship, and so our student-athletes can be looking for opportunities at a number of different universities, and if they're determine that they want to go to college and have an opportunity to participate in athletics, then some of them are willing to travel distances to be able to get that opportunity because they believe it will be a good experience, and it ultimately might pay off in a scholarship as well.

Walter: Does the red shirt status play into that as well? I understand that it's pretty useful.

Harris: Sure. If they're red-shirted, I mean you can either be red-shirted and either be a scholarship or a walk-on player, so it doesn't impact that particular status.

Swan: What does red-shirted mean?

Harris: Red-shirted basically means during your first year on campus you are practicing and potentially receiving aid, but you are not competing. All of our student-athletes have a five-year period in order to compete four years, with one of those years by the NCAA rules, can be a red-shirt year. You're on the team. You're practicing, you're doing everything else that everybody's doing, but then you don't play when it's time to play. It's meant to give a student-athlete the chance many times to get bigger, stronger, and more mature before they actually go out and compete. So after that red-shirt year, they still have four years—a red-

shirt freshman. So sophomore, junior and senior year to actually be able to compete with the team.

O’Kane: I think it would probably be safe to say that the bulk of the student-athletes are getting financial aid. Is that correct?

Eshbaugh: Beth will address that a little more specifically. Is that a fair statement?

West: Yeah. That will be one of our slides. On full scholarship, we only have 21% of our athletes on full scholarship.

O’Kane: Really what I’m curious about is the source of the monies. You’re going to cover that?

West: Yes, I will. Absolutely.

Swan: Before you go on, here with the racial/ethnic composition and the residency, so if you’re asking me to compare this with the all students, do you have a figure for the minority students receiving full scholarships?

So you just give us, if I read this correctly, all students who are minorities 10%, but it’s not in relation to receiving financial aid.

West: You’re correct.

Swan: So do you have that information?

Eshbaugh: I do not have that information. I would have to go back to Financial Aid. The data that we get is only regarding our students who are in athletics. I’m not sure actually how easy that would be to get. I’m actually going to take a note.

Swan: We do know that people come if we wanted to increase minority enrollment, we could offer more financial aid and get more minority to come we could offer more financial aid across the board, outside of athletics and that would increase this figure.

Eshbaugh: Anything else?

Campbell: As Jesse (**Swan**) said full scholarship, you have only 22 students you said. You could probably figure that out fairly easily yourself with the racial composition of the 22 students on full scholarship.

Eshbaugh: Of the 21%?

Swan: I was asking about all the student population; the whole student population, and she doesn't have that information. The minority population on scholarship. All students.

Campbell: Oh, not athletes on full scholarship.

Swan: To compare it to the athletes.

Eshbaugh: I'm going to move on and talk about our academic data, so what you have in front of you on page three is more detail. This is directly cut and pasted out of the FAR Report. What you have on the screen, because this is much, too much text to put on the screen, is a comparison of our most recent semester, which would be spring 2016. If I were to make a statement looking at the previous six years, or the previous twelve semesters GPA data, I would sum that up by saying that we do not find statistically significant differences when we compare

our general population to our student-athletes. You might see a .02 difference in one way or the other, but nothing that generally is going to reach statistical significance.

Swan: The international ones, looks like from your chart there, might be, but you're saying it's not. It's blurry to me.

Eshbaugh: I'll actually explain that. I had a note on that. That is the one we do see the biggest difference is with international students who happen to be student-athletes do have a higher GPA than the general student population. But that N is small in the group comparison. We actually do not have a lot of international student-athletes in that group. That is a big difference, but it does not reach statistical significance for that reason.

Swan: Thank you.

Eshbaugh: Thank you. Good question.

Choi: For other students, there's not much difference between the general population and student-athletes, but I'm concerned about the minority student population. For minority students, the athletes have lower GPAs I also have a similar question related to that, for your last page of this. The graduation/retention rates, all minority student-athletes 2009-2010--- it's only 31%. It's even lower than the all UNI minority students, which is 43%.

Eshbaugh: Actually if you do look at the Federal Graduation Rate and you're comparing minority student-athletes to minority students as a whole, what you see is they tend to flip-flop according to year quite a bit. It's not a real stable

number. There are some years where actually you see that the minority students have a lower rate of graduation, and there are years where they have a higher rate of graduation. So I'm not sure exactly what to make of that based on the fluctuation of that number, because it's not a steady trend across time.

Hesse: Do you have any data on the majors the athletes select compared with the general population?

Eshbaugh: Yes. Yes. There's something in athletics we like to call clustering, and clustering is a bad thing, because it may indicate that you may need to investigate if you do see a lot of student-athletes in a certain major. And if you watch national trends at some schools across the nation, there's been a problem where there was a major that was not an actual major, et cetera. That data is actually in the FAR report. We do see that we have a significantly, slightly but statistically significant difference of students that are in majors within the College of Ed, but they tend to be the coaching majors, and Leisure, Youth and Human Services. That is a good fit for a lot of student-athlete interests, but that data is in the report, looking at colleges, yes.

Hesse: I looked up the report and the report is broken down by College. It didn't give specific, individual majors, and there's a wide range within a College.

Eshbaugh: We do have a list of those if you're interested in the list of students in particular majors.

Hesse: I would be interested.

Eshbaugh: Okay. Yeah. Our athletic academic advising team, and they are fantastic, they keep track of that.

Hesse: I bring this up because for those of you who don't know, I graduated from UNI and when I was here I was a student-athlete. I ran on the cross country teams, and I knew plenty of student-athletes who chose majors because they were easy. So I would like some data.

Eshbaugh: Absolutely. In terms of Federal Graduate Rate, this is your six-year rate. So this is the percentage of students who graduate within six years. And again, we don't see any statistical significance in those minor differences across time. Unfortunately, we see a tiny drop across time based on those cohorts, but that's among both groups.

