

1-26-2009

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, January 26, 2009

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2009 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, January 26, 2009" (2009). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 874.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/874

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

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING

01/26/09

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Wurtz at 3:15P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 12/08/08 meeting by Senator Lowell; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Emily Christensen, The Courier, was present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker had no comments at this time.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

977 Emeritus Status request, Melba R. Widmer, Department of Design, Textiles, Gerontology and Family Studies, effective 8/08

Motion to docket in regular order as item #883 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

978 Resolution from NISG - "A Resolution for: The Northern Iowa Student Government Support of Changing the Electronic Media Devices Policy"

Motion to docket in regular order as item #884 by Senator Smith; second by East.

Discussion followed.

Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to Faculty Senate Speakers Series Review Committee

Senator Soneson, who serves on this committee, briefly described what the committee does.

Self-nomination by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to close nominations by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Senator Funderburk was elected to the Faculty Senate Speakers Series Review Committee by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

882 Motion that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the Academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place.

Chair Wurtz stated that Chris Edginton, Director, HPELS, recently contacted her regarding inaccurate language in the motion. She assured him this item was still being discussed, and urged him to contact the senators representing the College of Education about this. Dr. Edginton had also indicated he wanted to bring up some budget history information and she asked that it be sent in writing, which he declined. She again encouraged him to contact the senators representing his college.

Senator Yehieli reported that she did talk briefly with Dr. Edginton and he had indicated that the "Wellness and Recreation Center" is actually the "Wellness and Recreation Services (WRS)." The bulk of the funding for the WRS is from student fees.

Senator Soneson, who introduced this motion, stated that after learning more about the budgets at UNI, the wording of his motion is not correct. It is not the "Academic Budget" that's being discussed; it's the "General Education Fund."

Senator Soneson also distributed a summary of monies that have been taken from the General Education Fund for the past ten years, since 1997, and put into the "UNI Auxiliary Enterprises", which includes Athletics, Maucker Union, Wellness Center, Gallagher-Bluedorn and the Health Center. These figures come from summaries of UNI's budget published at the end of fiscal years. Transfers from the General Education Funds beginning with fiscal year ending 6/30/97 are detailed with yearly total contributions. In the Athletic Deficits there's been a transfer each year from the General Education Fund totaling \$42,459,719, through 2007, with \$4,434,453.61 being transferred fiscal year ending 6/30/08. This amount has grown from \$2.2 million about ten years ago to \$5.5 last year. This amount has grown from 2.32% to 6.09% in about ten years.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that Hans Isakson, head of the Union, has formulated a resolution, which could be a modification of the one that was proposed to the Senate, and in the last paragraph of the resolution proposes a resolution, which is probably a little more reasonable than the one that was previously proposed.

Chair Wurtz noted that the original motion was made by Senator Soneson and as long as the senator who made the second was agreeable, Senator Soneson could make that change.

Senator Soneson stated that asking for all the monies that have been given over to athletics and the WRS to be returned is probably not very reasonable because that is over half of the athletic budget.

Senator Soneson also distributed copies of UNI's Athletic Budget from the year ending June 30, 2008. The total Athletic budget for last year was \$10,775,953.47 with \$5,535,453.61 coming from the General Education Fund. He noted that it is probably a little unreasonable to say that all that money should go back.

What Dr. Isakson is suggesting, continued Senator Soneson, is for the total Auxiliary Enterprise operations, monies that are transferred from the General Education Fund be held at 3% of the total the General Education Fund.

Senator Soneson amended his original motion to read, that the UNI Faculty Senate resolves that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than a three percent of the General Education Fund, and that the savings generated by cutting Auxiliary Enterprise spending be used to maintain to the academic integrity of the university. He noted that this is a broader consideration and that the administration would thus be free make decisions on where to make appropriate cuts.

A lengthy discussion followed with Interim Provost Lubker discussing the budget projections, noting that in mid-November UNI received a 1% reversion of about \$1 million. Mid-December we received a 1.5% reversion, about \$1.5 million. These are permanent cuts to UNI's budget, a total of \$2.5 million gone. We fully expect a third reversion. However, what is more concerning to us is fiscal year 2010 and he expects the governor to began talking about that soon. It is expected that these will be cuts like none of us have ever seen or thought about. The deans have been asked to do scenarios on how they would deal with 5% and 10% cuts, and the cabinet has been discussing plans on how to deal with 15% and 20% reversions, or cuts. However, at levels like that every thing we have on this university is on the table, with one exception, Financial Aid, which they try to protect for the students. But everything else, including athletics, is on the table.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, stating that the Assessment and Prioritization Project, which was never put into place to cut programs or to save money is all of a sudden focused as if that's what we're going to use it for, and it's not. It's there for a whole different purpose, to try to determine what we're doing best and how we can do it better in a prioritized fashion. UNI will making budget decisions prior to any decision reached by Task Force II. And if we have to take something from athletics, something will be taken from everyone. He asked that the Senate give the Athletic Director, Troy Dannen and Vice President of Administration and Finance, Tom Schellhardt a chance to respond to questions.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Senator Soneson reiterated his motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Services be returned to the academic budget;

and that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than 3% of the General Education Fund; and secondly, that changes be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place.

Senator Basom, who made the second, agreed to the changes.

More discussion followed focusing on separating the two issues from Senator Soneson's motion.

Senator Soneson stated, in the interest of moving on, that he would amend his motion to read, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under the condition that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the UNI Faculty Senate for discussion and its recommendation before said changes take place.

Discussion followed with Senator Basom, who made the original second, suggesting that "recommendation" be changed to "approval" because it adds more strength the motion.

Senator Soneson agreed to change "recommendation" to "approval."

Discussion followed.

The final motion read: That the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under the condition that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the UNI Faculty Senate for discussion and its approval before said changes take place.

Motion passed with 4 nays, no abstentions.

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Motion to table by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI

881 Committee on Committees 2008 - 2009 Report

Motion to table Docketed Item #880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI and #881 Committee on Committees 2008 - 2009 Report; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed with one nay.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Consultative session with Interim Provost Lubker

Interim Provost Lubker addressed the Senate on the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project and responded to questions and comments from senators.

A lengthy discussion ensued.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

01/26/09

1659

PRESENT: Megan Balong, Maria Basom, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Mary Guenther, Doug Hotek, Bev Kopper, Julie Lowell, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Carol Weisenberger, Katherine van Wormer, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Wurtz at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 12/08/08 meeting by Senator Lowell; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Emily Christensen, The Courier, was present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker had no comments at this time.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, SUSAN WURTZ

Chair Wurtz had no comments.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

977 Emeritus Status request, Melba R. Widmer, Department of Design, Textiles, Gerontology and Family Studies, effective 8/08

Motion to docket in regular order as item #883 by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

978 Resolution from NISG - "A Resolution for: The Northern Iowa Student Government Support of Changing the Electronic Media Devices Policy"

Motion to docket in regular order as item #884 by Senator Smith; second by East.

