

4-12-2010

# University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 12, 2010

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 2010 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa  
Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](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. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, April 12, 2010" (2010).  
*Faculty Senate Documents*. 841.  
[http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/841](http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/841)

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](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

## **SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**4/12/10**

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/05/10 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

### **CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

Emily Christensen, Courier, was present.

### **COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson was not able to attend today's meeting.

### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

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

Chair Wurtz reminded senators of the upcoming Faculty Senate Retreat on May 7, and that a tentative agenda has been sent. The Retreat will held in the Oak Room, Maucker Union, beginning at 9:00; lunch will be served. Ed Amend will serve as the facilitator. She is looking forward to redefining ourselves and would like senators to think in terms of having no limits in looking at the work that needs to be done and the resources needed to do that, and if changes in the constitution are required we can do that.

Chair Wurtz also asked that senators that will not be returning to the Senate next year to let us know who will be taking their place.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure stated that senators that are finishing their first term and are not seeking re-election and those finishing their last terms on the senate are ipso facto part of

the nominating committee. They will be putting forward candidates for Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. An email will be sent to those senators who are eligible and the election will be held during the last regularly held meeting, Monday, April 26.

Chair Wurtz also noted that if Senators would like to follow a different procedure, the Senate would need to make that decision right away because notification must go out to the faculty of the change.

A brief discussion followed.

### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

1037 Emeritus Status Request, James Kelly, Department of Teaching, effective 12/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #935 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1038 Revised Honorary Degree Policy - Sue Joseph/Honorary Degree Selection Committee

Chair Wurtz noted that this item came with a request that it be moved to the Head of the Docket.

Motion to docket out of regular order at the Head of the Docket as item #936 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Roth. Motion passed.

Senator East asked why the request that this be moved to the Head of the Docket?

Senator Bruess noted that Sue Joseph, Interim Dean, Graduate College and Chair of the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, is not here due to today's graduate student conference.

Discussion followed on how to proceed.

A friendly amendment to docket at the head of the docket for the next meeting, when Interim Dean Joseph can be here by Senator Funderburk. Senator Soneson, who make the original motion, and Senator Roth, who made the second, accepted this.

A brief discussion followed.

Senator Funderburk offered a friendly amendment to docket in regular order, which was accepted by both Senator Soneson and Senator Roth. Motion passed.

1039 NISG Resolution on Distribution of Syllabi

Motion to docket in regular order as item #937 by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

A brief discussion followed.

Motion passed.

1040 NISG Resolution on Diversity Training and Development for Faculty

Motion to docket in regular order as item #938 by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1041 Educational Policies Commission Recommendations on Attendance and Make Up Work

Motion to docket in regular order as item #939 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #940 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Lowell.

Motion passed.

Discussion followed on 1038 Revised Honorary Degree Policy. Interim Dean Sue Joseph arrived at the meeting and noted that the policy change is being requested to accommodate the Dalai Lama's visit on May 18 as well as another honorary degree that is planned to be awarded at the fall commencement.

Discussion followed.

Motion to approve a waiver to the current Honorary Degree Policy passed.

**NEW BUSINESS**

## Athletic Update

Troy Dannen, UNI's Athletic Director, presented an informal update of UNI's athletic program and answered questions from senators.

## Regents Award for Faculty Excellence

Motion to move into Executive Session by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Roth.

Motion to accept the recommendation of six faculty for the award by the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Committee by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

**CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

930 Creation of Liberal Arts Core Coordinating Committee -  
Liberal Arts Core Committee (*tabled from 3/08/10 meeting*)

Motion to bring off the table by Senator Basom; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

A brief discussion followed.

Motion to approve failed.

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions  
Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities  
and Fine Arts Senate (*tabled from 3/22/10 meeting - for  
discussion after 5/07/10 Faculty Senate Retreat*)

933 Creation of a Standing UNI Faculty Budget Committee -  
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Motion to approve by Senator Lowell; second by Senator Bruess.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the Senate established a University Faculty Senate Budget Committee, which still exists,

and which has gone through the election process and elected members.

Discussion followed.

Senator Funderburk moved to table until after the May 7<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate Retreat; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

934 Inclusion of 48C:011, or 48C:071, or 48C:074 and 48C:004 or 48C:031 to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Senate. Discussion followed.

Motion to call the question by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson.

Motion passed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

---

***DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW***

### **MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING 4/12/10 1682**

**PRESENT:** Maria Basom, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Julie Lowell, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Phil Patton, Chuck Quirk, Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

Shelley McCumber was attending for Megan Balong, Forrest Dolgener was attending for Donna Schumacher Douglas

**Absent:** Michele Devlin, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Wurtz called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve the minutes of the 4/05/10 meeting by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

Emily Christensen, Courier, was present.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost Gibson was not able to attend today's meeting.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, JESSE SWAN**

Faculty Chair Swan had no comments.

**COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ**

Chair Wurtz noted that a tentative agenda was sent to senators for the May 7, 2010 Faculty Senate Retreat. Ed Amend will serve as the facilitator and she has already met with him, and is looking forward to the Senate getting some work done. The Retreat will held in the Oak Room, Maucker Union, beginning at 9:00; lunch will be served. There will be technology available so the Senate can view documents on screen and do wordsmithing. Currently there are four items on the agenda based on problems the Senate had run into over the past two years. She is looking forward to redefining ourselves and would like senators to think in terms of having no limits in looking at the work that needs to be done and the resources needed to do that, and if changes in the constitution are required we can do that.

Chair Wurtz also asked that senators that will not be returning to the Senate next year to let us know who will be taking their place. She's hoping to have both those senators who are leaving and those new senators that will be coming on to the Senate at the May 7 retreat.

Senator Roth asked what the term is for a Faculty Senator?

Chair Wurtz replied that it's three years and a person can serve two consecutive terms. Vice Chair Mvuyekure has been asked to take care of the nominating committee as he has served two consecutive terms and cannot be re-elected without taking a year off.

Vice Chair Mvuyekure stated that senators that are finishing their first term and not seeking re-election and finishing their last terms of the senate are ipso facto part of the nominating committee. They will be putting forward candidates for Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. An email will be sent to those senators who are eligible to serve on the nominating committee and the election will be held during the last regularly held meeting, Monday, April 26.

Chair Wurtz also noted that if Senators would like to follow a different procedure, the Senate would need to make that decision right away because notification must go out to the faculty of the change.

Faculty Chair Swan reiterated that the election of Faculty Senate Chair and Vice Chair are to be held at the next meeting.

Senator Smith asked if there is a way of accessing the Faculty Constitution or other documents that the Senate may review?

Chair Wurtz replied that they're on the Faculty Senate web page. She also noted that things are moving forward in getting a Faculty Senate website which will make our process so much better when things are timely posted and available.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

1037 Emeritus Status Request, James Kelly, Department of Teaching, effective 12/09

Motion to docket in regular order as item #935 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

1038 Revised Honorary Degree Policy - Sue Joseph

Chair Wurtz noted that this item came with a request that it be moved to the Head of the Docket.

Motion to docket out of regular order at the Head of the Docket as item #936 by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Roth. Motion passed.

Senator East asked why the request that this be moved to the Head of the Docket?

Senator Bruess noted that Sue Joseph, Interim Dean, Graduate College is not here due to the graduate student conference.

Discussion followed on how to proceed.

Friendly amendment to docket at the head of the docket for the next meeting, when Dean Joseph can be here by Senator Funderburk. This was accepted by Senator Soneson, who make the original motion, and Senator Roth, who made the second.