Burnight: This is the start date the entry date?

Eshbaugh: Yes, so the most recent data we would is from those who came in in the Fall of 2009. Yes.

Campbell: How does that compare to our sibling universities---Iowa State, Iowa City or our conference teams?

Eshbaugh: There is a program that the NCAA pulls together called the IPP (Individual Performance Program), and it allows us to look at numbers in our Athletic Department and compare those to certain peer groups. The information you're asking for is in the FAR report. I can give you the percentile within the conference, and also the percentile within what we call the FCS schools: so

schools who have football programs like ours across the nation. What I will say, and this is more of a generic statement, because I don't have that number in front of me, and I can actually grab that number quite easily, but what I will say is that in general, when I look at the academic data for our student-athletes in terms of Federal Graduation Rate, Retention Rate, GPA—those types of numbers, also our APR which I don't have listed here, which indicates how many of our students continue and stay eligible, what I find in general is that our Athletic Department on these numbers is going to rank between the 50th percentile and the 70th percentile, so I would say we're above average. Okay? Probably like in the third quartile moving up. I know it falls between those numbers.

Harris: I would say, having been at Iowa State the past ten years and looking at...and I can remember looking at UNI Graduation Rate numbers when I was interviewing to come and take this position, the numbers were fairly similar between institutions, but UNI had more cases where the student-athlete population's graduation rate was either similar or maybe slightly exceeded the student body at Iowa State. I think in the ten-year time period, Iowa State only exceeded their population on only a couple of occasions, where UNI seemed to do it a little more frequently, but the numbers we're pretty similar.

Eshbaugh: I do have our retention numbers, and this is provided by the Financial Aid and Registrar's Office. And the way that they track this is by looking at any student-athletes that receive financial aid, whether it is partial or whether it is full financial aid. We do find that, and again going back to what Jesse (**Swan**) pointed out, we do find that, and again, Beth (**West**) will get to the numbers in terms of how many students we are describing here, we do find that our retention rates

are far above the general student population. And again, it would be interesting, as Jesse pointed out earlier, if we were to take a look at students who were receiving financial aid from sources other than from athletics. But again, that's not how they're generally tracked across the University.

O'Kane: There seems to be a disconnect between Retention Rate and Federal Graduation Rate. The Athletic Retention Rate: Good for you guys. That's through the roof: really good. Why isn't that translating into a Federal Graduation Rate?

Harris: I think that part of the disconnect could be that with the Federal Graduation Rate, a student-athlete may be retained from their freshman-sophomore year but ultimately in their junior year, because they're not playing, they decide to transfer to another institution. And within the Federal Graduation Rate, if a student transfers to another institution, it's counted as a failure. Even if that student goes to that other institution and graduates, it's counted as a failure in your graduation rate. And it also does not count as a success in the graduation rate of the other place where the student actually went to and actually graduated. So you can be retaining some of your students initially, but ultimately if they transfer for reasons that may not have anything to do with their experience here as a student, but their desire to be able to play more, then that could be one possible reason. That may not explain the complete difference, but I know that's one of the reasons why there are two different types of graduation rates. One is called the Federal Rate and the other is called the Graduation Success Rate. It's one that was designed maybe five or six years ago to try to equalize those numbers a little bit more, and to take a look at how transfers were impacting the graduation rates for student-athletes.

O’Kane: But it seems like that must not be occurring very much, because if we were losing a lot of athletes say in junior or senior year, that number for retention rate would be---it’s at 97%! It would be less.

Harris: Typically, I’ve seen retention rates be freshman to sophomore.

O’Kane: Oh. It’s only freshman-sophomore.

Dhanwada: That’s what I was going to say. This is just the freshman to sophomore retention rate. We generally don’t measure the sophomore to junior or junior to senior. We don’t go all the way through. So yes, that would be...right.

O’Kane: That explains it.

Bass: And the graduation rate is measured the same for any of our students that transfer to another institution. They may eventually graduate, but it doesn’t count for us.

Dhanwada: I can give you an example in academics. So we have pre-nursing. A lot of our pre-nursing majors actually go off to Allen, and so lose them. We keep them for the first year, but then they leave so we can’t count them.

Bass: They count in our retention rates, but they lower our graduation rate.

Dhanwada: Right.

O’Kane: That seems like it should be fixed. It lowers the graduation rate?

[laughter] That’s the deal. They come here for two years and then they go there.

Dhanwada: That’s why we want them to transfer back. That’s a different story.

Bass: Another discussion.

Kidd: Just to clarify that in the FAR report, could you put like freshman to sophomore retention rates? I think it was confusing for everybody. Not everybody, but...

Swan: Do you think this happens more with minority student-athletes, that they transfer away? Just looking at all UNI minority students graduate with a rate of 43%, but the athletes are at 35%, just for the 2009-10, that difference.

Harris: I don't know if it's happening more with minority students. I would say in general, transfer numbers are going up across the board, across the nation. You're seeing more student-athletes transferring, and I think it's happening a lot more in sports like football and basketball where there are a larger number of minority student-athletes, so that may be one correlation. But one of the things that athletic departments are struggling with across the country are just the number of student-athletes who are coming in are making decisions a lot earlier and a lot more frequently to transfer, because something is not exactly the way they want it to be. I think there was a time period where when you came in you were expected to sit for a couple of years, and then when you were ready to play, then you'd go in to play. And now there's more of an expectation that "I should be able to play right away, and if I'm not able to play a significant amount of time within my first year or two, then I want to go to a place where I can do that." You're certainly seeing it in sports where they feel that there is a career perhaps professionally. Because some of them are coming to college thinking that they are going to be able to play in the NBA or the WNBA or overseas. So if they're here for

a couple of years and they're not playing, they don't feel like they have the opportunity to be patient and wait because until they want to get to a spot where they can play, show off their talents, and then hopefully be pursued by somebody with a professional team.

