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CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Terry Hudson, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier and Kelli Andreasen, Northern Iowan were present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY

Provost Podolefsky commented that we will hear the Governor's Condition of State Address this week, which will give us some parameters for next year's budget.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, CAROL COOPER

Dr. Cooper remarked that the Des Moines Register reported today that the Governor is speaking tomorrow on the State of the State address and budgetary issues on Friday.

She also noted that through Pat Geadelmann she has been in contact with the Board of Regents Office to have Greg Nichols come to campus as he did last year for a faculty meeting later in the spring.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MELISSA HESTON

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that caucuses are coming up and urged the Senators to attend and voice their opinions.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Heston noted that the Senate had received proposals from the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) Committee. Senator Chancey reported that the LAC Committee has its first meeting of the semester this coming Friday so this issue is not ready for further Senate discussion.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

770 Curriculum Review
Vice Provost Koch noted that in December the Senate returned the Curriculum Package to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for reconsideration. What the Senate is being asked to approve today are the changes in the Curriculum Packet that have no budgetary implications and require no additional review.

Vice Provost Koch reviewed the changes that the Curriculum Committee has approved. A lengthy discussion.

Senator Chancey moved to approve all curricular changes that have been accepted by the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate College. Second by Senator vanWormer. Discussion followed.

Senator Chancey clarified his motion as a friendly amendment to approve all curriculum proposals except those that were tabled by the University Curriculum Committee as listed in the January 8, 2004 memo to the Senate. Further discussion ensued.

Senator Couch Breitbach moved to call the question; second by Senator MacLin. Motion passed with nays from Senator Swan and Senator Herndon.

Senator Chancey’s motion passed with two abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

Provost Podolefsky gave a presentation describing a framework he has used for thinking about managing budget cuts. The Provost also presented data documenting changes in numbers and percentages of employees in different personnel categories.

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that the remainder of the meetings this spring will be in the Curris Business Building.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR’S REVIEW
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PRESENT: Ronnie Bankston, Karen Couch Breitbach, Clif Chancey, David Christensen, Carol Cooper, Cindy Herndon, Melissa Heston, Susan Koch, Otto MacLin, Steve O’Kane, Aaron Podolefsky, Jesse
Swan, Katherine vanWormer, Shah Varzavand, Donna Vinton, Mir Zaman

Barb Weeg was attending for Susan Moore, Reg Green was attending for Tom Romanin, and Shashi Kaparthi was attending for Susan Wurtz.

Absent: Gayle Pohl and Dhirendra Vajpeyi

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUES

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Terry Hudson, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier and Kelli Andreasen, Northern Iowan were present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY

Provost Podolefsky commented that we will hear the Governor’s Condition of State Address this week. During that address the Governor typically lays out a preliminary budget and we can take that as a best-case scenario and hope that he recommends either salary funding or an increase in appropriations, which will give us some parameters for next year’s budget.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, CAROL COOPER

Dr. Cooper remarked that the Des Moines Register reported today that the Governor is speaking tomorrow on the State of the State address and on budgetary issues on Friday.

She also noted that through Pat Geadelmann she has been in contact with the Board of Regents Office to have Greg Nicols come to campus as he did last year for a Faculty meeting later in the spring. She asked for input from the faculty on other ideas for his presentation.

COMMENT FROM CHAIR HESTON

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that caucuses are coming up and urged the Senators to attend and voice their opinions.
Dr. Cooper questioned if there is a formal plank from UNI on budget considerations that can be presented at the caucuses. Provost Podolefsky replied that the Board has repeatedly said that full funding of negotiated salaries is the number one priority.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Chair Heston noted that the Senate had received proposals from the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) Committee, which are now posted on the Senate's web page. Senator Chancey reported that the LAC Committee has its first meeting of the semester this coming Friday, so this issue is not ready for Senate discussion.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

770 Curriculum Review

Chair Heston asked Vice Provost Koch to review what the Curriculum Committee has recommended.