Senator East asked what action Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) would like the Senate to take with this item, to revise the current policy so that it will allow the use of cell phones in the classroom to respond to UNI Alerts. It is not clear to him that the current policy disallows that, doesn't encourage it or specifically relates to it. There is not a particular action or wording so if the Senate were to make such a change it would be nice to have that motion in advance rather than making it up as we go.

Chair Wurtz asked if Senator East is asking for more specificity than what is in this resolution?

Senator East replied that he just wonders what the Senate is going to do with it when the Senate gets it. If it is docketed and the Senate discusses it, then what?

Senator Smith commented that it was his understanding that there is an existing policy, which the Senate had considered revising. There were some issues, which the Senate did discuss, and this to him is just the NISG weighing-in on this at our request. If the Senate docketed this we are just accepting it as information that would go into the discussion of the original issue.

Chair Wurtz noted that a policy was approved by the Senate that stated faculty members had the authority to ban all electronic devices in their classroom, and which was also understood that those devices were not to be used unless the faculty member gave specific permission. This was prior to the UNI Alert system in which warnings came to students and faculty through cell phones, Internet, etc. From one perspective, if a faculty member tells students they're going with the basic policy that says "no electronic devices in this classroom" then that faculty member is insisting that students be in a situation where they would not know if there is something on campus they should be made aware of. Faculty can make the decision to allow students to have those devices in the classroom but this allows faculty to make that decision. The students' concern is that faculty not do that to students, put them in a situation where they cannot receive UNI Alerts.

When this comes before the Senate, Senator Smith continued, it would amount to the Senate reconsidering the existing policy and deciding if the Senate wants to change it or not.

Senator East noted that if the Senate is going to reconsider it would be nice to have the motion in advance rather than a discussion.

Chair Wurtz stated that from her conversation with NISG leaders, the intent was that this coming to the Senate today is the resolution, that the Electronic Devices Policy will allow the use of cell phones in the classroom.

Senator East continued, stating that the policy has particular words in it and those words would make a difference in how the Senate votes. Seeing the words in advance is a useful thing and most docketed items come as motions; this one does not. He would prefer something more definite be on the docket or be prepared for consideration.

Discussion followed.

Senator Smith suggested providing the senators with copies of the existing policy prior to review when this item comes forward for consideration.

Senator East responded that he would prefer that someone think of a motion to make and pass it on to the Senate before the Senate meets to consider this.

Senator Smith continued, noting that if someone wants to revise the existing policy in light of this resolution they could.

Otherwise, Senator East continued, it seems that any change in amendment to the policy would have to go through the process of docketing at the head of the order before it could be discuss. It is his understanding that the way the process works is a motion to be considered and voted on has to be on the docket. There are two ways to get it there, in regular or out of regular order at the head of the docket. This resolution does not include a motion.

Chair Wurtz commented that the Senate does docket things that are not motions.

Senator East noted that the Senate cannot take action without a motion.

Chair Wurtz replied that a motion could arise as a result of docketing this resolution.

Senator East stated that to be considered it would need to be placed at the head of the docket.

Chair Wurtz responded that if the Senate docket this as an item of business, a motion can then be created. Items that are placed at the head of the docket are usually done so so they can be discussed and taken care of before all other docketed items.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas added that the Senate can look at this resolution but the Senate cannot make a motion on it because it is not formally stated as a motion, nor is the title of it a motion. Once there's an "advertisement" that there's a motion before the Senate, not just that we'll review a resolution, but that there's a motion, then the Senate will return and look at it a second time. She does not believe that

the Senate can docket a motion at this time; we can only docket a review of the resolution because no one came forward with a motion to accompany this resolution.

Senator Funderburk asked if there was a Senate subcommittee that worked on the original Electronic Devices Policy.

Chair Wurtz responded that it was a student policy.

Senator Mvuyekure noted that it was his understanding that Public Safety was to return to the Senate as far as revising the policy, and the Public Safety policy is not included here.

Chair Wurtz noted that apparently the students did not want to wait for the Public Safety policy, and that students are allowed to bring things up.

There was no further discussion on the motion to docket this item in regular order. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Elect representative to Faculty Senate Speakers Series Review Committee

Senator Soneson, currently serving on the committee, stated that there is a budgeted amount of money in the Faculty Senate's Speakers fund which was given to the Provost's Office to distribute to groups on campus that would like to bring in outside speakers and are needing supplemental funding. Committee members review the petitions completed by faculty and indicate whether they support the petition or not, and they can ask petitioners to make changes to their petition. The amount of funding asked for can be no more than \$1000 and it must have matching funds. The procedure itself is conducted mostly electronically. He noted that it is a pleasurable committee to serve on and interesting to see what proposals faculty are making. The committee tends to support those requests that are interesting and open to the university at large.

Self-nomination by Senator Funderburk.

Motion to close nominations by Senator Neuhaus; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Senator Funderburk was elected to the Faculty Senate Speakers Series Review Committee by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

882 Motion that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; first, that monies from the Academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Center (WRC) be returned to the academic budget; and secondly, that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place.

Chair Wurtz stated that Chris Edginton, Director, HPELS, recently contacted her, noting that there is inaccurate language in the motion. She assured him that this item was still being discussed, and urged him to contact the senators representing the College of Education about this. Dr. Edginton had also indicated he wanted to bring up some budget history information and she asked that it be sent in writing, which he declined. She again encouraged him to contact the senators representing his college.

Senator Yehieli, representing the College of Education, reported that she did talk briefly with Dr. Edginton and he had indicated that the "Wellness and Recreation Center" is actually the "Wellness and Recreation Services (WRS)." The bulk of the funding for the WRS is from student fees.

Senator Soneson, who introduced this motion, stated that after learning more about the budgets at UNI, the wording of his motion is not correct. It is not the "Academic Budget" that's being discussed; it's the "General Education Fund."