Swan: I was paying attention, but is that kind of a yes? That more minority student-athletes do transfer out, because we seem to be more successful retaining non-minority student-athletes in athletics, and the population at large, less. Again, we're going very quickly, and maybe that's not what these numbers mean---than with the minority student-athletes, they seem to be leaving more than the non-athlete minority students. And that the non-minority athletes seem to be staying, and graduating at a higher rate, than the minority students at large.

Harris: I don't have data that shows that minority student-athletes are transferring at higher rates than non-minority student-athletes. The one thing that I can say is that we're seeing a larger number of students transfer in sports where we have a higher population of minority student-athletes, and that's probably why.

Swan: That could account for this.

Choi: That is related to my previous question also. While I appreciate your answer that this is fluctuating year by year, but I still think this is a significant issue because in 2007-2008 the Retention Rate is only 25%, which is surprisingly low. So I was wondering what kind of effort or support is provided for those students?

Harris: From my standpoint, and unfortunately this has been the case I think at every institution that I've worked at, the minority student-athlete Graduation Rate and GPA has been lower than that of the student body, and of the normal student-athlete population---the overall student-athlete population. And so it's something that's been prevalent for a number of different reasons. From our standpoint, minority student-athletes receive the same support and the same help and the same access when it comes to study hall, or tutoring, or assessments, or being evaluated for a potential learning disability, and in accessing those accommodations, being able to have tests monitored on the road, access to technology, computer labs: All of those things. And so there's no difference in what they're receiving versus others. The challenge for us to figure out what they need above and beyond what others are receiving, so their performance can be better. And that's something that we continue to look at, and continue to be challenged by. The biggest thing that we've come up with, is to try to find a way to individualize what they need as much as possible. Being able to assist them when they come in the door in areas like reading and writing; do a disability assessment, so we can truly come up with an individualized plan, so if they need a certain amount of tutoring, or they need to have accommodations, or they need to have whatever it is, so we're not just throwing them into a group and saying, "Well everybody has to do eight hours of study hall. You're going to have to do the same thing. And, everybody's going to be in a room, and they're going to be required to study on their own." If we can figure out that some may need much more individualized attention than that, so let's figure out what we need to do above and beyond that, so we can support them. I want the numbers to be higher. I want them to be the same as any other student-athlete at the very

least, and ultimately the very same as any other student. And they haven't been, and so that's something we want to give attention to.

Kidd: The only statistically significant---I can be wrong about this too, is the data not in the female minority student, but the male minority student, the GPA and Retention Rate. What do you think is the underlying? Is there a causality? By sports chosen? Or do male athletes as a higher percentage get more scholarship opportunities or...

Harris: Once again, generally everywhere that I've worked, the male student-athlete population has been lower than the female student-athlete population. And the minority population, that GPA has been lower for males than for females. The information that I have is only anecdotal, and typically when you look at an athletics department, the majority of the minority student-athletes fall in football, men's basketball, women's basketball, and track and field. Three of those four sports are sports where there are professional opportunities that are prevalent for student-athletes if they're good. So some of them come in and we really have to catch their attention and get their attention about focusing on their academics quite frankly, and not thinking about the career that they believe they're going to have afterwards. That could impact graduation rates and GPAs. Some of them will come in, and it's only after they get here and they have success that their focus can tend to wander into other areas and they start thinking about careers and what they see on TV and what they see with professional athletes, and what they are able to earn and the living that they're able to make. So we have conversations with them about how few people actually make a career playing sports. It being just a really, really small percentage. But of course, they all think

they're going to be in that very, very small percentage. We've got 400 athletes and they all think they're going to fit within that 2% that actually make it to a professional level. It becomes a day-to-day process for us, and it's one of the reasons why we have to develop a relationship with them, because we're trying to get them to trust us and understand that there's a 98% chance that you're going to be making a career like I am---like other former student-athletes are---doing something other than sports. Even if you have a chance to play professionally, it will be a very, very short career, and then you will need the degree to make the kind of living you ultimately want to make. We've just seen when there's a goal out there, that they get to see on TV more so than what you've seen with other sports, then there's the temptation of putting all the eggs in the basket of, "This is how I can make a better life for yourself." And we truly believe that it's the education that will lead them to make a better life for themselves.

Kidd: Thank you.

Eshbaugh: One other thing that I will mention and it's on the bottom of page three, you'll see that our women's basketball team is typically ranked in the top 15 nationally out of about---depending on the year---about 345 Division 1 schools. One of the more impressive things---beyond just the GPA--- is the culture of excellence that they have set up, is that if you go into their locker room, this right here---what you have right here in front of you---that is posted on the wall. They are ranked nationally in GPA, and I would say their head coach values that as much or even more than she values any victory on the court. I give them a lot of

credit for setting up a culture of excellence for student-athletes all around, not just athletically. And with that, I will turn it over to Beth (**West**).

West: Thank you, Elaine (**Eshbaugh**). I'm Beth **West**, Associate A.D. for Business. I help with the financial and accounting side of the Athletics Department. Just based on the time we have allotted today, like David (**Harris**) said, we're going to focus on a few key areas in our financial overview and we're going to look at our fiscal year '17 budget, the main revenue and expense areas there. We will look at the revenue components specifically, and then look at the relationship between athletics and the General Fund. Then we'll get into that Aid Overview, which I hope will help with some of the questions as far as the source of the aid, and how that is split up by our participants, and then finally we'll look at the Missouri Valley Conference as a peer, and see where we fit within that realm. So the first slide here, for budgeted revenue, this is fiscal year '17, our current 2016-2017 year, our current estimated working budget of \$14 million. Main revenue sources are Foundation Support, which some of you have heard about Panther Scholarship Club, so a lot of that is our Foundation Support. Ticket Sales: We have five ticketed sports between football, volleyball, men's basketball, women's basketball and wrestling. We also receive NCAA and Conference Distributions for various items. Some of them have distinct stipulations to them. We have a contract with a company called Learfield that handles our sponsorship and advertising. And then some other miscellaneous revenue items from marketing, concessions, ticket fees and guarantees. We also receive some support in the form of Student Fees, and then General Fund as well. So that is the breakdown of our revenue items.