Vice Provost Koch noted that in December the Senate returned the Curriculum Packet to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) for reconsideration. What the Senate is being asked to approve today are the changes in the Curriculum Packet that have no budgetary implications and require no additional review. Dr. Koch referred to a January 8 memo that was sent to the Senate that included a list of curriculum changes that have been tabled. She reminded the Senate that the changes before the Senate today for consideration have been reviewed and approved by all appropriate bodies.

Dr. Koch commented that in the list of course changes are the usual kinds of changes that we see every cycle such as changes in titles or descriptions. Those have all been reviewed and approved by the appropriate bodies. There are also program reorganizations included that do not show any increases in credit hours. She noted that in the College of Business, the Certificate in Entrepreneurship was approved by the Senate last spring but is in this packet because it is on its way into the new catalog. In the College of Education they are dropping a major in Mental Disabilities. In the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, there are changes in the LAC Humanities courses and requirements. Referring to the memo that was sent, Dr. Koch noted that the change in hours for Humanities is actually from 8 to 6. The College of Humanities and Fine Arts is also dropping the Master of Arts degrees in Audiology and Theatre. These programs have already been suspended and the Senate will now be dropping them from the catalog. In Social and Behavioral Sciences, the M.A. in Political Science has also been suspended and will now be dropped.
Senator Swan asked where the changes were listed that Dr. Koch just reviewed. Dr. Koch clarified that the Senate will not be approving the list of Tabled Curriculum Changes that was sent to the Senate and we are now approving those items that have been reviewed again for budgetary considerations. Dr. Koch noted that the Humanities Proposal was not sent back for reconsideration.

Chair Heston clarified that the Senate sent back the whole Curriculum Package for reconsideration on those changes that had no budgetary implications versus those that did because they were increasing programs, adding majors, things along those lines. What has been brought forward today includes all those pieces of the Curriculum Package that the UCC is certain that do not ask for additional resources that are not available.

Senator Swan noted he is questioning whether the LAC change in Humanities was reevaluated in budgetary terms. Provost Podolefsky noted that it is a reduction in hours but an increase in the number of credit hours to be offered. Senator Swan noted that this would require more professors to teach fewer courses according to this proposal. He illustrated, saying we would need three courses instead of two courses to serve 70 students, which would require additional staffing. Provost Podolefsky responded that we would retain the same number of seats with the advantage to the Humanities faculty being that they would be able to reduce class size comparable to the reduction of credit hours, which should be about a 20-25% reduction in class size. With a fixed number of students required to take Humanities and when they're taking it for six credit hours instead of eight there are less credit hours, which is where the cost is.

Senator Chancey stated that when this change came to the LAC Committee it had come from the Humanities faculty and they had indicated that there would be no additional resources. Discussion followed.

Roy Sandstrom, History, clarified the issue by noting that he teaches twelve hours of Humanities a year, four hours per class three times a year. If this change is approved he will teach four sections with three hours each. The same staff will teach more sections because they will still need to teach twelve hours a piece. There may be a saving of resources and it will eliminate the large classes of 300 - 350 with classes of 120, which will absorb the current overload. And this will also bring the Humanities faculty closer to the goal of having 60% of students being taught by permanent faculty.

Bev Kooper, LAC Committee Chair, also noted that as part of the process with new proposals in the Liberal Arts Core, they are signed by all department heads and deans involved.

Senator Chancey moved to approve all curricular changes that have been accepted by the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate College. Second by Senator vanWormer.
Senator Swan asked if there was a list of the changes. Chair Heston noted that she had talked with Vice Provost Koch about this and it was not possible because of time to pull together the list of all the changes for today's Senate meeting. Senator Chancey asked if it would be possible to get a list to put as an appendix to the minutes of this meeting. Vice Provost Koch responded that she wanted to make sure everyone had a very clear understanding of what the UCC was doing. She had hoped that by providing a list of items that had been tabled the Senators would be able to understand today's actions. It is a matter of staff time but she could provide a list if it would make things clear. Discussion followed on what the changes actually included and involved.