Senator Soneson distributed a summary of monies that have been taken from the General Education Fund for the past ten years, since 1997, and put into the "UNI Auxiliary Enterprises", which includes Athletics, Maucker Union, Wellness Center, Gallagher-Bluedorn and the Health Center. These figures come from summaries of UNI's budget published at the end of fiscal years. Transfers from the General Education Funds, beginning with fiscal year ending 6/30/97, are detailed with yearly total contributions at the right. In looking at the Athletic Deficits there's been a transfer each year from the General Education Fund totally \$42,459,719, through 2007. \$4,434,453.61 was

transferred fiscal year ending 6/30/08. This amount has grown from \$2.2 million about ten years ago to \$5.5 last year. Year ending 1999, the total transfer was 2.32% of the General Education Fund. The transfers have grown over the years and by the end of last year's fiscal year the total was \$9,804,450, 6.09% of the General Education Fund. This amount has grown from 2.32% to 6.09% in about ten years.

Senator Soneson continued, noting that Hans Isakson, head of the Union, has formulated a resolution, which could be a modification of the one that was proposed to the Senate. Senator Soneson distributed copies of Dr. Isakson's resolution. In the last paragraph of the resolution, Dr. Isakson proposes a resolution, which is probably more reasonable than the one that has been proposed.

Chair Wurtz noted that the original motion was made by Senator Soneson and as long as the senator who made the second is agreeable, Senator Soneson could do what he wants with this motion.

It was noted that Deirdre Heistad, who was serving on the Senate for Senator Basom during fall semester, made the second, which means that Senator Basom would need to agree to whatever changes or modifications in the original motion that Senator Soneson would make.

Senator Soneson stated that asking for all the monies that have been given over to athletics and the WRS to be returned is probably not very reasonable because that is over half of the athletic budget.

Senator Soneson also distributed copies of UNI's Athletic Budget from the year ending June 30, 2008 so the Senate can see where that money is going and where it comes from. The total Athletic budget for last year was \$10,775,953.47 with \$5,535,453.61 coming from the General Education Fund. It is probably a little unreasonable to say that all that money should go back as it would virtually gut the athletic program.

What Dr. Isakson is suggesting, continued Senator Soneson, is for the total Auxiliary Enterprise operations, monies that are transferred from the General Education Fund be held at 3% of the total of the General Education Fund.

Senator Soneson amended his original motion to read, that the UNI Faculty Senate resolves that the allocation of General

Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than a three percent of the General Education Fund, and that the savings generated by cutting Auxiliary Enterprise spending be used to maintain the academic integrity of the university.

Senator Soneson noted that this is a broader consideration and that the administration would be free make decisions on where to make appropriate cuts.

Senator O'Kane asked what the logic behind the 3% limit was.

Senator Soneson replied that ten years ago it was 2.32% and it has gradually crept up year by year to 6.09% last year. Cutting back to 3% is not cutting it back all the way to 2.32% and it's giving the administration some flexibility. This is capping it so the gradual creeping from over the past years is recovered, most of it without asking for all of it.

Senator Funderburk commented that in discussing this with Dr. Isakson, this was the point at which he noticed the increases seeming to fall in place and accelerate. 3% was putting it back to where he felt it was reasonable and where UNI had had stable budgeting. Ten years ago was when things started to change.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that this is obviously an important issue that needs to be considered. If it is going to be discussed, he suggested inviting UNI's Athletic Director, Troy Dannen and Tom Schellhardt, Vice President for Administration and Finance to answer questions as they should be given the opportunity to respond.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, noting that he would hate to see this issue hold the prioritization process hostage. If the Senate is not going to grant any endorsement to that process until this motion is taken care of, it won't be taken care of very quickly. If that's the case, he would hate to have to go forward without the Senate's endorsement. He would like to see the two uncoupled.

Senator Yehieli commented that when the Senate first had this discussion back in December, the Senate was bringing it up as a way to regain the ability to discuss the program assessment issue itself, a way to get that issue on the table. She agrees in terms of the budgeting issues, as faculty we're not experts or knowledgeable in the budgeting and financial elements of the operations of the university. However, she would not feel

comfortable right now voting to give a certain percentage of something. She would be much more interested in the second element of Senator Soneson's proposal which talks about if programs get cut in the future. That would be something that would be helpful if we could look at first and provide recommendations or endorsements. This was brought up for the opportunity to be able to discuss the program assessment issue, not necessarily as a proposal in and of itself.

Chair Wurtz asked if it might not carry more weight to discuss the funding issue on it's own merits, and separate this motion into two.

Senator Soneson responded that the reason it was originally put in the motion was that one of the things that may come out of the program assessments is that some programs may likely be cut, with the idea that we were going to take money from those programs and re-allocate it to other programs that we "like." What is of concern is that's going to go on at the same time that we have been taking money out of the General Education budget and putting it in these Auxiliary programs. It's problematic for those of us who believe that the fundamental mission of the university is academic. It's hard for us to feel comfortable about that kind of support of Auxiliary programs while we're gutting our academic programs. It's not that anyone is against the idea of restructuring academics. The problem is that if we're doing it for the purpose of reallocating funds then one concern that a lot of faculty have is that we're not recognizing and supporting the academic integrity of UNI. That's why it is a part of this thing. If we are going to cut programs to reallocate funds, alright, let's take the money from the Auxiliary programs, bring it back into the General Fund so that we can reallocate funds from there first.

Interim Provost Lubker asked to talk off topic about the budget projections over the past weeks. In mid-November UNI received a 1% reversion of about \$1 million. Mid-December we received a 1.5% reversion, about \$1.5 million. These are permanent cuts to UNI's budget. \$2.5 million gone and we fully expect a third reversion. He hopes he's wrong but will not be surprised if there is a third reversion probably sometime in March. There are people in the state who estimate how bad off or well off we are four times a year and this third reversion is expected after their next report. What is more deeply concerning to us is fiscal year 2010. Later today the governor will be speaking in Des Moines to the Iowa Business Council. It is believed he will at least "open the doors" about how bad the cuts will be. If he

doesn't do it today he will do it before the first of February. These are cuts like none of us have ever seen or thought about. The deans have been asked to do scenarios on how they would deal with 5% and 10% cuts, which is not as bad as they're guessing it will probably be. At the cabinet level they have been trying to determine what they would do in the face of 15% and 20% reversions, or cut. He doesn't believe it will be 20% but believes it will be more than 10%. 20% would mean \$20 million out of our budget, 15% would be \$15 million. At levels like that every thing we have on this university is on the table, with one exception, Financial Aid, which we try to protect Financial Aid for the students. But everything else, including athletics, is on the table.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, stating that the Assessment and Prioritization Project, which was never put into place to cut programs or save money is all of a sudden focused as if that's what we're going to use it for. It's not. It's there for a whole different purpose, to try to determine what we're doing best and how we can do it better in a prioritized fashion. And yes, it will be huge to do some of these things. The data doesn't have to be back to Task Force II until the first of March. We're going to have to be making decisions on the budget prior to any decision reached by Task Force II. It's highly unlikely that we will get any of the new money we ask for including faculty salary increases. We will be getting a budget reduction, the governor has said so; the only thing he's held back is how large it will be. So yes, we're going to have to look at athletics, and everything we're doing. He doesn't want to see us getting locked into an argument, "take this, not that," "don't hurt me, hurt them." This a more serious economic issue than this university, or the whole country, has ever faced. This is why he hopes we can avoid this "take it all from athletics and put it over here." Yes, we should take something from athletics, we should take something from everyone because we'll have to. If you're going to talk about this particular issue, please give the Troy Dannen, Athletic Director and Tom Schellhardt, Vice President for Administration and Finance a chance to respond to questions.