O’Kane: Can you point me to the General Fund?

East: The last two.

O’Kane: Both of those? Okay, got it. Thank you.

Burnight: What is the difference?

East: The difference in the General Fund line?

Burnight: The two.

Kidd: One is SWFB and one is S & F.

East: Yes. SWFB is Salaries, Wages, and Fringe Benefits. S & F: Scholarships and Fellowships. That is just the way that University Business Operations separates them. That’s the total amount that we included in there.

Swan: Have those two been decreasing over the last five to ten years?

East: Yes.

Swan: Do you have a chart showing us that?

East: I do.

Campbell: Do you also have a chart showing us what’s happening to those last three together over the past years?

West: Student fees? Yes. We have a look on that one as well. We can go back and do a ten-year look. So, moving on to the expense side of the \$14 million budget, Personnel makes up about \$6 million of that with pay and fringe benefits related to that--- coaches, administration and support staff. Student Aid is another large

component of our expenses. About \$3.9 million in Student Aid. Travel Expenses: that relates to our team travelling, as well as individuals, so that can be hotels, meals, busses, any flights--that is all put into Travel Expenses. And then some other Miscellaneous Expenses, such as hospitality, interdepartmental expenses, professional services, equipment, office supplies---all of those areas. And then we also note on there because we are an auxiliary unit of the University, we pay an overhead allocation back to the University on that as well.

Swan: What's the relationship between the personnel, so this screen, those expenses, and the previous screen? So for example, I think, but I don't remember for sure, so that you'll be able to tell me, that some of the salaries come out of the Foundation and not elsewhere. Do you have that split up, how the personnel expenses, where they come from? So for example, there's one coach, we got a lot of money for that coach, and so that comes out of that account and no other account, right?

West: Right, from a strictly accounting standpoint, all Personnel wages come out of our operating account. If a certain coach has Foundation Support pledged for their position, we would then draw those funds from the Foundation, and reimburse our account. So that coach isn't paid directly from the Foundation. They're still on University payroll, but the full coach's salary would be in that Personnel line, and then the support for their salary would be on the slide before that you mentioned, that Foundation Support.

Swan: How much of the Personnel comes out of Foundation Support?

West: Off the top of my head, I don't have an exact amount.

Swan: Half?

West: I can look it up.

Kidd: Can't you just subtract?

West: No. The Foundation Support, there's multiple things that go into that, so it could be Salary Support, but then it could also be Scholarship Support from our Panther Scholarship Club. So, there's multiple things rolled up into the Foundation Support.

Kidd: What I mean is you have it split up into Salaries, Wages, and Fringe Benefits of \$3 million, if you go to the next slide.

West: From the General Fund?

Kidd: And here you have Personnel Pay and Fringes being \$6 million, so how is that different?

West: The first slide from the revenue is just what we received from the General Fund that's paid as Personnel Support. So the General Fund does not fund all of our positions. We have a total of \$6 million that we are paying out.

Kidd: I understand. So \$6 million minus \$3 million is \$3 million?

West: Is what we're footing the bill for? Yes, is that what you're wondering?

Kidd: Yes. Foundation, Ticket Sales, all revenue sources.

West: Yes. Exactly.

Swan: So half is, other than General Fund, but that might not be the Foundation, and that's why you couldn't answer my question because I wanted to know how much of that comes out of Foundation and it may not be half. Correct?

West: Correct.

Kidd: Can I ask a question? Student Aid, I'm sure that includes Scholarships, does it also include the tutors, because I know you guys have a lot of tutoring and things like that?

West: It does not. The cost of the tutors and Academic Support, that would be a separate expense. That number is just the tuition fees, you're right.

Kidd: So where is that actually located?

West: That would be rolled up into one of our other categories. Some of it would be in the Personnel, as far as the wages piece of it, but if it's certain materials and things like that, it could be in one of those Miscellaneous categories.

Kidd: But generally, I would guess that the majority of that expense would be then in the Personnel.

West: The Personnel.

Kidd: Okay. Thank you.

O'Kane: Where does facilities upkeep and maintenance--- heating, lights? Is that up here?

West: Good question. The structure of the division that David oversees falls with Facilities. As far as athletic facilities, between the Dome and McLeod and Athletic Operations. So any utilities that you're mentioning fall within a Dome Operations Account versus an Athletics Account.

Swan: So that's why that's not here? Where does that money come from to pay that account?

West: Dome Operations? They have a separate budget. They have a separate budget outside of this \$14 million budget. They run on a structure where they're hosting events, and doing other sort of Revenue Generating items, other than just Athletics specifically.

O'Kane: Is General Fund money going there at all?

West: To the Dome Operations? There is a transfer from the University level on an annual basis, but I would have to go back to see if it's actually put in as General Fund, or if it's coming from a different University account. It's a good question.

Swan: So for football using the Dome, does it pay the Dome operations funds to use it, or do they just use it?

West: It does not pay the Dome, no.

Campbell: I think we're looking at that last bullet, Overhead Allocation.

Presumably that covers some of the Dome, some of the grounds keeping, or what does that Overhead Allocation pay for?