Barb Weeg, Library, asked what specific costs were looked at when the budgetary implications are considered. Chair Heston responded that this is asked on the curriculum forms, whether it is technology, library support, etc.

Dr. Koch began to review the entire Curriculum Package as to changes. In response to Senator Swan, she noted that budgetary issues are discussed at the departmental level because they have an obligation to offer the courses and meet the demands. It is difficult for a university-wide committee to address the details of these kinds of things because it is the faculty and the department heads, as well as the deans that look at that.

Senator Swan questioned why the approved changes were deemed ok. Dr. Koch responded that the Senate was concerned about increasing the length of programs so restatements that have been tabled for further reconsideration are restatements that lengthen programs. The ones that the Senate is looking at today have already been approved by the College and University Curriculum Committees and are restatements that do not increase the length of programs. She noted that all programs are doing all they can to get students through their major courses in a timely way. Discussion followed.

Vice Provost Koch noted that a number of items on the tabled list that will be reconsidered will be approved but the Senate has asked that they be reviewed again with regard to the budget. Senator Swan responded that he wants to communicate to the committee that he wants the same kind of generous analysis to be given to these tabled changes as well.

In response to Senator MacLin's question about how the tabled items will be brought back to the Senate, Dr. Koch noted that dates have been set to bring things back to the Senate as there is a deadline on getting new programs to the board. The Program Restatement deadline is in March, as that has to do with the publication of the new catalog. She anticipates the Curriculum Committee will bring back recommendations for approval. If something is denied, the department head has the right to come
forward at the Senate meeting to state his case. The Senate’s practice in the past has been to trust the UCC recommendations because they spend a great deal of time looking at the details. But that doesn’t mean the Senate cannot overrule the UCC. Discussion again followed.

Senator Chancey clarified his motion as a friendly amendment to approve all curriculum proposals except those that were tabled by the University Curriculum Committee as listed in the January 8, 2004 memo.

Senator Couch Breitbach moved to call the question; second by Senator MacLin. Motion passed with nays from Senator Swan and Senator Herndon.

Senator Chancey’s motion passed with two abstentions.

Dr. Koch remarked on the timeline on the Curriculum Package changes noting that at the next Senate meeting the UCC will be coming back with a request for approval of the new courses and new programs. This will be the second step in the three step process with the restatements to come back to the Senate in March.

NEW BUSINESS

An E-mail from Chair Heston about how these curricular changes will save the university money prompted Provost Podolefsky to share with the Senate his perspective on budgetary considerations within the university. He noted that he has had this conversation with the Senate budget committee over the years, and they have found it quite helpful.

A key to managing the budget crisis, he noted, is to distinguish short term opportunities from longer-term strategic change. The Provost showed the Senate a two-by-two table with Short-term Actions/Options and Long-term Actions/Options on one axis and Opportunities and Strategies on the other. It is best, he said, to make short-term, strategic decisions, but this is seldom possible. Oftentimes we must use the opportunity of a retirement, for example, to save money, even though the position may be important. Freezing lines, reducing equipment budgets, reducing supplies and services, closing center “X”, deferring maintenance and equipment are not particularly strategic and hopefully short-term. Over time, strategic decisions regarding the allocation of new funds or the reallocation of existing funds realign resources and goals to enhance quality.

The perspective, he noted, is particularly important during the discussion of curriculum. As programs lengthen, new costs are created within departments and across the university. These increased cost compete with our ongoing efforts to realign resources with needs. Thus curriculum has important budgetary
considerations that should be addressed. These costs are not always immediately obvious but they are there nonetheless.

Provost Podolefsky also shared his 10 Philosophies Strategies. First was to preserve flexibility. This is critical for responding to immediate reductions that might come mid year or even late in the Spring. He noted that deans want to open positions because departments are pressing them to do so. But people are hired we’ve reduced our ability to respond to the unknown. He stated that he wanted the Senate to understand that many of the things he does are to preserve that flexibility. The present “soft freeze” will be lifted shortly once we have a handle on likely budget scenarios for this coming Fall.