Chair Wurtz noted that if we can maintain that prioritization as a voluntary self-assessment that we did because we care about the integrity of our academic programs, and then of course we're going to look at what we're doing, what we're doing well and how to make the best use of our resources. If we can pick the high road on that by doing it even before the budget cuts hit us, we look far better in the eyes of people who make the decisions

about appropriations and who support education. She would like to see us take a more positive, pro-active approach to this, looking at ourselves even before the budget cuts hits because we recognize and support the academic integrity of UNI.

Interim Provost Lubker added that when the governor's proposed budget reductions come out in the newspaper, in looking back in history, every single year whatever the governor has proposed the legislature has made it worse. If we see something in the newspaper saying the governor is recommending an 8% reduction, it will probably be worse once the legislature gets through with it.

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate is in the middle of Senator Soneson working out a proposed language change for the approval of the second.

Senator Soneson reiterated his motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under two conditions; that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Services be returned to the academic budget; and that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than 3% of the General Education Fund; and secondly, that changes be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place.

Senator Basom, who made the second, agreed to the changes.

Senator East remarked that he has difficulty in deciding how to vote on this because if he's in favor the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project but not in favor of the other he has to vote against it. If he's in favor of the other but not the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization he has to vote against it. He would really like to see the two separated. He understands Senator Soneson's point about the budget cuts being done presumably to reallocate funds but still feels the issues need to be separated in order to vote in a way that makes sense.

Senator Funderburk added that he knows that Dr. Isakson wants his resolution to stand on it's own, because it is coming from an effort of the last three and a half years of his ten year budget study. The last time funding reductions were made on the campus funding for athletics was increased while academics was reduced. People are concerned that as a philosophy the faculty

hasn't taken exception to the idea that teaching funds have been diverted, as were financial aid funds. They were able to trace the support for students, faculty and teaching that were reduced during that period. It is two separate issues. It is worth noting that this does not come out just because of the program assessment that's going on now, it's an ongoing issue that we've had before us a few times.

Senator Yehieli stated that she agrees, that these are two separate issues that she would like to see separated and pushed back to a different meeting to discuss in light of the severe economic issues that have recently come out. The Senate needs to think about both of these issues in light of what the cuts ultimately will be and that will effect how this motion, whether one or two motions, should ultimately read. It would be premature to act on them now.

Interim Provost Lubker asked, that keeping the idea of separating the two issues in mind, when or if the Senate does that, in looking at the Auxiliary Enterprise spending, that the Senate not lump them into one chunk but think about them as separate auxiliaries. What has helped him when he thinks about them is to ask where is the money coming from, where is it going, and when it gets there is it doing what we want done? The only one of those Auxiliary Enterprise operations that he knows anything about is the Performing Arts Center (PAC). In 1999 it didn't exist but there was about \$400,000 in the General Academic Fund for what was called the "Artist Series." It brought events to campus for students, faculty and the community and was considered an educational academic event. The Performing Arts Center was built as a building. As Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) he was asked by the UNI Cabinet to investigate performing arts centers around the country to see how they were funded. He learned that no performing arts center can make more than about 70% of it's operating costs on ticket sales. The rest of the funding has to come from underwriting by businesses, from donors, and some sort of subsidization from the university. That information was given to the Cabinet and Provost Aaron Podolefsky put together a model where over a three-year period the university put \$200,000 a year into the budget of the PAC and that would be the permanent subsidization to PAC. The first \$200,000 was put in and then the "sky began to fall in." Provost Podolefsky put in the second \$200,000 and that's all that got put in. As the PAC grew it was working on the budget model that it was assigned to work on by UNI's Cabinet. The question to be asked is not if that's unfair money but is that money we want to spend here at

UNI to bring big name performers, acts and events here for our faculty, staff, students, and the community to see. If it is, fine. If it isn't, then take the money back. The Senate needs to look at each of those Auxiliary Enterprise operations that way.

Chair Wurtz commented to Senator Soneson that the discussion is focusing around pushing him to change his motion, and asked if he is open to that?

Senator Soneson asked Interim Provost Lubker if the first condition of the motion, that monies from the academic budget that have been given to athletics and the Wellness/Recreation Services be returned to the academic budget, to be discussed separately at another time, and the second condition, that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than 3% of the General Education Fund, was passed, would he as Provost abide by that?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that if it was taken through the procedures he absolutely would.

Senator Soneson continued, and that no changes would be put into effect unless they are brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that the university would follow whatever the rules and procedures are for the university in doing something like this. However, the Faculty Senate cannot circumvent the rules and procedures for the university any more than he can.

Senator Soneson replied that Associate Provost Kopper had informed the Senate that the way this is set up looks as though this is out of sequence with the Curriculum Cycle.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that that will create a problem right away because budget changes need to be made right away to prepare for the fall term. What's being discussed by the Senate now won't be ready until April or May. What the Senate needs to keep in mind is it wasn't put into place to save money; it was put in place to make this a better university. It doesn't need to take place fall term 2009. What he sees this as is a wonderful proposal to give to the new incoming Provost, Gloria Gibson, so she has an idea of what's happening and what needs to be done and can work with it.

Senator Soneson continued, as a condition for agreeing to drop the first part of the motion and discussing it at another time, he would like some guarantee that if the Senate passes the second condition it wouldn't be a heroic act that would be ignored down the road but that Interim Provost Lubker would take it very seriously and make sure that no changes will take place unless it is brought to the Faculty Senate at some point for discussion and approval.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that he would be delighted to bring any of these to the Faculty Senate. What he's saying is that he doesn't believe that the Senate can stop something from happening if the procedures for the university are followed and does not require approval by the Senate, any more than he himself could stop it or make it happen. The Senate should discuss these things but in the end they will "recommend" on a lot of issues and not "determine" them.

Senator Funderburk offered for clarification the reason that these two were lumped together in this motion, having to do with how part of this is reported at the federal level, noting there were difficulties sorting out budgetary issues. Dr. Isakson had told him that it was not the faculty trying to micromanage as much as saying that we think Auxiliary should be locked into a percentage regardless of the budget. The faculty does not have the information that the UNI Cabinet use to make its funding decisions..

Senator Smith noted that it sounds as though Senator Soneson is saying that the Faculty Senate ought to have a veto on any changes of programs or dropping of programs. Personally he doesn't think we should have a veto on it, it has to be an administrative decision in part. The normal process would run it through the Senate and we'd get an opportunity to vote on it and make our recommendations. He doesn't believe we should have the right to veto dropped of programs because they require funding and ultimately it's up to the administrators to decide if this is the best way to allocate their money.

Interim Provost Lubker added that if within a college it was decided that money could be saved and efficiencies could be created and everything would be happy if two departments would merge, and if everyone involved in that merger from the departments to the college senate was in favor of it, and in going through whatever process it needs to go through, and then comes to the Senate for discussion, could or would the Senate even want to stop that from happening?

Senator Soneson replied that it probably would not be reasonable to stop it.

Senator Lowell remarked on the statement made previously in the discussion that this program assessment was voluntary and how good it's is going to look to everyone. It is not a voluntary assessment, it was an assessment that was forced on the faculty and is not voluntary. She also noted that she believes we should keep the two parts of Senator Soneson's motion together because this whole assessment is about money, what programs will have money put into them, what programs will be kept the same, what programs are not going to have money put into them and be thrown out. It is all about money. She really agrees that if the Senate is thinking about cutting academic programs or putting more money into them we should look at these auxiliary programs, they should be tied to it. She is not going to go along with the idea of decoupling these two proposals.

Senator Basom noted that she agrees that it is about money. There was a report last year that the Senate reviewed that reported the percentages of the General Education funds budget at UNI and corporate institutions, what percentages were spent in what areas, which were devoted to academics and which were devoted to auxiliary expenses. As she recalls, UNI was at the bottom devoting the least amount to academic funding and at the top in terms of auxiliary funding. The Senate can't make the Provost do anything but we can at least give an indication of the direction we would like this institution to be heading in terms of spending and prioritization, because it does come down to budget and resources. If we want to prioritize to some of the auxiliary programs ok, but if we would really like to see the money spent on the academic side instead and fill in some areas that have been suffering we should be able to do that. Has every academic program received the same increases over time as the auxiliary services have? They cannot have and most have received cuts over the past several years.

Senator Basom continued, noting that the other thing that concerns her is the timeline of the program assessments. Faculty are busy teaching classes and this is a very short amount of time to write this report. When doing Academic Program Reviews faculty are given at least a semester, maybe a year and have the questions a year in advance so they can collect their data, consult with colleagues and so forth. For many, this isn't enough time.

Senator O'Kane offered a minor comment in light of what Interim Provost Lubker had to say, suggesting the second half of the motion read, "sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and endorsement" rather than "for discussion and approval". In that way the Senate could endorse it or not endorse it because we have no idea if changes would be approved or not on through the process.

Senator Soneson noted that the Senate has the power to veto a new program that is coming up through the curriculum process. There are several steps in the curriculum process before coming to the Senate where we look at the whole package program by program sometimes, and we could say "no" to a program. If we said "no" to a program, would that stop it?

Associate Provost Kopper responded yes, that would stop it. The process goes to forward to the Provost and the UNI Cabinet once it leaves the Faculty Senate for approval before going to the Board of Regents.

Senator Soneson continued, if the Senate has a key role in establishing programs, shouldn't we also have a key role in their demise?

Senator East added that he agrees, that the one thing we have any power over is curriculum, in particular new curriculum. But how could we prohibit someone from shutting down a program? How could you stop a department from dropping a program, how can we even consider it? We can prohibit programs from going through that we feel are not academic.

Senator Yehieli commented that as the Faculty Senate of this university, we don't control the budgets or funds that allow programs to operate. The most we could do would be to endorse any decision or say it's a bad decision but ultimately it's nothing more than a recommendation, as we don't have any budgetary authority to keep things in place.

Senator Soneson remarked, what if it turns out that Task Force II decides that UNI does not need the Computer Science Department any longer, that it's too technical, it's extraordinarily expensive and it should go over to Hawkeye Community College,. However, none of the people in the Computer Science Department want to drop their program, they're all for it and think it should be one of UNI's signature programs. But the way Task Force II is looking at things it just doesn't make sense to keep it. Wouldn't you want the Faculty Senate to be a

safeguard against what looks to be an arbitrary decision? If it's not arbitrary, if it is really reasonable that we drop Computer Science, than shouldn't Task Force II come in and make a case and persuade us that this is the most reasonable thing to do? The Senate would function as a safeguard for Senator East's program if it should come on the chopping block. If the Computer Science faculty were to say they're tired of teaching, it's bad and they don't want to be a program any longer, it would be stupid for the Senate to say no, you have to be a program.

Senator Basom concurred with what Senator Soneson is saying, it does make sense if the Faculty Senate has a say in new programs we should also have a say about elimination of programs and how resources are spent. In looking at the information on Intercollegiate Athletics, there are a number of expenses listed as "scholarships." Are all those scholarships coming out of the General Education Fund? Are those funds that would then be reverted to the General Education Fund? Where is this money coming from? If it is coming from the General Education Fund that is quite a bit of scholarship money. If other programs had the scholarship money that athletics does we would all be looking very different.

Associate Provost Lubker responded that that is a good question and the kind of question the Senate needs to ask Troy Dannen, UNI's Athletic Director, and Tom Schellhardt, Vice President for Administration and Finance. There is some donor money involved but a lot of that money is set aside as scholarship money. Each university is required by law to take at least 15% of the tuition money generated and put it back into "set aside" for scholarships. Here at UNI it's about 18%, which is money taken from student tuition money and goes back to students as scholarships. The Athletic Department, all colleges and the Graduate College all get a piece of that money to give out scholarships. The Senate would need to ask Vice President Schellhardt where is that money coming from, where is it going, and is it doing what we want done? That's one of the reasons that the Athletic Departments curve is rising more sharply than the other auxiliaries because scholarships are built into it.

Senator Basom asked if those scholarships are coming from monies that could be scholarship for academic departments?

Associate Provost Lubker replied it's going to students who are students.

Senator Basom reiterated that they're not academic scholarships, they're athletic scholarships, they're not by departments.

Senator Funderburk noted that there was a report showing that the increase in scholarship costs through departments did not justify the speed of increase of the other things, and was nowhere near a match.

Senator Funderburk continued saying he doesn't believe the Senate has the ability to stop the closing of a program. If we don't at least talk about it and go on the record saying what we feel is proper then we've abdicated our responsibility to the faculty. The real crux of this is less one of control over what ultimately happens as much as allowing us to have the opportunity to hear the facts as academics if we think it's the right thing to do. Many things happen that we may or may not agree with but we should at least be able to publicly state if we think it's reasonable or it's not in the best educational interest of our students and colleagues.

Chair Wurtz reminded the Senate that we're in the middle of a discussion where the question is, will the person who put this motion forward be open to changing language.

Senator Patton provided a bit of history that will hopefully be helpful. He noted that he's been involved with the Faculty Senate since 1978; this discussion has come up many times. At one point he remembers a statement that was made by a senator who identified the true power of the Faculty Senate, which is the power of moral suasion. As matters come forward the Senate reasonably judges a situation from all possible sides and make a recommendation.

Associate Provost Kopper noted that traditionally when programs are eliminated they do come through the normal curriculum process because there are students involved in those programs. In looking at closing a program that has been part of their curriculum process, whenever they do that, they always guarantee that those students in the program will be provided for and allowed to continue to complete their degree. That is traditionally how the process has run.

Associate Provost Kopper continued, regarding athletic scholarships, there is the Panther Athletic Scholarship that raises money specifically for scholarships for our student athletics. She's not sure how that is reflected in these

figures or what that amount is. There are some scholarships for athletes that do come from that specific scholarship fund.

Interim Provost Lubker noted, in the closing of programs, programs are "suspended" until all students in the program are through and the program is then "closed."

Chair Wurtz stated that the Senate is looking at a motion that contains the element of endorsing the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under certain conditions. The conditions are two fold; one with a change in language concerning the General Education budget and Auxiliary programs with a 3% limit on monies from the General Education budget to Auxiliary programs, and the second condition is that any proposed changes must be brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval.

Senator Smith moved to amend the motion to read " that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project provided that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the Faculty Senate for discussion and its recommendation before said changes take place." The thrust of this would be to separate the two issues, and to make it very clear that the Senate is offering its recommendation, is using its more suasion on this issue, and that it doesn't have any power to actually disprove changes that might be proposed.

Second by Senator East.

Point of Order by Faculty Chair Swan, who stated that it is obviating the purpose of the main motion, which can't be done. You can vote down the motion but you don't amend it to obviate the purpose. The real procedure would be to vote it down, not to amend it. He asked Chair Wurtz to recognize that it is out of order.

Senator Yehieli noted that the real intent of this motion was a way to really talk about the program assessment issue and to have Interim Provost Lubker available to answer questions and address issues. It seems we've gotten way off track and way behind in terms of his valuable time and our opportunity to be with him to answer program assessment questions, which she was under the impression was to be the main focus of today's meeting.

Chair Wurtz ruled that Senator Smith's amended motion was out of order.

Senator Soneson stated, in the interest of moving on, that he will amend his motion. He is concerned that we get something down before it goes too far, and it's our responsibility as faculty representatives to endorse the process because it is a very important thing we're doing, and to also recognize that we don't advocate our role as faculty representatives in this process either, and we have a responsibility to our constituents that we serve. He amended his motion to read, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under the condition that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the UNI Faculty Senate for discussion and its recommendation before said changes take place.

Discussion followed with Senator Basom, who made the original second, suggesting that "recommendation" be changed to "approval" because it adds more strength the motion.

Senator Soneson agreed to change "recommendation" to "approval."

Chair Wurtz reiterated Senator Soneson's motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under the condition that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the UNI Faculty Senate for discussion and its approval before said changes take place.

Senator Funderburk noted that he recalls that in December there was a lot of concern noted about the process being executed in the first place. We haven't gotten down to talking about if there is approval of the way the process is being executed. He likes program review but he doesn't think the timetable is reasonable. He's seen the stack of documents that haven't been completed in his department, which is now an inch and a half thick, which does not include the five pages from faculty member's doing the individual areas. It's not humanly possible to actually read that much and to consider it. He questions the process because of the time frame.

Senator Weisenberger agrees with Senator Funderburk and the data that they were to receive from the Office of Institution Research (OIR) is not accurate. They alerted the OIR to that two weeks ago and only now is it showing up but in a way that's hard to get at. She does approve of the concept of the program review but not the time frame.

Senator Basom asked if it would be possible to add another condition to extend the time frame because she's heard concerns on the timetable from everyone she's talked to.

Senator Soneson asked how the rest of the Senate feels about that.

Senator Hotek noted that he seriously doubts that he has enough time to review his program, as he is a one-person program coordinator. With teaching a full nine-hour load and doing new course prep, and articulation agreements, he has a lot of responsibilities this semester and doubts that he'd be able to do as good a job as he'd like to do in one month.

Senator O'Kane stated that he has one concern about the current wording, saying we will "endorse" it if this condition is met. Should the Senate get together and want to consider moving monies from here to there, we can't because we said we would "endorse" it.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas commented that the concern is "under the condition".

Senator Soneson reiterated that his motion read "under the condition," which was approved by Senator Basom.

Senator Funderburk noted that clearly for those people concerned about the timing, it would mean a "no" vote against the process as it's stated now.

Chair Wurtz commented that our concern has been with the academic, and as far as the task itself goes it sounds as if we're comfortable with the intent. Most of the concern is about the timing, and whether or not this is a too heroic of an effort to be something that can be accomplished. Is this something we can trust the administrative process to deal with?

Senator Yehieli noted that there seems to be some mixing of the issues. The one issue is the changes in the amendment, which say we'd like to see this stuff before any cuts are made so we can make a professional recommendation as faculty. The other issue of the timing seems to be an issue that should be brought to the consultative session with Interim Provost Lubker, which involves the process and is separate. These are two different things and they keep getting mixed up. We should first vote on the motion, cancel what remains on the agenda and then move on

and let Interim Provost Lubker have a chance to speak with us. Motion call the question.

Chair Wurtz again reiterated Senator Soneson's motion, that the UNI Faculty Senate endorse the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project under the condition that any proposed changes in academic programs be sent to the UNI Faculty Senate for discussion and approval before said changes take place. Motion passed with 4 nays, no abstentions.

Chair Wurtz commented that in looking at the remaining Docketed Items, we are coming up on 4:40 but we do have this room until 5:30. If we extend the meeting past 5:00 we will need a motion.

879 Report and Recommendations on Research/Scholarly Activities

Motion to table by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI

Senator Mvuyekure stated that he does not want to be the appointed person associated with this item, and noted that this item came from the Senate's retreat at the beginning of the academic year and was to be one of the key elements that the Senate was to be working on this year. He was asked to produce a white paper with statistical numbers, which he did. Things have changed as we've gone through the semester; for one thing we have a new appointed Provost. He doesn't want to be the appointed person that follows diversity concerns at UNI.

Senator Yehieli noted that she and Senator Mvuyekure share the same passion and concern about diversity issues. This is a topic that she'd love to devote an entire meeting to. Motion to table Docketed Item #880 Diversity of Faculty/Staff and Students at UNI and #881 Committee on Committees 2008 - 2009 Report; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed with one nay.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Consultative session with Interim Provost Lubker

Chair Wurtz stated, that because the Senate asked Interim Provost Lubker for this time, we will give him an opportunity to address us.

Interim Provost Lubker responded to the questions that were previously sent to the Senate on the Academic Program Assessment Prioritization Project, addressing first the amount of work that this will require. Yes, it will require a lot of work; it already has required a lot of work. Two members of Task Force I are present and they can attest to that, meeting an hour each three times a week but they showed that by concentrating themselves and their efforts they can do this kind of a job. There are very few things done at a university that turn out to be good that don't require work.

Addressing the issue of time, Interim Provost Lubker stated that he realizes the time allowed for accomplishing the work is problematical. When first meeting with Task Force I he used a model by another, larger university that did it on a timeline almost identical to the one we're using here. It has been done; he knows it can be done. The Task Force put together that model, extended the deadline by two weeks, and they also believed it could be done. Yes, it would require a lot of work but other schools have done it and it can be done. If it turns out that it's absolutely unreasonable, we could make adjustments but he'd like to continue to try.

The explicate specification of the people who will be required to take on that work will vary from department to department. One department head has asked untenured faculty to give a "back of the envelope look" at it to get an idea as to whether it was a good experience for them and then senior faculty began to pick it up after that. He doesn't want to micromanage how it's done. People on the ground know who the right people would be to do the work.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, noting that the budget cuts announced after the review process was started changes the intent. It changes a bit in nature of what we're looking at because we're always looking at ways to be more efficient now because of the budget issue; however, we can't separate that. The central part of this effort is still to make this a better university, to define what we're doing and to see if we're doing it right, to see if the process we're doing to educate is a good one.

Does the review take time away from what we do as educators? Yes, but you should take time away from what you're doing in order to evaluate what you're doing. Faculty don't do the same course over and over and over again. You stop and look at the course, at the program and try to decide if you're doing it right. At least that's what faculty should be doing.

Interim Provost Lubker noted that he worries a lot about the budget aspect of this, a staying up at night kind of worrying. We're looking at some tough times. He doesn't want this process to get unnecessarily messed up with what we're going to need to do to meet the budget issues. Properly used it can form us so we can make informed decisions. It will be based on a better understanding of what's going on and what we're doing. He really does not want to see it stopped or slowed down, he wants it to move forward with all vehicular speed because it's more important now than it was a few months ago. These will be pieces of information that will be extraordinary helpful to us. He really believes this will protect the academic side.

Chair Wurtz suggested that the Senate begin with questions to facilitate the process, where the question is solely focused on any additional information that faculty feel they need, and then moving into other aspects.

Senator Funderburk noted that he agrees with what Interim Provost Lubker said, however, there are some elements in this that don't work. For example, he's being asked to figure out how many hours he spends teaching each type of major when his class has all the different majors in it. He has to go through and figure out how many are what and he can't get an accurate figure, it's going to be made up. Those are the things that he thinks chew up a lot of time that keep us from getting to what is actually wanted.

Interim Provost Lubker responded that that is an issue because teaching music, theater or art are very much different than teaching history or psychology but that shouldn't stop us from doing the whole thing. Maybe we need to take a special look at those majors.

Senator Funderburk commented that that is the kind of question which is often encountered. While the question makes perfect sense in business or management, for example, it does not apply in the arts. He can understand why the question is asked but does not reflect the way things are done or counted for all.

Maybe that part of the process can be modified in order to be more pertinent to the individual area.

Senator Lowell stated that one thing that the Interim Provost Lubker should be aware of is that there is a real morale problem across campus with this request, that they are being told they need to do this assessment and it is really not a reasonable amount of time to do this and to do it well. That is something that is important to think about. There are many upset people who are trying to get this done and realize they cannot do it right. We are people who work hard and are not afraid of working hard. The implication was that they could find the time to do this but it is very, very hard to find the time to do this if you are teaching a heavy load and wanting to do things such as creative writing with your students. If you are doing serious research and other service it is an incredible amount to ask, and morale is really, really poor across campus in part because of this assessment that is being required. She feels it would be a wonderful thing for him to do, to show respect and understanding for the faculty and how hard they do work and how much they care if he would extend the deadline into November. That might be a reasonable amount of time for faculty to do a really good assessment.

Senator Lowell also stated that the implication was made that faculty do not assess their programs, which is done all the time, individually, whenever someone is hired, every two years with curriculum coming up, every seven years, we assess all the time. It is not that faculty sit by complacently and never change their programs. Faculty do change their programs and he needs to understand that they do. The understanding that faculty work very hard is not coming across.

Senator Smith, as a member of Task Force I, in response to Senator Funderburk's comments, in terms of allocating faculty resources across programs he urged him to use his judgment. It's not as though you have to get down to the "nitty-gritty", they want to get an idea of the amount of faculty resources employed by each program, which is an important thing when evaluating whether that program should be maintained. That's the intent and it is recognized that some will become judgmental in this process and he should feel free to use his judgment.

Senator Funderburk replied that faculty members are individually having to do this. Students change their majors and end up with something has nothing to do with music but his resource allocations aren't changed, it's the same people teaching. The

proportions of what you wind up doing may shift and most of it shifts outside of Music.

Senator Smith continued, to the point of morale, he has not seen any concerns about moral in his college. He's not aware of what's going on in other colleges but he hasn't seen anything.

Senator Soneson responded on the time issue, noting that it's important that Washington State University, which is the model that our program assessment is using, did do this whole process in one year. Our schedule is tied pretty closely to theirs. The major difference between what they had to do and what we're doing is that each department for all of their programs could produce no more than five pages. In contrast, each department here not only has to do a department report but a separate program report for every program. His conservative estimation is that these reports together will produce a report between 3000 and 5000 pages of narrative, not including appendices, which will be 10 point, single-spaced. The difference between this assessment and our regular departmental program assessments is that this is comparative. When someone sits down to read each departments assessment they're going to have to read them and judge them in comparison to every other program that is out there. In talking about time, we have to produce a lot more material, fifty times as much material as what Washington State had to produce. And then someone is going to have to sit down and read the whole thing. If someone reads reports on just eight departments they're not going to be able to compare it to any others without reading them all, it just wouldn't be fair. When talking about time, we're talking about time in both producing the documents which amount to much more than what Washington State produced, and then someone people, sets of people, are going to have to read the whole thing and then make judgments. In thinking that we can follow the Washington State model in terms of time is probably misplaced.

Interim Provost Lubker replied that he's not trying to get out of this at all and that two members of Task Force I are present, Senators East and Smith. Perhaps they might be able to respond better than he can.

Chair Wurtz reiterated what Senator Smith had previously commented on regarding morale, that we don't want to overstate it, because it is spotty. For some faculty it makes perfect sense and for some they are totally up in arms about it.

Senator Funderburk noted that when inquiring about documents he was told that in his area there were six people assigned head areas for writing reports and he was told to come and look at them because it was too expensive to make copies. It was half a ream of paper to get people the data and a copy of their instructions before they started filling it out. That's what they're starting out at before they've even done anything.

Motion by Senator Funderburk to extend the meeting time by ten minutes until 5:10 P.M.; second by Senator O'Kane. Motion passed.

Senator Smith, in discussing insights, noted that the Task Force went round and round about how to do this and a kind of challenge between cutting it down to make it very manageable or leaving it open so departments could make their stories. One way that the burden of reading the reports can be dealt with is through a triage process, which he also encourages to the departments in preparing this. Put efforts on the programs that are at the high end or the low end. If you have a very small major that doesn't have many students and you feel we should have that major, that's where you should put your time. If you have a program that you feel you want to have recognized as a signature program, make the case for that. But for the mainstream programs, most of the evidence you can get off the OIR data, and in terms of the narrative, he suggests minimizing efforts on them with a "continue as is" type of thing. When Task Force II gets going they will probably be forced to do the same kind of thing, and they will fairly quickly decided on which programs are just fine, and then focus on the high end programs and the low end programs because they also have limited resources.

Senator East stated that he supports what Senator Smith said. Task Force I put a 15-page limit on departments plus any programs so that it's not 15 pages for the department and then 15 for each programs. Imagining Task Force II, he would not try to bury them in garbage, he would dazzle them with brilliance at saying what's wonderful about his program, using as few as and as important words as he could find.

Senator East continued, stated that he's not thinking about this as program assessment in the normal sense. Routine program assessments all assume that what we're doing is important. This assessment is saying we have programs that we may not be enthusiastic about and it's an opportunity for someone to do something neat with if we thought about changing it. That's

what guided his thinking on the Task Force to start with. There are a number of programs on campus that always say let's really give ourselves an in depth examination. His experience, and the experience that he's heard about, says let's write this as favorably as we can and ask for more resources. Program reviews are always about getting someone to say how wonderful they are, not about can we fix this or do a better job. This is a chance to examine and say maybe we might want to do some things differently than we've been doing.

Senator Lowell commented again on the amount of time this is taking and give what may be a partial explanation as to why some faculty are not terribly upset and others are. Her guess is that large departments that have more faculty can allocate this process to a few people to do most of the burden and that people are not terribly upset about this whole process. Whereas small programs, they are the ones that might be threatened with being reduced or dropped, and everyone has to get involved and there's no choice about it. It is extremely time consuming and it's going to be much harder and more stressful for good reason because of the threat of being dropped. She believes that the timeline should be extended into next fall.

Senator Smith asked Interim Provost Lubker if it would be possible to provide a process whereby departments could request an extension so they could, on a case by case basis, allow some departments to have more time but at least the process would be under way with many of the departments and programs.

Interim Provost Lubker replied that Task Force II will have plenty to do to begin working with those programs that get things in and he would be wide open for that.

Senator Lowell noted that if departments can request extensions that should be publicized immediately so faculty are not tearing their hair out.

Interim Provost Lubker commented that he is okay with that but as this is a faculty driven effort he would want to confer with Task Force I on this before making a decision.

Chair Wurtz reiterated that the concerns on the timing, noting that different departments have different resources and it is therefore putting different stresses on different departments will be conveyed to Task Force I and ask them to look at kinds of things can be done to relieve these stresses.

Interim Provost Lubker stated that he believes this can be done fairly quickly by email. He did note that he does not think he'd approve extending this until November but he could see bending a bit on a case-by-case basis.

Senator Soneson asked for clarification on the extension.

Interim Provost Lubker replied that would depend on the case, on the department. He would like to get feedback from Task Force I before commenting.

Interim Provost Lubker continued, noting that he has not yet brought Task Force II together. All the members of Task Force I have volunteered to serve on Task Force II but he has been slowed down somewhat this month when he fell on the ice over break and shattered his right elbow.

Interim Provost Lubker thanked the Senate for the way this meeting was conducted.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Yehieli to adjourn; second by Senator Weisenberger. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

Resolution Regarding Funding of Auxiliary Enterprise Operations
at UNI

by
Hans Isakson, Professor
Department of Economics

The University of Northern Iowa funds and operates various Auxiliary Enterprise operations, which include Residence System, Intercollegiate Athletics, J.W. Maucker Union, Field House (UNI Dome), Gallagher-Bluedorn Performing Arts Center, Wellness &

Recreation Center, Health Clinic, and Miscellaneous other, smaller operations.

Except for the Residence System and Field House, all of these operations are allocated General Education Funds. (The General Education Fund includes tuition, fees, state appropriations, sales and services income, investment income, and other revenues.) In FY 2007-2008 (the latest year for which data is published), Auxiliary Enterprise operations received 6.09 percent (\$9,804,450) of the General Education Fund. In FY 1999-2000, Auxiliary Enterprise operations received 2.32% (\$4,581,522) of the General Education Fund.

This dramatic, nearly three-fold, expansion of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations has occurred with very little debate or deliberation of the faculty or the University Faculty Senate.

Currently, the University is facing State imposed budget cuts and dismal prospects for the immediate future. The University is exploring ways to reduce spending in order to meet these financial challenges.

Therefore, the University Faculty Senate resolves that the allocation of General Education Funds to Auxiliary Enterprise operations at UNI be limited to no more than a three percent of the General Education Fund, and that the savings generated by cutting Auxiliary Enterprise spending be used to maintain the academic integrity of the University.