West: Good question. The Overhead Allocation is actually a charge that goes to the University Office of Business Operations, so OBO at Gilchrist, for again being Auxiliary, the thought is for helping maintain the accounts, they charge a fee. We're not a General Fund account.

Campbell: Is that just for their bookkeeping, or does it extend to other things?

West: It is. Yes. They might say it is for bookkeeping. I would have to go back to see exactly how they describe it. It's an operations overall percentage that they charge a fee on.

Smith: I have a question and then a follow-up, dependent on how my question is answered. Let's just speak hypothetically, and say that the University has ten donors that pledge \$500,000 each to support one of our excellent coaches. So that's too much, but some other amount--- \$100,000 each. Do we wait until we have the money in the bank before we include that money, or do we rely on the pledge card and build our budget? And then what happens if unfortunately, one or two of those donors, their business goes into bankruptcy or whatever happens, and they can't or won't pay their pledge? So if we were planning on five people sharing \$100,000 each or \$500,000 now we don't have \$500,000, we have \$300,000. So do we wait to build the budget until we have money in the bank or do pledges count like money in the bank, and everybody is just hoping that everything is going to work out really well for everybody?

West: The pledges are handled from the Foundation side of it and you're right, they take multi-year pledges, and so with that there is always the on-going donor

relationship, so if there is something where they pledged... through those donor relations, hopefully there would be some sort of heads up if something were to happen and they were to have to pull their pledge. Thankfully, we haven't seen that, but you're right. That could happen.

Smith: You haven't seen that? I know I'm speaking hypothetically. I'm not trying to be personal, but you haven't actually seen that?

West: Right. From a budgeting standpoint, when we're looking out to the year ahead, we're looking at what pledges are there for the upcoming year and then the collectability of those, which again have historically been high.

Harris: And then if we were to have an issue to where we weren't able to collect something, then it's our responsibility to go out and find another donor who can make up that amount.

Smith: That's tough, isn't it?

Harris: And it's one of the things you get into. If you're in a spot where you're trying to pay a coach an amount that's maybe market value for their services, or in some cases maybe below market value for their services, but it's still beyond what you can do, throughout your budget you have donors who are generous enough to be able to make pledges to be able to hold on to some of those coaches, but it is still a challenge if you were to ever have a donor who for whatever reason couldn't fulfill an initial pledge, then we have someone who works in the Foundation office, who is assigned to the Athletics Department that we can work with and say, "Okay, this is where we think we're short. We need to

go out and fundraise the appropriate amount to be able to make up for that.” Thankfully, as Beth (**West**) has said, we haven’t been in that situation to this point. It doesn’t mean that it can’t happen. But if it does, it becomes our responsibility to be able to make up that amount either through additional revenues, or through finding another donor to take over that spot.

Smith: That’s wonderful news, and I’m glad to know that because I’m well aware, as everyone in here is, of the waxing and waning of the economy, and for us not to have had a problem in the past, is very good news. I’m glad to know that. I would just have assumed that out of donors that are making substantial contributions, pledges, there would be some kind of business reversals or issues beyond their control actually where they weren’t able to honor it. So for you to tell me that really that hasn’t been a problem, is very encouraging.

Harris: One of the things that, fast-forwarding a little bit situations where you may find a challenge, is sometimes donors will give because they’re supportive of one particular coach. They want to retain that coach, and they’re giving money to support the salary of that coach. So if that coach were to leave, are they going to be in the position to want to continue to give at that same amount, so you can go out and hire the next coach at the same level? Many times their willingness to give and support the salary is based on a relationship that’s been built over a period of time. When that coach decides to leave, and you have someone they don’t know, they may say, “Hey, I’m not so sure I want to give \$100,000 there.” And that’s where you have to look at either finding other donors to chip in if you’re trying to bring somebody in at that same salary, or you have to step back and say, “Okay, we’re able to pay X to this coach because of the support he or she

had garnered,” now, when we’re bringing in a new coach, we’re going to have to pay this amount because we don’t have that level of support as of yet.”

Smith: Thank you, sir and Beth.

Kidd: Two quick questions. The bonds that are paid, are they paid in that Dome Operations Account?

West: Correct.

Kidd: Another thing is Peregrine Financial. There was a donor who was convicted of fraud basically. So that donor did promise money to the Athletics Department, so I guess I’m confused by saying that never happened.

West: Very good case. \$220 million. The Wasendorf funds are currently frozen in the Foundation. I don’t have any other legal information but yes, the money is sitting in the Foundation completely frozen. It has not been touched in three or four years, since the initial... The Foundation is in some of the discussions with the lawyers. But that’s a very good example.

Smith: I just want to share with our group the usual practice on that. I don’t have any specific on that, but the policy, as harsh as it may sound, that contributions like we got from that particular donor: You can’t benefit from ill-gotten gains, and usually those contributions are clawed back to go to the investors that are going to be paid. That’s standard operating procedure. I understand that the receiver has not been aggressive in asking for the claw-back provision to be applied, and I don’t know how long he has to do that. But normally when there’s a situation like that, it’s construed as ill-gotten gains, as harsh as that might sound to us, because we received it in good faith. It will be good from our standpoint if we’re able to

keep that money, but I think we have to be prepared for that to go bye-bye. Someone's looking out for us if we don't have to pay that back.

Hakes: Peregrine stock.

West: Now moving on with our next slide, looking at our revenue components, so putting our current fiscal year 2017 budget into three kinds of general areas: Athletics Generated Revenue, at about \$ 7.6 million, and then you see the Student Fee Support and the General Fund Support as well. Here we go back about ten years just to show that comparison in that breakdown of how the revenue components look. The next slide shows the same information, just from the pie graph way of using the percentages. Athletics Generated or our fiscal year 2017, at about 54%. Going back ten years, that was 34%, so just showing the trend in the movement of the revenue sources.

Campbell: Can I go back to the previous slide? The other way to look at it though, is I'm looking at \$6 million in subsidy both years, and the Athletic Generation has doubled.

West: Looking at the break down?

Campbell: Yes.

West: Yes.

Swan: So why are we spending so much more money--- why are we getting so much more money and I guess we're spending it?

West: This is a ten-year look, so general increasing costs from a lot of different areas. Increased Scholarship expense, increased Personnel and fringe benefit expense, increased travel industry as far as busses and meals and hotels--- Everything has gone up from that regard as well. Those are some general areas that I can think of.

Swan: So the General Fund support is still high, but it's because you have so much more money, that it's a lesser percent?

West: The percentage in our total revenue, right.

Swan: So we haven't been growing that contribution, but it hasn't been shrinking as much as some might have wanted, going down to zero for example; it's not doing that.

O'Kane: Like Jesse (**Swan**), I noticed that the Athletics-Generated Revenue has increased, and this may be a completely off-the-wall question, but I and a number of people have noticed that over the last few years that the number of tickets for a football season ticket has gone from six to five and I'm wondering if we make more money if we go on the road. Is there something to that?

West: The number of home games, is that what you're referring to?

Harris: Only if we're being...only if we're in a situation to be bought, for lack of a better way of putting it. If we're on the road for a conference game, then no. But if we're going on the road let's say to Iowa State, then typically it's a guarantee game, where they're giving us a certain amount of money to go there and play. Typically, in any given football season, there will only be one of those with the

exception of every four or five years or so, there will be a twelve-game season. The next one I think is in 2019, where we'll have, if we decide to take it, we'll have two opportunities to be involved in games where teams at the FBS level, are paying us to come in and play them, and we have to make the determination whether or not it's worth it whether to go and play those games in order to get the financial payback.

Swan: So is this true too with the decrease in General Fund support looks like it's been replaced with Student Fees basically, just in dollar amounts? Am I looking at that correctly?

West: Some of it has...

Swan: It looks like it's about a million dollars less in General Fund and it's about a million more in Student Fees. So, that's about right? That's necessary? I only see the slide as it comes up, so maybe there's a slide coming up. So how does this compare to expenditures? So we're having to have the Student Fees go up because the money is needed? Is that correct?

West: Correct. Some of the justification on our Student Fees request is similar.

Swan: Do you know what...I understand inflation, but is it inflation? Can you...Are there increases in certain areas that are clear, such as salaries? Are those much higher than what they were ten years ago? I guess it's not the Dome account. We don't pay for the Dome out of this money, right? So is it increases in scholarships? There are ways that money is spent. What are the biggest increases in the ten-year period?

West: I would probably point to both of those, from the Personnel side and from the Scholarship side as far as tuition increases. I would have to look back to see if the number of student athletes or the aid component. I don't want to say either way, but I don't think we're providing a lot more in the number of student-athletes who are receiving aid compared to ten years ago. The cost of that same number now is greater, say from a Personnel standpoint. If it's someone who's been here those whole ten years, and received increases, or if it's new hires. It's all going in to that, yes.

Harris: I think from our standpoint while I don't know what the history is of when Student Fee support has gone up over that ten-year time period to be from \$1 million to \$2 million. I think that part of this slide is also to show that while Athletic Generated Revenues have gone up, if we were pacing---using the same percentages that we were using in 2006---then the amount of Student Fee support and General Education Fund support would be much higher, in that the amount of money that the Athletics Department is generating is more. The expenses are more, but at the same time, as a percentage of the overall budget, Student Fee support and General Funds support are a smaller percentage by a significant amount than they were ten years ago.

Kidd: I think inflation, I just looked it up, is about 20% from 2006-2016, so that's a 20% effective reduction, even though you're keeping the same amount of money from the General Education support, Student Fee support. I also know that tuition has gone up more than that in the past ten years, because tuition started to rise pretty dramatically at this institution. I agree, the total amount of dollars is the

same, between Student Fees and General Funds, but the effective purchasing power of those dollars is a lot less. Kind of like or Supplies & Service budgets. They've been constant for ten years but we can't buy as much stuff. That's all.

Harris: We should probably keep going as it will probably be easier to explain stuff when we have a chance to get through more of the slides.

West: With the Athletics and General Fund relationship, we just looked at how the General Fund fits within our revenue component, but now looking at the total General Fund, at the University level, and then as a percentage so again, using that ten-year comparison. Currently it's at 2.4%. About ten years ago, 3.5% of the General Fund. We included some notes at the bottom, just to outline a Board of Regents Funding Plan back in 2010 that limited the amount of support to 2.4%, and then were some larger reductions over a three-year period, started fiscal year 2013 through fiscal year 2015. Additionally, we looked at it kind of both ways. Obviously, we've been talking about the General Fund support to athletics, that the \$4.3 million number. But also the athletic support back to the General Fund, looking at the \$3.9 million of aid that we pay for student-athletes, and then the overhead allocations is another small area. The number that we also put on there, the tuition paid by student-athletes beyond what is provided to athletic aid—that was mentioned in some of the earlier conversation with Elaine (**Eshbaugh**), that a lot of our student-athletes are not on full-ride scholarships, and so they are paying a lot of that aid themselves, or from other sources. The next couple slides get into that aid amount, and kind of shows that breakdown. So just an overview of the aid. We have 17 NCAA Division I sports and about 400 student-athletes.