Second was to embrace and deal with ambiguity. He noted that our budget depends on state appropriation, tuition, and the number of students enrolled. Each of these have fluctuated wildly during the last several years creating great difficulties for students in predicting college costs and for us in predicting our operating budget.

Third is when strategic cuts are impossible, cut opportunistically but rebuild strategically. Last year we had new tuition, which enabled us to put back many adjuncts and the rest was divided up for strategic appointments.

Fourth, reduce budgets “fairly”, rebuild them strategically. People get upset if they feel the whole budget cut is coming from their college or department.

Fifth, proportional across the board cuts do not mean similar actions are taken everywhere. In recent years some colleges reduced equipment funding while others reduced positions, for example. He has tried to avoid a “one size fits all” approach.

Centralize some cuts are sixth. Consider one time versus permanent reductions. Building repairs is something that we can give up once but we can’t go into the future as a university without a building repair budget. Our building repair budget was cut last year from $2 million to $300,000 but we can’t live with that forever.

Next, understand the full context, the latent effects, and/or unintended consequences. It is very hard to know those things, but it is critical that they be considered.

Eighth, seek systemic sophisticated strategies; policy changes that reduce barriers or costs, for example.

Consider revenue as well as expenditures is the ninth principle. This is where out of state recruiting comes in and other ways to generate revenue.
Last, create evolutions rather than revolutions by using strategies such as the double counting policy, minimum class size policy.

The success of these strategies are clear in the outcomes. The Provost also shared graphs showing UNI’s Student/Faculty Ratio from 1992 - 2003, noting that 2003 and 2000 tied with 17.4% per faculty member for the lowest since 1994. Average class size of organized sections showed Fall 2003 was the lowest since 1998-1999. These results are the products of strategic planning and strategic budgeting.

He also noted that the growth in the UNI workforce for the past five years by employee categories showed the number of tenure tract faculty has gone down by 1.4%, that administrators is down by 9%, P&S has grown by 22%, Secretarial and Clerical has grown by 6.8%, Technical Professionals has grown 19%, and Skilled, Crafts and Services has gone down. The overall total is about a 5% increase. A large proportion of the P&S growth seems to be due to the expansion of technology as almost every college and department wants more tech people. Compared to 2000, we are losing faculty, and what we’ve lost is opportunity for Iowa students because we can’t have as many Iowa students and maintain quality.

Provost Podolefsky commented that the Senate, as a deliberative body, has historically focused on longer term issues such as curriculum. It has a very hard time dealing with rapid budgetary change, i.e., opportunity. The Senate doesn’t control open lines, or equipment, and can’t generally respond in a meaningful way in a timely fashion. Though we have done considerably well working with the Senate Budget Committee and in assuring that all understand the rational for actions. On the other hand, the Senate has a number of very critical and important functions that impact the long-term strategic well being of the university. The major cost of doing business is people and personnel. Much of that is controlled and constrained by curriculum. For so long we have gone on saying that nothing costs anything, a new course or program doesn’t cost anything. He wants people to step back and really look at what such changes would involve. It’s a simple formula, the more you offer, the more it costs us. He sees the Senate as an important, critical player in that strategic change process.

Chair Heston remarked that she was surprised at the increase in P&S, and she’s wondering if that is the right proportion. It seems that if curriculum is the central part of the university, why wouldn’t we have faculty be as important as the curriculum.

The Provost noted that one thing that this doesn’t show is General Education fund support (educational appropriation plus tuition) versus non-general fund support (grants and contracts or special appropriations). There are many parts of the university
that are grant-funded and have increased considerably in recent years. In addition, the rapid expansion of technology has resulted in increases in staff, and much of this is the result of the needs expressed by faculty. Our P&S colleagues have been found to be of great value.

Discussion followed.

Chair Heston thanked the Provost for his presentation.

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that the remainder of the meetings this spring will be in the Curris Business Building. The Senate can decide if we would like to continue to meet here in the Union, where there is a charge for the room, or in the Business Building where the room may not always be available. We will talk about this after the next meeting in the Business Building.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn by Senator Zaman; second by Senator Herndon.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary