

10-14-1996

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 14, 1996

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1996 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 14, 1996" (1996). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 820.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/820

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

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Monday, October 14, 1996
1509

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the September 23, 1996, Senate meeting were approved as corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification: No members of the press were present
2. Comments from Chair Haack: The deadline for new calendar items is 10 days before the Senate meeting. President Koob has provided student wage money to assist the Senate's secretary. The President refused to seat four faculty members on the Strategic Plan Response Reconciliation Committee. E-Mail balloting among Senators led to the selection of Scott Cawelti, Andy Gilpin, and Ken De Nault as faculty representatives and Sherry Gable as alternate. The Board of Regents meets on campus this Thursday.
3. Report from Mary Bozik, Chair of the Faculty, on the disposition of the recommendations of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee to Study Quality in the Curriculum. The Faculty met and passed motions on some of the recommendations. A subsequent meeting to continue discussion failed to have a quorum. The faculty has completed its discussion of the matter as required by the Faculty Constitution.
4. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost presented her plan for formulation of the academic budget for the budget cycle we are just starting. The Governor's proposed budget is expected to be announced December 1, 1996. The Cabinet will make a tentative distribution based upon the Governor's proposal. Early next semester, the Provost will distribute proposed divisional distribution to departments. Departments will send reactions through their heads to appropriate deans who will bring their college response to the Provost. Concurrently, college senates will review the proposal and bring their reactions to the University Senate which will present a faculty response to the Provost. The Provost will prepare a final recommendation that will be brought to the cabinet. Ultimately, the President will take the UNI budget to the Board of Regents.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

- 619 Request for the Senate to review the 1995-1996 Annual Report of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations. De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 546.
 - 620 Report on 1995-1996 Faculty Budget. Gable/McGuire moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 547.
 - 621 Request from the University Committee on Curricula for guidance on the Honors Program. De Nault/Cooper moved/seconded to refer to the Educational Policies Commission. Motion carried.
 - 622 Request from Senator De Nault that the Chair of the Senate and Chair of the Faculty appoint a committee to examine the desirability of changing the Faculty Constitution and By Laws so that the Chair of the Faculty is the presiding officer of the Faculty Senate. Gable/Van Wormer moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 548.
 - 623 Request from Susan Koch to change the University Mission Statement in the current Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan to state "*The mission of the University of Northern Iowa is to prepare individuals to live a thoughtful, free, and responsible life in an increasingly diverse, complex, and changing world.*" De Nault/McDevitt moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion to docket in regular order carried. Docket 549.
 - 624 Request for Emeritus Status from James L. Doud, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling. Gable/Isakson moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 550.
 - 625 Request from Senator Haack to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to collect and generate proposals for revision of the University Strategic Plan and to draft responses to proposed revisions that are generated by other constituent bodies. Soneson/Gilpin moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 551.
-

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 550 624 Request for Emeritus Status from James L. Doud, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling. De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to approve with gratitude the request for emeritus status for James L. Doud. Motion carried.
- 547 620 Report on 1995-1996 Faculty Budget. Gable/Thomas moved/seconded to receive the report. Gable/Gilpin moved/seconded to recommend that the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate have separate budgets. Motion failed. Motion to receive the report carried.
- 537 610 Request from the University Committee on Curricula that the University Senate address the issue of how, when, and where students should acquire competency in basic computer skills. Gilpin/Cooper moved/seconded to remove from the table the motion that the Chair (of the Senate) appoint an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of at least three faculty to study the issue of when, where and how students acquire basic skills, whether in discipline-specific or general courses. Motion carried. Isakson/Grosboll moved/seconded to amend the motion to send to the Educational Policies Commission a request to study the issue of when, where and how students acquire basic skills, whether in discipline-specific or general courses. Motion to amend carried. Gilpin/Shand moved/seconded to add to the communication with E.P.C. a copy of the original request from the Curriculum Committee. Motion to amend carried. Main motion, as amended, carried.
- 527 600 Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council. Gable/McDevitt moved/seconded to receive the report. Gable/Soneson moved/seconded to table the report until the Director of Athletics and the Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council can both be present. Motion to table carried.
- 538 611 Report of the General Education Committee. De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to receive the report. Motion carried.
- 539 612 Request from Senator Cawelti that the Senate Examine Administrative Costs at UNI. McGuire/Gilpin moved/seconded to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to Examine Administrative Costs at UNI. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 5:05 PM.

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Haack at 3:30 PM.

Present: Hans Isakson, Randall Krieg, Dean Primrose, Sherry Gable, Carol Cooper, Merrie Schroeder, Richard McGuire, Calvin Thomas, Martha Reineke, Jerome Soneson, Kenneth De Nault, Paul Shand, Joel Haack, Suzanne McDevitt, Andrew Gilpin, Katherine Van Wormer, Barbara Weeg, Sue Grosboll, Phil Patton, and Mary Bozik (ex-officio.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Gabel pointed out that "BOR" on page 7 should be "Universities". Gable/Cooper moved/seconded to approve the minutes of the September 23, 1996, Senate meeting as corrected. Motion carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification: No members of the press were present
2. Comments from Chair Haack:
 - The deadline for new items to be calendared at the Faculty Senate meeting is ten days before the meeting (the second Friday before the meeting). This allows the Secretary time to process the items and have them delivered to Senators in a timely fashion so that they can be considered, after appropriate review, at the next meeting.
 - After e-mail discussions, President Koob has provided the Senate with student wage money that will be used to assist Ken De Nault in carrying out the duties of his office as Secretary of the Senate. We

are grateful to President Koob for this support.

- The President did refuse to seat the four faculty members selected by the Senate for the Strategic Plan Response Reconciliation Committee. E-Mail discussion and balloting among Senators lead to the selection of Scott Cawelti, Andy Gilpin, and Ken De Nault as faculty representatives and Sherry Gable as alternate. Other members of the Committee include Bob Hartman, Aaron Podolefsky, Joel Haack, Margaret Empie, Alan Peterson, Jane Close, Doreen Hayek (alternate), Jason Reid, Threase Harms, Steve Murra, and Malinda Mechem (alternate). The Committee had its first meeting last week.
 - Mary Bozik and Joel Haack attended a meeting of Regents Faculty leaders in Montour, Iowa, last month. The agenda items were a report on the tenure situation in Minnesota; the activity at the University of Iowa regarding Post Tenure Effort Allocations and at Iowa State University reviewing Promotion and Tenure criteria with implications for those already tenured; and the relationship between the Faculty Senate and United Faculty at the University of Northern Iowa.
 - In order to expedite Senate action, Haack encouraged Senators to consider referring docketed items to appropriate faculty committees.
 - The Board of Regents meets on campus this Thursday. Items that might be of interest include distance education, tuition rates, enrollment reports, salary reports, and progress reports on the Pappas recommendations. Haack also reminded Senators of the dinner with the Regents this Wednesday.
3. Report from Mary Bozik, Chair of the Faculty, on the disposition of the recommendations of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee to Study Quality in the Curriculum. Bozik stated that the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee to Study Quality in the Curriculum turned in its report to the Senate. On March 13, 1995, this report was sent to the faculty as a whole by petition. At a faculty meeting on April 15, 1996, the faculty met to consider the recommendations of the committee. The first recommendation passed, the second recommendation failed. At the second faculty meeting held April 29, 1996 a quorum was not present. As a result, the Chair of the Faculty rules that the Quality in the Curriculum Proposals were considered by the faculty and, with the absence of a quorum, died. Bozik thanked Joan Duea, Chair of the Committee and Barbara Lounsberry, former Chair of the Faculty for their efforts on behalf of the Committee's report.

De Nault stated that the minutes of the April 15, 1996 faculty meeting had errors. He had pointed these errors out to then Chair of the Faculty, Barbara Lounsberry. She had acknowledged the errors, but no correction to the minutes has been distributed. He questioned current Faculty Chair Bozik's iteration of faculty action at the meeting. He wondered when the corrected minutes of the April 15, 1996 faculty meeting would be distributed.

Bozik was unaware of the errors. The iteration she gave the Senate was from former Chair Lounsberry. Haack said that he would contact Barbara Lounsberry and see what could be done about the situation.