The next slides kind of categorize our sports into two different areas: head count sports and equivalency sports. Head count sports means that a team can award only full ride scholarships. So it's either a full ride or nothing and the number of those scholarships are capped at a certain amount by the NCAA. At UNI, we have three Head-count sports volleyball, men's basketball, and women's basketball. So in the example on the slide there, women's volleyball can award twelve full ride scholarships. Up to twelve. They can award ten, they can award twelve, but they cannot award fourteen, and they can't take those twelve and split them up. On the other side, equivalency sports, would be all of our other sports. And that basically means a team can award a full or a partial, and there's still a limit on the value of those aid awards. So with the example of wrestling, they have 9.9 equivalency worth of scholarships that they can distribute out to as many student-athletes as they want. They can split up that 9.9 and give it to twenty student-athletes if they choose.

Campbell: Volleyball can still have walk-ons?

West: They can. Correct. Very good point. They can provide twelve scholarships, but they can also have walk-ons that receive no support. Correct. And that's the same thing for head count and equivalency sports. They can always have walk-ons because they do not receive athletic aid. Going into are participants by sport. We have women's sports on the left; ten women's sports. Two of these sports are head counts sports that we just talked about, women's basketball and volleyball. Men's sports on the right with one head count sport, men's basketball, and the other six are equivalency sports. Just for the ease of showing this, we included cross country, indoor track and outdoor track just as a track and field number. A

lot of these athletes are multi-sport athletes, but they count as individual sports when we're looking at our seventeen sports. The next slide shows the source of the aid. Basically, that left hand table in each column is full rides. All of their aid is coming from athletics. The middle column is partial so some of their aid is from athletics and then the last column is none. None of their aid is coming from athletics. So when we're looking at our total 400 student-athletes, 83 of them receive full support; 208 are on partial scholarships. Some of it is coming from athletics, some of it is coming from another source, and then 109 receive no aid from athletics. So when we're going back to our budget numbers, the \$3.9 million of aid that's budgeted in our athletics budget would be split between those full rides and those partials. The additional \$4.3 that we put on the slide is the other half are the partials or the students who are receiving no aid. When we looked at that number, the 4.3 number in estimating that, we tried to take into account that some of these student-athletes might be receiving a Distinguished Scholar Award, or some other type of aid, and so we reduce it by that because it's not coming out of their pockets, but it's in another form of aid. The next table shows the same information as percentages, so only 21% of our athletes are on full ride scholarships. The majority, 52%, about half, are on partial, and then 27% do not receive any athletic aid. The last slide that we have here, and sorry this got a little small, is looking at the Missouri Valley Conference, which UNI is a member of. It has ten member schools: three private institutions and seven public universities. We pulled out the Student Fee piece and the Direct Institutional Support piece. This is from fiscal year 2015, so the 2014-2015 year, but it was the most recent that the conference had access to as far as compiling this information. So if you're looking at the dollar values, at Student Fees, in 2015 UNI received \$1.9---almost

\$2 million in student fees and that put us sixth, so in the bottom half of the conference. You can see it ranges from zero at Bradley and Drake who are private, all the way up to \$9.8 at Illinois State.

Hesse: But don't you need to break it down like fees per student, because some of those are double our size?

West: Right. You're right. Some of that plays into it and you're very correct. Unfortunately, we didn't have that from the conference, so in order to...

Hesse: It's a little misleading if you're looking at raw numbers.

West: Right. In order to provide some sort of comparison, we went with this. There would be some additional drilling down that we just didn't have access to at the conference level.

Kidd: You can look up the undergraduate enrollment at these universities. It's public knowledge.

West: You could. You're right and you could back into an estimate. Same thing from the General Fund side. For fiscal year 2015 at UNI we received about \$4 in comparison, it ranges from about \$100,000 up to \$11 million. That is our brief financial overview and I know we could get into it in much more depth, but...

Harris: So if you look at where we stand within the conferences, when you add all the Institutional Support with Student Fees, we are ninth out of ten schools in the amount of money we receive from institutional sources. And then going back about couple of slides, when we talked about the \$3.9 million that we provide in

aid, and then the \$4.3 million that our student athletes either pay or have paid for them, there's about an \$8.2 million amount that's going in to the General Fund for the University, so ultimately, there's a net amount that's coming to the University when you consider the \$6.2 or the just over \$6 million amount that's coming to the Athletics Department.

Gould: One last question.

Kidd: Could you go back then, if you're going to bring that up then. The net amount: That's a complicated thing to put up. For example, that's tuition that's going in, but that's not related to the costs of instruction and things like that, right? I've been asking some of these questions for a long time. Like for example, what is the incremental cost of instruction for a student, as opposed to the actual cost of instruction? The actual cost is about \$12,000 from my understanding. It's not like this is just free money going into the University. It's being paid into doing things, right? I would say that these numbers---I'm not saying they're useless by any means--- in fact, what I would like to see more is the other academic support that athletics provides, like the tutoring service and things like this. But this is not like this is a straight up net \$8 million, I don't believe. That's kind of a strong statement to make.

Harris: From our standpoint, I think everything that you said is accurate. The main thing is that we want to be able to show and compare for instance is the amount of funding that we receive from the University in comparison to our peers, because we get asked that question quite a bit, and being able to show where that stands.

Kidd: Sure. Sure, and that's all so complicated because you've got private institutions, which are a different funding model, right?

Harris: Right.

Kidd: And you've got like southern, and this is a bigger school, so it's supposed to be overall budget. You've got places where you've got ticket sales; even the student body is paying for tickets. So it's not trivial, right? It's a complicated situation.

Harris: At the same point, these are our peers. The example is not put up to show that all of these schools are the same, and are funded exactly the same, and have the exact same costs per student. It's meant to say these are the people that are in our conference, and so regardless of all these differences, this is what we're competing with within our conference to try to have success as an institution.

Kidd: Yes. I understand absolutely.

Gould: thank you so much for joining us.

Harris: Thank you for having us.

Gould: We are at the end of our time. I'm sure we would love to continue talking, but I appreciate you guys coming to talk to us and I hope you got some benefits out of the discussion as well.