Senator Neuhaus stated that this probably relates to the Dalai Lama's visit and the awarding of an honorary degree, which will not be during spring commencement.

Senator East argued that it makes no sense putting it at the head of the docket because decisions have already been made about this year's recipients. There will be plenty of time to act on it at the next meeting, or until fall, which seems reasonable enough time to make changes in this for next year. Unless someone says that this year's selection will be changed, which he can't imagine would be the case.

Senator Funderburk offered a friendly amendment to docket in regular order as item # 936, which was accepted by both Senator Soneson and Senator Roth. Motion passed.

1039 NISG Resolution on Distribution of Syllabi

Motion to docket in regular order as item #937 by Senator East; second by Senator Neuhaus.

A brief discussion followed as to documentation. It was noted that documentation for this item, as well as Calendar Item #1037 and #1040 were mailed to senators as no electronic versions were available to email.

Motion passed.

1040 NISG Resolution on Diversity Training and Development for Faculty

Motion to docket in regular order as item #938 by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

1041 Educational Policies Commission Recommendations on Attendance and Make Up Work

Chair Wurtz noted that this was a request sent to the Educational Policies Commission from the Senate last fall after it was raised by parents of a UNI student that was not allowed to make up an exam missed because of the funeral of his grandfather, asking that UNI's policy be changed to be inline with the University of Iowa and Iowa State's policies.

Motion to docket in regular order as item #939 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

1042 Request to change 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development from Category 5B of the LAC to Category 5C - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #940 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Lowell.

Senator Lowell noted that this is being pushed by groups to be moved to Category 5C and she believes their arguments are sound and believes it should be docketed and discussed.

Motion passed.

Senator Funderburk noted that the reason Interim Dean Joseph had wanted this Revised Honorary Degree Policy docketed early was because it states in the policy that these degrees shall only be awarded at the spring commencement. The Dalai Lama's visit will be May 18, after commencement.

Senator East stated that changing the policy doesn't change the decision the Senate made earlier.

Senator Funderburk responded that when those honorary degrees are awarded is the issue, and it appears that the committee would like the language of the policy to be in line with what was actually going to happen.

Senator Smith asked if the Senate could agree that if this became an issue of time that this could be done electronically?

Interim Dean Joseph arrived at the meeting.

Chair Wurtz noted that the Senate is suspending Robert's Rules of Order for the moment and that the Senate had looked at the proposal and in the absence of a clear reason why this needed such fast action the Senate decided to docket it in regular order and it would be addressed at the next meeting, April 26. She asked Interim Dean Joseph for any information she might have that would lead the Senate to decide otherwise.

Interim Dean Joseph distributed copies of the policy with the changes. The reason the committee was asking for it to be decided in a more timely manner was to have it in place for the Dalai Lama's presentation on May 18. If the Senate does not feel a compelling need to approve the policy she's fine with that but would ask for a waiver on the current policy to allow that to happen this year.

Chair Wurtz asked Interim Dean Joseph to clarify the specific piece of the policy that will be violated.

Interim Dean Joseph replied that the current policy states that awardees have to be present for spring commencement. There will be another degree that will be awarded in December, which is also contrary to the policy. The Dalai Lama's is not even at a commencement ceremony. She noted in the policy, under "Awarding of Degrees" it states "Honorary degrees shall be awarded only at the spring commencement." They would like that to be changed to "Honorary degrees shall be awarded at regularly scheduled University commencement ceremonies, or if necessary, during special honorary ceremonies." She's not sure what the reasoning for the spring commencement only awards was in 1974 when that was approved by the Faculty Senate.

Chair Wurtz noted that what the Senate is looking at is do we really want to change the policy in order to accommodate decisions that have already been made. Or do we want to cover ourselves by saying we will approve the two waivers and if a

change in policy is needed we'll address it when we can do so not in a reactionary way?

Senator East stated he still doesn't see the need for doing it this week without having the rest of the faculty having seen the proposal and the Senate talking about it and having a chance to reflect on it. The decision that would be made next meeting if we follow the regular order of things would be just as good as a decision made today.

Interim Dean Joseph commented that she didn't know if the Senate would be having another meeting yet this year and that's why she asked for it to be moved to the Head of the Docket.

Senator East asked her if a decision made in two weeks would be just as good as a decision made today?

She replied yes.

Senator Basom noted that this issue was discussed by the Senate in Executive Session previously and it's her belief that the wording was to accept the recommendations of the committee. What the Senate voted on included this idea of waiving the policy. She believes it was vague, that the Senate would accept the recommendation of the committee.

Interim Dean Joseph agreed that it was discussed.

Senator Roth stated that he believes it's not a good idea to change a policy post facto; let's just waive it.

Senator Smith moved to approve a waiver for the two cases cited with the understanding that the Senate will, in the normal course of it's business, review the policy; second by Senator Neuhaus.

Senator East commented that he doesn't think the Senate should conduct business, ad hoc, like this. Unless there's a real critical time factor everything the Senate discusses should be available to the faculty before voting on it. He sees no reason to do this in this case.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that he agrees with Senator East that the Senate can address this at the next meeting in two weeks in regular order to not approve the policy but approve a waiver for these two instances, which will give the faculty at large opportunity to review the previous minutes, the announcement,

the docketing in regular order of this issue, and the probable sense that this policy change won't be approved but a waiver would be, which would be very deliberative and not ad hoc. That would be a much better way to proceed.

Senator Roth remarked that, unless he's mistake from what he's read and what he understands, the wording on the requirements leave enough "wiggle room" in them to where we don't need to waive anything, with words like "normally" and "usually".

It was noted that the current policy does state "only at the spring commencement."

Senator Smith commented that he believes the Senate is making a "mountain out of a molehill" here.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that some people care about this issue.

Chair Wurtz stated that she believed Senator Smith was talking about the Senate's process. The motion before the Senate is to approve a waiver to the policy for this one event in May, which would not be at commencement and for another award at the fall commencement, and that the Senate will take it under advisement to review the proposed change in policy.

Interim Dean Joseph reiterated that what Chair Wurtz just stated was whether a change in policy was needed. When she previously spoke with the Senate about this the Senate asked for the policy to be changed. She's asked that the Senate approve the policy as it has been changed.

Motion to approve a waiver to the current Honorary Degree Policy passed.

Chair Wurtz added that the Revised Honorary Degree Policy is still on the Docket for the next meeting.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### Athletic Update

Troy Dannen, UNI's Athletic Director, presented an informal update of UNI's athletic program.

Mr. Dannen thanked the Senate for the opportunity to share information and update the Senate on where the athletic program

has been and where they're at. Regarding the UNI's General Fund, the athletic department is down \$1 million from last year. \$5.4 million last year and \$4.4 this current year is the amount of General Fund dollars that go into athletics. Last year it was 50%, currently it's 38% of their budget. That money has been offset by a couple of things. There was a large drop in expenses with the elimination of a program and an increase in revenue from outside sources.

A Board of Regent (BOR) member suggested last fall that UNI examine its football program to determine whether scholarship football was the way to go, with the premise being the \$1.2 million that's spent on football scholarships alone. That number could be eliminated, theoretically saving the university \$1.2 million. A consulting group was brought in from Massachusetts who had done a similar study when Drake University made the decision to go to non-scholarship football. The same firm had also done another study for Drake when they were considering going back to scholarship football in recent years. The study came back in general, looking at the complete subsidy, including student fees allocation, which is about \$1.2 million, and the General Fund appropriation, which at that time using last years figures, made the total approximately \$6.8 million complete institution subsidy. If UNI went to non-scholarship football within five years, if all things remained the same including some assumptions such as increased tuition, the institutional subsidy would increase by \$500,000. The rationale behind that was there are other ancillary revenue streams that are associated with the level of football UNI plays that disappear if we don't play this level of football. He used as an example Drake attendance revenue was about \$100,000/year. UNI's is about \$700,000. Since the highest attendance revenue of the 19 schools in the country that play non-scholarship football is about \$200,000, the assumption was that UNI would go to \$200,000. There was \$500,000 of the \$1.2 savings that was eliminated.

UNI has a \$1 million marketing package with Learfield Sports; Mr. Dannen stated. They guarantee UNI \$1 million a year, which increases over the next decade in exchange for the ability to sell signage, commercials, and multi-media marketing. That agreement would go away if the level of football UNI plays changes. Two years ago that number was \$380,000. The assumption was that if UNI went to non-scholarship football we'd fall way back. The other big revenue loss came from the donor base. Currently the athletics endowment going into this fiscal year was about \$2.9 million, with about \$140,000 going to

scholarship costs. About \$6 - \$8 million has been added to that endowment during this current fiscal year; some of it is commitments still out. And that number is going to raise significantly. About \$1.5 is raised as annual contributions for the scholarship club with that money going directly to scholarships. The assumption that the consulting group made from experience at other institutions was that that money goes down about half. It will start to rebound but there's an immediate cut of about half. The financial panacea of non-scholarship football, according to this study, doesn't necessarily exist.

Mr. Dannen continued, noting that they have also looked at two other alternatives. One was to eliminate football completely, which came up with an annual savings of about \$700,000 - \$800,000 by year five. They also asked the consulting firm to look at moving up and going to full-blown scholarship football on the level of Iowa and Iowa State, not that UNI would play in a conference like that. That was never a realistic speculation, as it would require another \$4-5 million of institutional subsidy. It was off the table before it was even discussed but they at least know what the numbers are.

The football subject almost became moot as the BOR then moved from that discussion into the broader discussion of institutional subsidies in general, particularly at Northern Iowa and Iowa State. The University of Iowa is claimed to be exempt because basically whatever they raise they spend; there is no institution money involved. There is an accounting difference that Iowa uses that UNI and Iowa State do not. There is a tuition set-aside at UNI of 18%. At Iowa that set-aside is given back to the athletic department. The scholarship money that is paid that produces that set-aside money is returned and is not considered an institution subsidy. The set-aside that UNI and Iowa State pays, the tuition and scholarship dollars paid, is not returned to the athletic departments. It is counted as part of the institutional subsidy in general.

Mr. Dannen stated that he's met with two different BOR members at two different times, with a motion coming out of the last meeting for the presidents of UNI and Iowa State to develop a plan to reduce or eliminate their General Fund support. That is currently in President Allen's hands and Mr. Dannen has been providing information, guidance, direction, recommendations as asked. He will argue that there is a cost of having intercollegiate athletics. Universities either have athletics or they don't. How that cost is realized varies. At 20-25

schools in the country there is no cost in hard dollars because they generate what they spend. These are schools such as Iowa where they get \$9 million for a TV contract, which allows schools like Iowa to get off general fund support.

Another method is endowment-based support, Mr. Dannen continued. Stanford University has a \$325 million athletic endowment, which kicks off enough money for their scholarships. UNI obviously doesn't have that and it's not realistic to think that will happen. The third model, besides what we do, is a model that's been more borne on the backs of students, a student fee based model. This is a common model in the mid-west and within UNI's league. He's not here today to promote it or to endorse it but schools such as Illinois State, which is very similar to UNI in many respects, use this model. At Illinois State their student fee is a little over \$400 a year and generates about \$7 million. That's an example of how someone can look a little bit different and do the same thing UNI is doing. All of that is on the table and has been shared with President Allen. He will be developing that in consultation with many others.

Mr. Dannen noted that he also wants to talk about UNI's basketball run, and to "justify our existence." He distributed a document, prepared by UNI's Marketing and Public Relations, "NCAA Tournament and Sweet 16 Marketing and Public Relations Impact on the University of Northern Iowa." Athletics role at UNI is, which hasn't been any more evident than in the past month, the face of the university. It's not the heart and soul of the university, and they understand what that is. Athletics job as the face of the university is to make sure the picture looks good and that hopefully someone, because of the face and because the picture looks good, will look into the heart and soul of the university. In the last month they optimized that to the degree that they will never be able to in getting people to know Northern Iowa outside of the 90% of the student body that's from the state of Iowa. The document talks about the context, the impressions, and the marketing value equated to being in national media. It also discusses admissions, and increases in giving for the College of Business during this time period. There are also other examples of giving going up. As an example, athletics is currently in the middle of their fund drive and there were 50 new members during the first 5 weeks, with 45 new members in the five days after UNI beat Kansas.

When it was time to renew the basketball coach's contract, President Allen gave him permission to do so with the caveat that he couldn't spend any institutional money. They raised

\$1.95 million in 36 hours from seven donors. This is money that was not earmarked to come to the university for any other reason. It was money that without the success of the UNI's basketball team they would not have been able to raise. It is also money that has opened the door as three of those donors had not given anything to the university before. This goes back to the foundation argument about how to build the endowment; there might not have been enough to fund everything but \$141,000 is not going to suffice very long in the future.

Senator Smith stated that Mr. Dannen had said that it is up to President Allen to decide how to respond or deal with the BOR charge, but President Allen has probably asked for advice. He asked Mr. Dannen to give the Senate what he sees as a plausible strategy for cutting back or doing whatever's necessary to satisfy the BOR.

Mr. Dannen replied that there are a couple of issues involved. The first is what the athletic department does to continue to minimize expenses. It will not be his recommendation to President Allen to consider eliminating any programs. UNI has to have 6 male and 8 female sports to remain a Division I institution. Currently there are 7 male sports and 10 female sports. A female sport can't be touched because UNI is also bound by federal regulations by Title 9, and UNI's not even close enough to being in compliance to consider it. He has told UNI's football coach, Mark Farley, that he fully expects to be adding a second "money game" to the schedule. This would be another game against a BCS level school. Those games are \$400,000 - \$500,000 revenue games. The reason they don't do that often, have more than one game against a BCS level school, and the reason only one school in the country did that last year is because it puts the team "behind a competitive eight ball" when it comes to advancing in the playoffs. The playoffs are not determined based on power or schedule, they're based purely on win/loss record. You have to assume that if you play two of those schools that's two loses. Only one school in the country made it this year with more than 3 loses. If the school should win their conference it's not an issue.

They have cut some expenses but they can't control the biggest expense item which is scholarships, and that will continue to increase. Then it becomes a question of whether they should reduce the number of scholarships offered, and there may be a little bit of this this coming fall. Scholarships technically are awarded by equivalency with each program having a dollar amount that it's allowed to spend on scholarships. With the

increase in tuition, room and board next year that number did not increase so there are fewer equivalencies to give next year. There's a point in which that adversely impacts your ability to compete. They have to be very careful with how far that goes. If the argument that this is the cost of doing business is made then they'll have to look at a student fee based model. He can make some arguments for athletics supporting the educational mission of the institution but he won't make those arguments very loud because those arguments are on the periphery. He can make a lot of arguments why this is cultural, why it's about the atmosphere, why it's about the environment, why it's about the rest of going to school at an institution of higher learning besides the classroom. It enhances the experience of the students. He can justify those dollars out of student fees before he can justify them out of the general fund. Students may have a different opinion of that because ultimately the students will decide whether that's an appropriate fee or not. The bottom line to all of this, and the message he's given to President Allen, is there has to be an institutional subsidy, just like there's an institutional subsidy for almost every department on campus. Some of those departments are further away from the core of the educational mission. If they choose not to provide an institutional subsidy then athletics goes away.

Senator Smith asked if UNI did go to a student fee what size would that fee be roughly?

Mr. Dannen replied that first you'd need to determine what is the amount of general fund subsidy that is palpable.

Senator Smith continued, is he talking about \$200 per year, or what?

Mr. Dannen responded that currently the athletic portion of student fees is approximately \$112, which includes free admission to games. He's look at a couple of different options which over a period of 5-7 years would increase that to \$250-\$300, still allowing free access for students. In determining the general fund amount that would palpable, he went with the assumption that the athletic department pays about \$1.7 in tuition for their scholarship students which goes back into the general fund.

Senator Lowell asked if there is an increase in student fees to support athletics, will students have a say in it?

Mr. Dannen replied yes. There is a student fee committee and it's his understand that they would make that decision.

Jake Rudy, NISG Vice President, explained the Students Services Fee Committee is chaired by the president of the student body, and joined by members of faculty and staff from each division and as a committee they hear arguments from each department that's applying and designate a portion of the student fee as they see fit. There would not be a general student body referendum.

Senator Funderburk stated that at the end of the process the committee makes a recommendation to the president of what they feel the fee should be and he then makes his decision, which is sent to the BOR.

Mr. Dannen noted that the BOR ultimately approves whatever the allocation amount is.

Senator East added that that committee could do a referendum of students.

Mr. Rudy responded that that would be something for the committee to decide on.

Senator Soneson thanked Mr. Dannen and noted senators always appreciate it when he comes for these updates. If we weren't in a fiscal crisis in Iowa, he doesn't think any senator here would be all that concerned about what's going on in athletics. But we are in a very serious fiscal crisis and the question is where are we going to be putting the dollars that are available? It's difficult for those who are a part of the educational side of the university to see dollars going elsewhere, such as to athletics. One symbol of that was the recent raise to UNI's basketball coach, which he now understands and appreciates the fact that the money for that raise came from outside raised by donors. However, at a time when faculty, staff, and administrators are taking pay and benefit cuts it comes as a shock and a kind of demoralizing realization that the basketball coach is getting an extraordinary raise, almost 100%, while the rest of us are sacrificing. Where is the coach's sacrifice coming from? He realizes that it could be said that his salary is driven by the market and things like that but that doesn't help us accept the fact that so much attention and so much money is going in that direction. As he suggested, this is a symbol and believes that many would be happier if the educational side of the university kept the general fund money and that was

replaced with student fees. The students would be voting on that and raising their own fees. The question would then be if they would find it worthwhile? Is it enriching enough for them to contribute to athletics to the tune of \$300 a year? \$300 a year, compared to what some of them spend on drinking and so on is not that much. A good question to ask would be, do our students really find it that valuable? He's talked to many faculty about this, particularly about this recent raise and frankly he's surprised and disappointed. He's tempted to make a motion to censor that move. It's something that he cannot approve and that he believes is violating the spirit of what we're about as a university, especially in a time of fiscal crisis. He doesn't know if other faculty feel as strongly as he does and if so, maybe they will make a motion.

Mr. Dannen replied that he knew that this was going to be a concern as soon as it went down the road, but he felt the need to go down the road because one of the things he's expected to do is grow the athletic revenues that are generated so he can release the burden on the general fund. Basketball is a profit center; it's not a great profit center but it is the one program that is a profit center here at UNI. If he can go out and generate this without using other institutional dollars and keep his revenue strong then he believes it's a good investment, which was part of his discussion with President Allen. He knew it was going to cause heartburn, there was no question but these do at every institution in the country.

Senator Soneson respond that one concern that he has is the fact that \$1.95 million was raised in 36 hours. That's remarkable but it has occurred to him that a tremendous amount of time and energy on the part UNI's Foundation has gone into cultivating those dollars.

Mr. Dannen reported that UNI's Foundation was not involved.

Senator Soneson remarked that they weren't involved at all, that they've never spoken with the at all?

Mr. Dannen replied that he doesn't know if they've ever cultivated those folks over the years but the 36 hours was him.

Senator Soneson asked if it was specifically for athletics, rather than honor scholarships for students? That's the only way they could have raised that kind of money in such a short period of time. He wonders what would happen to UNI's overall educational budget if the same amount of time and energy would

be donated to cultivating people who would be interested in our music program, debate program, our literature program, and so on. On the academic side there's an awful lot to offer and the Foundation people aren't knocking on our doors saying what can we do to raise money for your programs. They are doing that for athletics, and that's the worry, that to keep a program of this great caliber going we really need the Foundation to go out there. But for them to do that is to take away time and energy for raising money for academic programs.

Senator Smith stated that he personally thought that the move in giving the raise to the basketball coach was the right thing to do, and that using outside money was quite appropriate. If you're going to be in a sport you want to be good in that sport and as Mr. Dannen pointed out, basketball is one sport UNI has that may be covering its own stuff. If faculty have trouble with this they'll have to get used to the real world. There is a market. This sport being successful did a lot more for UNI institutionally than if it wasn't successful and it's not going to be successful if you don't have a good coach. We do have a good coach and we need keep him.

The question he wanted to raise, Senator Smith continued, concerns what Mr. Dannen talked about earlier, that by dropping football it would save us roughly \$700,000 - \$800,000. He's not sure if in thinking that Mr. Dannen considered the possibility that at the same time that would free us up on Title 9 where some women's sports could also be dropped, and still satisfy the Title 9 gender equity issues. How much additional money could be saved there? Has that been thought about? If he understands correctly, UNI is two over on female sports and if two female sports were dropped how much extra money could be saved there?

Mr. Dannen replied that he couldn't say because it would depend on the two sports and he didn't go back to look at that. Senator Smith is correct that it would open some equity doors but for the most part they're not talking about a big savings. Scholarships alone in the largest women's sports are about \$250,000, which would be the bulk of the savings along with some salaries. The savings might be approximately \$500,000 for the whole process.

Senator Lowell stated that her question may sound "flip" but she doesn't mean it that way, it's her own naïveté; she doesn't understand this sports thing at all. What really would happen with quality if the coaches, including the basketball coach, were paid more in line with faculty salaries? A typical faculty

salary is about \$60,000, would there not be some young up and coming coach who would be willing to coach our teams for that amount of money? She doesn't understand anyone being worth the amount of money for their skills that our coaches are paid. What would happen with this money that's coming to athletics because of our basketball team if these people were told that it's wonderful that you want to give money to UNI but we would like to request that you give your money or some of it to our academic programs, not just the athletic program?

Mr. Dannen replied that that young up and coming coach will become someone else's third assistant because that's what the salary is for third assistants.

Senator Lowell asked if we couldn't just break the pattern?

Mr. Dannen responded that the NCAA paid an approximately \$47 million fine when it tried to regulate salaries of assistant coaches. It would be quite a leap of faith to think Northern Iowa could set the market for the rest of the country. While it may sound as an excuse but it's his belief that everything we do is market driven; the market dictates certain things. He looks at a coach's salary as being market driven and how he came up with the number he did. It ranks fourth in our league of ten in salary. As far as asking donors to give money, or part of the money to our academic programs, it's not his to answer. It would be UNI's Foundation to answer.

Senator Lowell commented that he had said that the money didn't come through Foundation.

Mr. Dannen stated that it does come through the Foundation, it's the intent that donors have stated. Very few dollars are given to the university for the university to do with as they please. This money was given to the athletic department through the Foundation, money earmarked specifically for this salary of this coach. One of the donors that gave \$200,000 also just gave \$1+ million to UNI's fine arts. There are some donors that overlap and there are some that do not.

Chair Wurtz added that the Senate could ask Bill Calhoun, Vice President for Marketing & Advancement, to speak with the Senate.

Senator Funderburk noted that he believes Mr. Dannen has done a great job and that he came in at a really tough time. He's doing a very good job of trying to get more efficient use out of what we have in athletics. He's been saying for years that

basketball was the only thing we had a chance of being at a national stage and being profitable, and he applauds Mr. Dannen's efforts. The thing he wanted to see was a change in where the revenue came from because he does think it weakens our position when a lot of our general education fund is going to athletics and we're having to deal with asking the legislature for money. It was time for another funding structure here, and we're behind the times.

Mr. Dannen commented that most institutions made the move to a more student based model about a decade ago. He's actually an advocate from a sustainability standpoint. As long as enrollment is maintained that funding stream is stable, and there are not many stable funding streams. He looks at it as a good situation for an athletic department.

Senator East also thanked Mr. Dannen for coming and talking with the Senate today. He appreciated the tone and appreciates the thought and re-consideration of doing things somehow differently than what's been done in the past. He doesn't know how much, if any, was the result of some action taken here a year or two ago, but he hopes some of it was. He'd like to remind senators that we do have Foundation people working for all of us. In his college they meet with that person every year. If our department heads and deans were out beating the bushes for money we might make a little more. He also tends to agree about market driven; presumably the coach here at UNI likes UNI and is willing to stay but might have thought differently had he not received the going wage. His guess is that most of us, if we don't receive the going wage for what faculty receive we'll be going someplace else, too. It's important for all administrators to try to cut costs where they can and to generate money where they can, and he hopes Mr. Dannen continues to do that.

Senator Van Wormer stated that she'd like to focus on football. She was thrilled about the basketball teams success, receiving letters from all over the country. She believes it even boosted UNI's Social Work program. However, she's always thought we should get rid of the football program. She's been reading about the brain damage, dementia, that's caused by football. It's not an aesthetically appealing game like basketball; there's no beauty in it. And reading about the injuries and long-term damage caused by football concerns her, as well as the related low graduation rate. She's also thinking about the crime rate associated with football, and it's not just the team members, it's the fans. She read an article from the University

of Colorado about the damage fans do when there's a game, whether their team wins or not. That was why Gilchrist Hall and other buildings on campus were almost burned down; it was fans after a football game. She believes it would be worth if we lost money to get rid of football.

Senator Roth also thanked Mr. Dannen and appreciated his comments, noting that he seems like a good guy. What he says goes deeper than Mr. Dannen's decision on the coach's salary raise based upon what's happening around us and the going rate is. He doesn't understand how one person is worth that much. Mr. Dannen made his decision based on his contemporaries. He's not arguing with Mr. Dannen on this but he doesn't get why someone would get that much to stay.

Mr. Dannen responded that one of the first things he said to President Allen was that he knew something was going to come, that the coach was going to be asking for more when the team accomplished what they did before the tournament. He said that there is a point at which the University of Northern Iowa can pay only so much. Have we reached or passed that point? He believes we have. The fact that we were able to generate that money is his only comfort. He tells all coaches and programs that his financial goal for them is to be in the middle of the pack against their peers, and expects them to perform about that level. That's why he was comfortable with fourth, and fifth is right behind that. He's comfortable but won't be beyond this point.

Senator Patton also thanked Mr. Dannen for talking with the Senate. When talking about coach salaries he believes we have to stay focused on market considerations. We need to look around the table because we all know that Ph.D.s by discipline get paid different salaries.

Faculty Chair Swan added also by the quality of the institution.

Senator Patton continued that that is also a market driven decision. He also would always encourage anyone, as they look at some other location to save money or to change or make policy decisions, to also look inside. Sometimes it's very easy to look outside to the guy standing behind that tree, easier than it is to look at oneself.

Senator Neuhaus added that he too is glad Mr. Dannen was able to speak with the Senate today. He thought the discussion was really frank, and Mr. Dannen is in a tough position. Like

others he's been contact by people he's forgotten who discovered UNI. He was involved in an online seminar and everyone who came on congratulated us on our success at the tournament. There is a certain amount of recognition that comes from such an event. He believes, especially with basketball, there is a cult personality and in looking a certain coaches, even when they switch to other programs people follow them. Our young coach appears to have some of that as well. We're all looking at how on earth we can make money in this environment but this coach seems to have a bit of a golden touch. Is it a risk? Yes, but what isn't? If he proves to be someone who is going to stay with us, it's possible we could see a real return. This body has asked the athletic department to try to stand on its own and that's what Mr. Dannen is trying to do. But that's not without risks, and he recognizes that. He applauds Mr. Dannen for taking that risk and hopes it plays out for all of us. There are a lot of people that really like basketball and if we happen to be successful over time that might prove well for all.

Mr. Dannen added there is one other financial impact in basketball that he should mention. The NCAA pays based on the round you advance to. That money goes to the conference and is then split. What the run this year meant to UNI was an immediate \$250,000 for this fiscal year, and about another \$100,000 each of the next six years, just for this run. And added to that is a bit more from last year. There is a tangible financial impact just for advancing in the tournament that isn't seen in any other sport.

Senator Breitbach asked if it generates that much money nationally?

Mr. Dannen replied that it's all television money and the contract is over \$1 billion, and is the reason we'll see the NCAA go to 96 teams. It's going to happen because they can opt out of their TV contract. CBS has already told them they're not going to pay \$1 billion next time. ESPN is willing to come in with \$1 billion and 96 teams. The institutions in the country are not going to let that money go, it's too important; it funds everything.

Senator Funderburk asked what's going to happen with the old basketball floor?

Mr. Dannen responded that it will be sold through the secondary market as it has a decent value. UNI was given money to purchase a new basketball/volleyball floor, which is needed.

The NCAA offered about a 20% discount if you bought one of the floors that was used during the tournament, and the floor UNI got was the one that was used in St. Louis and that they played on. UNI will get that floor at a discount through a gift and will sell the current floor with that money going into that athletic account in UNI's Foundation.

Chair Wurtz thanked Mr. Dannen for taking the time to come and talk with the Senate.

#### Regents Award for Faculty Excellence

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the Senate will probably want to go into Executive Session to discuss the faculty who have recommended by the committee.

Motion to move into Executive Session by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Roth.

Motion to accept the recommendation of the six faculty by the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Committee by Senator Breitbach; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

Chair Wurtz stated that with some of the Docketed Items the Senate may want to table until the May Retreat because they speak to some of the issues that will be looked at then.

930 Creation of Liberal Arts Core Coordinating Committee -  
Liberal Arts Core Committee (*tabled from 3/08/10 meeting*)

Motion to bring off the table by Senator Basom; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Coordinating Committee Coordinator, noted that she has been consultation with Dean Haack, College of Natural Sciences/College of Humanities and Fine Arts. It is that college that has the biggest issues with the Coordinating Committees. She talked with them about creating those committees and doing that and moving forward internally. At this point they don't really need an outside force to tell them what to do. And the Senate can come forward at any time and tell the LACC to get moving.

Motion to approve failed.

932 Creation of Task Force to Review Recent UNI Actions  
Regarding Merger of Academic Units - College of Humanities  
and Fine Arts Senate (*tabled from 3/22/10 meeting - for  
discussion after 5/07/10 Faculty Senate Retreat*)

933 Creation of a Standing UNI Faculty Budget Committee -  
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Motion to approve by Senator Lowell; second by Senator Bruess.

Senator Neuhaus noted that his only concern on this is that we've had budget committees before and they've gone into mothballs. Unless we keep these people occupied, more occupied than in the past, people will forget that they even serve on this, as what's happened in the past, and it will become one of those committees that people try to avoid. He's hoping, with the current budget situation, that there's enough to keep people active. But next year it might not be and what happens to the committee? His concern is that we may be creating a committee that doesn't have enough to do.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the Senate established a University Faculty Senate Budget Committee, which still exists, and which has gone through the election process and elected members. He doesn't know what the effect will be if this is passed, possibly having two committees unless there's a motion to abolish the current committee, to substitute this committee. As it's stated now, it doesn't make any sense as we currently have a committee and this proposal is to create an identical committee. We could have two committees but why couldn't business be sent to the current committee? The current committee has never been asked to do any business by this body. They don't meet just to be meeting but they would meet if asked to by the Senate. Resolutions have been passed asking other committees to meet and they have.

Faculty Chair Swan continued, stating that he has visited with several faculty who are very eager about this. They just want a budget committee to meet, and they don't care how this body or another body operates. As Senator Neuhaus was saying, the budget situation is interesting right now and the current committee could be meeting. If a new committee is created he would suggest abolishing the old committee. But the people

elected to the current committee may not understand why their committee is being abolished. He asked the Senate to consider what they're doing, modify, shape, possibly send business to the standing committee.

Senator Soneson noted that as he understands it, the current budget committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate. This is asking for a UNI Faculty Budget Committee, which would be a stand-alone committee. It wouldn't be responsible to the Faculty Senate but to faculty as a whole.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that the Faculty Senate can only create their own committees.

Senator Soneson responded so what they're asking is for us to create the same committee.

Senator Basom asked if the Senate is not discussing the entire committee structure at their retreat on May 7<sup>th</sup>? It seems to her that this should be tabled for discussion on May 7<sup>th</sup>. She also stated that we do have a Faculty Senate Budget Committee and perhaps we could revise this and charge them with reviewing the budget and creating a report for the Senate, rather than creating a new committee.

Chair Wurtz added that she hopes to look at the reporting structures of Senate committees so that they're actually sustained.

Senator Basom stated that she would prefer that the Senate take this up May 7<sup>th</sup>.

Senator Breitbach noted that what we as Senators want is more information about the budget process. To ask a group of faculty to wrap their minds around the UNI budget would be a full time job and we don't have time for another full time job. What she wants is more information forth coming from administration about budget decisions and the budget crisis, and where the priorities lie in terms of how we spend our money. She doesn't want to be on another committee; she doesn't want to be tasked with doing something that is almost insurmountable for her, which is to understand all aspects of the budget and to report back to the Senate. That's why the committee has not been active. She sees it as an almost insurmountable task. If we could get more reporting back from the people who make the decisions that would do what we'd expect this budget committee to do. Let the people

who are already doing it simply come and answer questions, as we had Mr. Dannen do today.

Chair Wurtz commented that on May 7<sup>th</sup> the Senate will be talking about such procedures.

Senator Lowell stated that this proposal came out long ago but she was in on the discussion. One of the reasons that the Faculty Senate Budget Committee really doesn't exist any more is that according to the committee guidelines people only served three years, and they haven't met for years so they're defunct.

Faculty Chair Swan noted that the Senate never asked them to do anything.

Senator Lowell continued that they've been in that position for years so that anyone who was on this committee, whether they've done anything or not, is no longer on it until we hold elections.

Faculty Chair Swan responded that people have been elected, and they're serving their terms and going through rotations.

Senator Lowell noted that the proposal here is to have representatives from each college.

Faculty Chair Swan stated that's what we have with the Faculty Senate Budget Committee. The proposal is to have what we have.

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate, in theory, has a lot of stuff in place.

Faculty Chair Swan said that the Senate should just tell their committee to meet, and give them a charge.

Senator Bruess noted that he was also at the meeting, as was Senator Lowell and Senator Van Wormer. There were two issues. One was that it was comparable to the committee that came from the English Department wanting to recharge the College Reading and Writing Committee; to get some energy put into the process. The other part was that there was a move to combine the Budget Committee with the Strategic Planning Committee. It was the concern of the College of Social and Behavioral Science senators that those committees remain separate, that they not be combined into one mega-committee. It's his recollection that they had some statement to this effect that something had been passed by the Faculty Senate some time ago that combined the two

committees. Senator Basom is right in one sense that this is another thing to re-examine. Part of the confusion was that they want to re-charge the Budget Committee and part was to maintain its separate identity.

Chair Wurtz commented that she is reviewing and checking on the history for a committee, and she has three different stories from three different people who she considers credible sources. Which is why she's suggesting wiping the slate clean and start over with the committee structure.

Senator East stated that part of the confusion may have come from him. There was an email about the establishment of this committee and he responded saying something along the lines of "what would they do" and "why don't we consider creating something sort of like the US Senate's ways and means committee" that does these kinds of things. That may have been where someone got the idea that the Senate had approved something. He suggested something like that for dealing with the administration.

Senator Funderburk moved to table until after the May 7<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate Retreat; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

934 Inclusion of 48C:011, or 48C:071, or 48C:074 and 48C:004 or 48C:031 (6 total hours) to Category 1B of the Liberal Arts Core - Liberal Arts Core Committee

Motion to approve by Senator Basom; second by Senator Soneson.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, was present to discuss this with the Senate. She noted that proposal came from the Communication Studies Department to allow their majors to take what is the equivalent of the Oral Com/Gen Ed/Liberal Arts Core course by substituting a 6-credit two-course sequence with multiple options. It's kind of the equivalent of having the science majors take General Physics and General Chemistry rather than the survey courses because these courses go into more detail in the discipline-specific area.

Senator Soneson stated that he thinks this is a great idea as it eliminates some of the way too simple courses for students who are going to be spending a great deal of time in that area. It relieves us of a little bit of the Liberal Arts Core burden as well as helps to streamline the programs.

Dr. Morgan added that this would not be exclusive to those majors. Any student could take this 6-credit option rather than the 3-credit option if they were so inclined.

Senator Van Wormer noted that it makes good sense if they could take those courses because they shouldn't have to take more elementary courses. These are students that are debaters and they don't need to take basic courses in oral communications. She would like them to just be exempted from the requirement rather than to put it in the Liberal Arts Core. By putting 6 hours there they know regular students aren't going to be taking a 6-hour sequence; they'll take the 3-credit option. It's not intended for general students and she doesn't like the Liberal Arts Core to have a course that's just intended for majors. Would be possible to just waive the requirement for them?

Dr. Morgan replied that the problem comes if a student changes their major. This process would reduce the paperwork involved and makes it automatic.

Senator Basom stated that the problem is making that kind of recommendation right now is that it wasn't considered by the Liberal Arts Core Committee. These courses are used by just more than Communication majors. The committee felt that by doing this for all students, whether they were majors or not, would open it up and students would select it but it's not tied to it if they change their major or any other program. That was the rationale of the committee.

Senator East asked if this is explainable to students? His understanding is students can take this one course, or they can take one of these two courses and one of these three courses. And that can be put into words in the Liberal Arts Core that are really understandable by our students?

Dr. Morgan responded that she believes we can explain anything but they will have to have discussion with the people that produce the catalog and that provide advising information to students to make sure students understand. With other complicated courses they have explained and students have understood.

Motion to call the question by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator Soneson.

Motion passed.

## OTHER DISCUSSION

## ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Funderburk to adjourn; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden  
Faculty Senate Secretary

### 2.05 Honorary Degrees

#### Purpose and Nature of the Honorary Degree Program

- A. The University of Northern Iowa may award honorary degrees to individuals in order to recognize outstanding achievements and attainments which exemplify the goals and ideals of the University.
- B. The degrees awarded shall normally be Doctor of Laws (LL.D.), Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.), Doctor of Literature (Litt.D.), and Doctor of Science (Sc.D.), and shall be awarded as appropriate for the achievement or attainment being recognized.
- C. Degrees which may be earned in regular course at the University of Northern Iowa, University of Iowa, or Iowa State University shall not be awarded as honorary degrees.

#### Criteria to be Considered in Selecting Recipients

- A. Achievements and attainments meriting recognition should exemplify the goals and ideals of the University.
- B. Financial and political consideration should not be involved.
- C. Holders of elective or appointive public office at the time of nomination ordinarily should not be considered.
- D. Significant connections with the University or Northern Iowa or with the State of Iowa may be important considerations, but recipients shall not be limited to such.
- E. Faculty or staff members of the University of Northern Iowa are not eligible. Former faculty or staff members would be selected only in unusual cases.
- F. Accomplishments meriting recognition should not be too far in the past

#### Committee on Honorary Degrees

- A. A standing committee shall be responsible for supervising the elicitation of suggestions and nominations and for making recommendations to the President of the University.
- B. The committee shall be composed of eight members. These shall be one member of the faculty from each of the five academic colleges (to be selected as each college senate determines), Executive Vice President and Provost or his/her designee, Special Assistant to the President for Board and Governmental Relations or his/her designee, and the Dean of the Graduate College.
- C. The Dean of the Graduate College shall serve as chair of the committee.
- D. Members from the academic colleges shall serve terms of four years beginning July 1 with at least one member being selected each year.

### Procedures for Selection

- A. Chair of the selection committee shall publicize solicitation for nominations, secure nominations for recipients from University faculty, staff, and/or administration, and distribute nominations to selection committee members.
- B. Selection committee shall review nominations, arrive at consensus (simple majority), and forward recommendations to the President.
- C. The President shall request University Faculty Senate review.
- D. The President shall forward final recommendation to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.
- E. All invitations to the Honorary Degree recipient(s) will be extended by the President.
- F. Additional procedures and details necessary for implementation shall be determined by the committee.

### Nomination Materials

- A. Letter of Nomination, describing outstanding achievements and attainments of the nominee. This letter must include information/documentation relevant to, or in support of, recognition. Examples of documentation may include (but are not limited to) CV/resume of the nominee; website of the nominee which includes description of accomplishments; books, recordings, or other examples of the nominee's work.
- B. Letter(s) of support from additional sources are strongly encouraged.
- C. Other materials as deemed appropriate to support the nomination.
- D. All materials should be sent by the published nomination deadline to the office of the Dean of the Graduate College. Letters of nomination and support (and other supporting materials already in electronic format) should be sent electronically.
- E. All nomination materials shall be kept in complete confidence at all times. Names of only those individuals who will be awarded an Honorary Degree shall be made public upon final approval by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

### Awarding of Degrees

- A. Honorary degrees shall be awarded at regularly scheduled University commencement ceremonies, or if necessary, during special honorary ceremonies.
- B. The Committee on Honorary Degrees shall be responsible for the preparation of an appropriate citation.
- C. An honorary degree shall be conferred only if the recipient is present in person.
- D. It is not expected that honorary degrees will be awarded every year. However, more than one degree may be awarded in a single year, if appropriate.

University Faculty Senate Approved, [date].

---

## Educational Policy Commission Recommendations Regarding University Policy on Class Attendance and Make-Up Work

**March 31, 2010**

The Educational Policies Commission members are Melissa Heston (ED, chair), Maria Basom (HFA), Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn (SBS), Shahina Amin (BA), Ben Schafer (NS), Susan Moore (L), Megan Balong (at large, ED), Beverly Kopper (represented by Deirdre Heistad, ex officio, Academic Affairs), Philip Patton (ex officio, registrar), Angel Banks (student), Mary Jo Halder (student), and Robert Conway (student). The committee met on Jan. 15, Feb. 5, Feb. 12, and Feb. 26. During these meetings the committee reviewed current university policies related to class attendance and make-up work (pages 38-39 in the 2008-2010 catalog). We agreed that the

current policies were vague and inconsistent in these two areas. We also examined the policies of both Iowa State University and the University of Iowa in these areas with particular attention to the issue of exam make-ups following an absence.

The University of Iowa has the following policy:

Students at The University of Iowa are permitted to make up exams missed due to religious holidays, illness, or special circumstances. Faculty members should reschedule exams for students who miss them for reasons consistent with the University's policy regarding religious holidays, as stated in Part III, Chapter 22, section 10 of the University Operations Manual.

Each college within the University is free to establish its own rules and regulations concerning absences from class. However, University regulations require that students be allowed to make up examinations that have been missed due to illness, mandatory religious obligations, or other unavoidable circumstances or University activities

Retrieved March 22, 2010 from

Iowa State University does not seem to have an explicit policy regarding making up exams due to an absence caused by illness, or other unavoidable causes. However, the faculty handbook does include these relevant policies:

Students are expected to attend class meetings as scheduled. Each instructor sets his or her policy on class attendance, and excuses for absence from class are handled between the student and the instructor.

From *10.4.1 Class Attendance*, retrieved Mar. 22, 2010 from

And:

Instructors are encouraged not to penalize students who miss class because they represent Iowa State University in activities such as:

- a. academic and professional conferences
- b. intercollegiate athletic and judging competitions
- c. musical, theatrical, dance and other artistic performances
- d. presentations or programs given to external audiences about ISU or academic matters

Ultimately, however, it is up to each instructor to decide whether absences will or will not be excused for participation in these activities.

...

Instructors are urged to provide timely opportunities for students to take missed examinations and/or make up missed assignments. While instructors are free to change the format of make-up exams or assignments, students should be evaluated by the same standards as other members of the class.

From *10.4.3 Extra-Curricular Activities*, retrieved Mar. 22, 2010 from

Based on our review of this information, the situation which led to this matter being brought to us for consideration, and recognition of the importance of academic freedom and that grades should be a sound reflection of student learning, and not unduly influenced by extraneous factors beyond a student's control, we recommend the following changes to current policies. This would replace the current information under *Class Attendance*, and *Policy on Make-up Work and Missed Classes* (pg 38, 2008-2010 catalog). We also recommend that this title in the catalog, "The Making Up of Incomplete Work" be changed to the following: **Policies regarding Course Grades of Incomplete.**

Two different options have been provided regarding grievance procedures in connection to make-up work and missed exams. On the whole, the committee believes the second option makes the most sense in terms of working within a tight time frame, and the challenges of busy faculty and student schedules.

**It is the expressed focus of the University of Northern Iowa to further the educational development of each of its students. On occasion events will necessitate a student's absence from class.**

#### **A. General Expectations**

**1. Instructors who choose to have policies related to attendance and make-up work must distribute those policies on the first day of class. It is strongly recommended that all faculty have written policies regarding attendance and make-up work. When such policies are not provided in writing at the start of the class, it is understood that there will be no grade-related penalties due to absences, missed exams, make-up work, and so on, regardless of the cause of those events.**

**2. Students must adhere to each instructor's policies regarding attendance and make-up work.**

#### **B. Absences**

Occasionally, students will have reasonable cause to miss class. In order for both faculty and students to plan effectively for these absences, the following procedures have been developed. Faculty are encouraged to take into account the reason for an absence and make appropriate accommodations.

1. Instructors have the discretion to determine the reasonability of an absence.
2. When an absence is deemed “reasonable”, the instructor must provide the student an opportunity to make up missed work, or have in place a make-up policy that does not unjustly penalize a student for the absence.
3. All absences due to participation in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must be considered reasonable, and a student must therefore not be unjustly penalized for these absences.
4. Students participating in educationally appropriate, university sponsored activities or sanctioned events must inform each instructor of their known and anticipated absences as far in advance as possible.
5. Other types of absences due to extenuating circumstances, either predetermined or unexpected, may also be deemed “reasonable” by the instructor. Such absences include, though are not limited to, the following: non-university sanctioned educationally appropriate events and activities (e.g., attendance at a professional conference); illness; significant personal emergency; bereavement; jury duty; military service; mandatory religious observances, etc.

#### **Make-up Work Grievances Arising from Absences**

Should an instructor refuse to allow a student to make up missed work, and should this refusal constitute an unjust penalty upon the student, the faculty member’s decision can be appealed by the student using the grievance process outlined below. This process reflects the constraints that both faculty and students face in dealing with the timely make up of missed work:

##### **Grievance Procedure Option 1**

1. The student must contact the faculty member, the faculty member’s department head, the faculty member’s dean, a Northern Iowa Student Government Executive Officer, and the Provost (or designee) in writing requesting a review of the instructor’s decision within 3 business days of the denial of make-up work.
2. The department head will organize a meeting between the faculty member, the dean, the Provost (or designee), the Northern Iowa Student Government Executive Officer (or designee) and the student within 2 business days upon receipt of the letter, and this meeting shall take place within 5 business days of the receipt of the appeal letter.

- 3. The Provost (or designee) shall review the cause of the absence and the instructor's reasons for denial and policies regarding attendance and make up work. The Provost (or designee) will render a final decision within 2 business day regarding whether or not a student will be allowed to make up missed work. This decision is final and binding upon the instructor and the student. Any make-up work or exam must be equivalent in terms of academic demand to the original assignment or exam, although it may differ in form.**

#### **Grievance Procedure Option 2**

- 1. The student must contact the faculty member, the faculty member's department head, the faculty member's dean, and a Northern Iowa Student Government Executive Officer in writing requesting a review of the instructor's decision within 3 business days of the denial of make-up work.**
- 2. The Northern Iowa Student Government Executive Officer will organize a meeting between the student, the faculty member, the faculty member's department head, and a minimum of 2 tenured faculty members (drawn from a pool of faculty who have previously agreed to serve in this capacity, and who come from outside the faculty member's department) within 2 business days upon receipt of the letter, and this meeting shall take place within five business days of the receipt of the appeal letter.**
- 3. The three person committee (2 faculty volunteers and the NISG officer) shall review the cause of the absence and the instructor's reasons for denial and policies regarding attendance and make up work. This committee will render a final decision within 2 business days regarding whether or not a student will be allowed to make up missed work. This decision is final and binding upon the instructor and the student. Any make-up work or exam must be equivalent in terms of academic demand to the original assignment or exam, although it may differ in form.**
- 4. The specific findings of the committee will be strictly confidential, and reported only to the faculty member's dean to ensure that the committee's decision is acted upon in good faith in cases where a student's appeal is granted.**

---

TO: Susan Wurtz, Chair of the Faculty Senate  
FROM: Siobahn Morgan, LACC Coordinator

DATE: April 5, 2010

RE: Request to change the location of the course 200:030 *Dynamics of Human Development* from Category 5B of the LAC and to Category 5C.

***Proposal:*** The Liberal Arts Core Committee is asking that the Faculty Senate approve the change from Category 5B to Category 5C of the previously approved LAC course 200:030, *Dynamics of Human Development*.

***Background:***

At the March 8, 2010 meeting of the UNI Faculty Senate, the course 200:030 *Dynamics of Human Development* was approved for inclusion into the LAC in Category 5B. The original proposal from the LACC asked for its inclusion into Category 5B in part due to how some transfer credits are classified for courses such as this, usually as 5B credit. Further consultation with the Category 5 Coordinating Committee after the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting showed that the course is clearly more appropriate for Category 5C. At the March 26, 2010 meeting of the LACC, a motion was approved to recommend to the Senate that the course be shifted from Category 5B to Category 5C.

Apart from the pedagogical reasons for changing the course from Category 5B to 5C, this would result in a larger number of students taking 5C classes than is currently the case. At the present time this optional category of the LACC is the most underutilized with typically less than 300 students enrolled in 5C courses during fall semesters, while typically more than 1700 students are enrolled in 5B courses during the same semester.

A copy of a memo from the Category 5 Coordinating Committee outlining the reasons for the change is attached as well as a copy of an e-mail from the interim department Head of Educational Psychology and Foundations, Radhi Al-Mabuk, indicating no issues with the proposed change.

-----

**MEMO**

**Date:** April 2, 2010

**To:** Siobahn Morgan,  
Coordinator, Liberal Arts Core Committee

**From:** Brenda Bass  
Chair, Category 5 Coordinating Committee  
Associate Dean, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences

**RE:** Moving 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development into Category 5C of the LAC

As discussed with your LAC Committee, the Category 5 Coordinating Committee is requesting that 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development be moved from 5B to 5C. We have consulted and received support from the Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations (and they will be submitting a separate document showing their support of this move).

The Category 5 Coordinating Committee is making this request based on their examination and evaluation of the category and its current structure. In the recent (2008-2009) category review, this committee examined all recent syllabi for every class included in the category, gaining an understanding

of how these classes contribute to the goals of Category 5 overall as well as to the subsections (5A, 5B, & 5C).

Category 5 is divided into 3 subsections, with courses organized based on a general structure. Categories 5A (Sociocultural & Historical Perspectives) and 5B (Individual & Institutional Perspectives) reflect introductory, survey level courses for broad disciplines. All of these courses cover the foundational blocks that go into the disciplines. For example, 400:001 Introduction to Psychology surveys the diverse field of psychology covering the wide range of areas such as sensation & perception, memory, abnormal psychology, bio-psychology, industrial/organizational psychology, cognition & intelligence, social psychology, personality, clinical psychology, and developmental psychology. This range of topics is typical of classes found in Categories 5A and 5B, which 200:030 does not provide. While some of the course titles in Categories 5A and 5B may not directly reflect their introductory nature on first examination (e.g., do not have "Introduction to" in their titles), their intent is to provide broad overviews of key disciplines within social and behavioral sciences. For example, 990:011 Culture, Nature, and Society is the introductory course for anthropology.

In contrast, the intent for 5C (Topical Perspectives) is to offer classes that reflect specializations in subfields of the various social and behavioral sciences. These courses focus on more narrow topics or content areas found within the broader disciplines. As a child and adolescent development class (please see course catalog description below), 200:030 Dynamics of Human Development reflects a topical specialization area in the broader psychology discipline. Therefore, the Category 5 Coordinating Committee believes it fits best in 5C.

#### **CATALOG DESCRIPTION:**

##### **200:030 DYNAMICS OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (3 HRS.)**

Introduction to behavioral characteristics of individual development; basic developmental principles, age-stage characteristics; and provisions community, family, and school make in the development of children and youth