Harris: Thank you.

Gould: May I have a motion to move out of Consultative Session? Okay, motion by Senator **Walter**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor say, "aye," all

opposed say, “nay,” abstain, “aye.” Motion to adjourn by Senator **Campbell**, seconded by Senator **Hakes**. All in favor? Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Two Addenda Follow:

Addendum 1: SA Majors 2016

Addendum 2: Athletics Department Report to Faculty Senate

Addendum 1: SA Majors

<u>Major</u>	<u># of Students Declared</u>
Accounting	10
All Science Teaching	2
Art: Studio Emphasis	2
Athletic Training	1
Bachelor of Liberal Studies	7
Biochemistry	6
Biology	27
Biology: Biomedical	8
Business - Potential	20
Chemistry	2
Communication	15
Communication/Public Relations	1
Communication:ElecMedia Ldrshp	6
Communicative Disorders	10
Computer Science	5
Construction Management	7
Criminology	9
Deciding	41
Early Childhood Education	1
Earth Science	1
Economics	8
Electrical Eng Technology(EET)	2
Elementary Education	25
English	4
Environmental Science	1
Family Services	5
Finance	10
General Studies	1
Geography: Env Syst & Sustain	0
Graphic Design	2
Graphic Technologies	0
History	2
Health Promotion	10
Interactive Digital Studies	1
Interior Design	2
Leisure,Youth & Human Services	5
Management Information Systems	3
Management: Business Admin	16
Management: Human Resource	2
Management: Organizatnl Ldrshp	3
Management:Supply Chain & Oper	3
Manufacturing Technology	1
Marketing: Global Marketing	3
Marketing: Management	5

University Faculty Senate Meeting

Oct. 10, 2016



Elaine M. Eshbaugh, PhD

School of Applied Human Sciences; Family Services & Gerontology

NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative

Elaine.eshbaugh@uni.edu

Student-Athletes vs General Student Population: Demographics

Racial/Ethnic Composition

	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
Minority Student-Athletes as a Percentage of Student-Athletes*	22%	24%	20%	18%	22%	21%
Minority Students as a Percentage of All Students	10%	9%	8%	8%	7%	7%

*Includes only student-athletes receiving athletic financial aid.

Residency Composition

	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11
Out-of-State Student-Athletes as a Percentage of Student-Athletes**	32%	40%	34%	32%	41%	44%
All Out-of-State Students as a Percentage of All Students	11%	12%	11%	10%	9%	9%

**Includes student-athletes receiving athletic financial aid and walk-ons.

Grade Point Average Data

Grade Point Averages by Team (2015-2016)

Team	Spring 2016	Fall 2015
Basketball, Men's (BBM)	3.10	3.03
Basketball, Women's (BBW)	3.48	3.65
Cross Country, Men's (XCM)	3.17	3.20
Cross Country, Women's (XCW)	3.56	3.63
Football (FB)	2.82	2.70
Golf, Men's (GM)	3.32	2.98
Golf, Women's (GW)	3.40	3.57
Soccer, Women's (Soc)	3.05	3.02
Softball (SB)	3.01	3.17
Swimming and Diving, Women's (Swim)	3.53	3.44
Tennis, Women's (Ten)	3.27	3.10
Track and Field, Men's (TFM)	2.94	2.87
Track and Field, Women's (TFW)	3.46	3.47
Volleyball (VB)	3.37	3.44
Wrestling (W)	2.65	2.90
All Student-Athletes	3.09	3.06
All Male Student-Athletes	2.87	2.81
All Female Student-Athletes	3.35	3.37
All Minority Student-Athletes	2.61	2.73
All Minority Male Student-Athletes	2.51	2.58
All Minority Female Student-Athletes	2.96	3.24
All International Student-Athletes	3.34	3.32
All UNI Students	3.07	3.04
All UNI Male Students	2.88	2.84
All UNI Female Students	3.22	3.19
All UNI Minority Students	2.77	2.74
All UNI Minority Male Students	2.64	2.59
All UNI Minority Female Students	2.87	2.86
All International Students	2.87	2.71

The women's basketball team has placed in the top 15 teams of all 345 Division-I schools in the past nine years (except for 2010-11) based on team GPA. At the time of this report, the Women's Basketball Coaches Association had not posted the top 25 honor roll for the 2015-16 season. Most recent IPP data indicate that UNI's women's basketball team's GPA ranks at the 98th percentile of all division 1 institutions.

Women's Basketball Team GPA National Rank

2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07
12 th	7 th	7 th	14 th	26 th	7 th	6 th	6 th	2 nd

Graduation and Retention Rates

Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) Comparisons and Demographics

	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Four-Year Averages					
Student-Athletes	66%	68%	67%	70%	73%
Student Body	66%	66%	67%	67%	67%
Individual Years by Gender and Ethnicity					
All Student-Athletes	68%	74%	63%	61%	73%
All Male Student-Athletes	58%	61%	43%	53%	65%
All Female Student-Athletes	77%	86%	84%	71%	82%
All Minority Student-Athletes	35%	56%	25%	55%	40%
All Non-Minority Student-Athletes	80%	79%	71%	68%	76%
All UNI Students	68%	64%	66%	66%	67%
All UNI Male Students	65%	61%	63%	59%	64%
All UNI Female Students	69%	65%	69%	71%	69%
All UNI Minority Students	43%	50%	42%	45%	47%
All UNI Non-Minority Students	70%	65%	67%	68%	68%

Table refers to graduation within six years of enrollment.

Retention Rates (freshman to sophomore)

	2014-15	2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
Student-Athletes*	96.8%	97.0%	97.8%	95.0%	96.0%	97.9%
All Students	80.1%	84.7%	82.9%	81.4%	82.0%	82.5%

*Includes student-athletes who receive financial aid.