Bozik announced that Owen Newlin, President of the Board of Regents, will be addressing the faculty on November 18, 1996. The address will be at 3:30 PM in Maucker Union. There will be a reception following.

4. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost presented her plan for formulation of the academic budget for the budget cycle we are just starting. President Koob is committed to making budget decisions consistent with the University's Strategic Plan. It is hoped that the Reconciliation Committee will be successful in resolving issues and there will be a reconciled Strategic Plan in place. If not, the present Working Draft of the Strategic Plan will be the operational document.

The University's requests have been sent to the Board of Regents. Proposals which survived the Board's approval process were sent on to the Governor's office. The Governor's proposed budget is expected to be announced December 1, 1996. Once the Governor's recommendations are known, the Cabinet will make a tentative distributions based upon the Governor's proposal. Early next semester, the Provost will distribute proposed divisional distributions to departments. There will then be a two-channel response to the Provost. On channel will be an administrative channel involving department heads, deans, and the Academic Affairs Council. The other channel will involve faculty through their governance bodies. This input will start with the college senates who will transmit their response to the University Senate. The

University Senate will, like the Academic Affairs Council, submit a response to the Provost. The Provost wants to assure that everyone has a chance to comment on the proposed allocations. The Provost will prepare a final recommendation that will be sent out for a quick review by everyone before being brought to the cabinet. Ultimately, the President will take the UNI budget to the Board of Regents.

This procedure will require that both the College Senates and the University Senate react in a timely manner. The process will start early in Spring Semester.

Haack commented that the Senate may wish to schedule a special meeting to consider responses from the College Senates.

Gable requested a visual to see how the process will work.

De Nault stated that there had been several inquiries about the number of students served at the Carroll Campus. The Provost directed inquires to the College of Education.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

619 Request for the Senate to review the 1995-1996 Annual Report of the Regents Committee on Educational Relations.

De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to docket in regular order.

Grosboll asked what action was expected on this item.

Gable replied that this would give the Senate and faculty information on how some decisions are made at the Regent's level and how subsequently these decisions are passed on to faculty.

Motion to docket in regular order carried. Docket 546.

620 Report on 1995-1996 Faculty Budget.

Gable/McGuire moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 547.

621 Request from the University Committee on Curricula for guidance on the Honors Program.

De Nault/Cooper moved/seconded to refer to the Educational Policies Commission.

Soneson questioned whether the task of the E.P.C. would be to formulate guidelines and bring them to the Senate for approval. Haack stated that would be the intent. Haack read the charge of the E.P.C. which is, "the Educational Policies Commission researches and reports to the Senate on issues and implications of broad curricular and educational policies." Soneson asked if the membership of the E.P.C. was known. Haack replied that it was. De Nault wondered what difference this made. Haack read the current membership of the E.P.C.

Motion to refer the request from the University Committee on Curricula for guidance on the Honors Program to the Educational Policies Commission carried.

622 Request from Senator De Nault that the Chair of the Senate and Chair of the Faculty appoint a committee to examine the desirability of changing the Faculty Constitution and By Laws so that the Chair of the Faculty is the presiding officer of the Faculty Senate.

Gable/Van Wormer moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 548.

623 Request from Susan Koch to change the University Mission Statement in the current Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan to state, "*The mission of the University of Northern Iowa is to prepare individuals to live a thoughtful, free, and responsible life in an increasingly diverse, complex, and changing world.*"

De Nault/McDevitt moved/seconded to docket in regular order.

Soneson questioned whether the Senate would have time to examine this before the Committee to

Reconcile the University Strategic Plan meets. Haack, who is chair of the Reconciliation Committee, replied that the Reconciliation Committee will not complete its task until the end of the semester. Haack also pointed out that the Mission Statement is more complicated because any change must be approved by the Board of Regents.

Reineke stated that we only offer candidates for a mission statement. In reality, there are items that the Regents find absolutely essential to the mission statements because these are their descriptions of the Regent's institutions. These descriptions are not ours. These are comparative documents and the Board wants them to reflect the distinct profiles of the Regent's institutions. The proposal would not meet these criteria.

McDevitt/Thomas moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion to move to the head of the docket, out of regular order.

De Nault argued against the motion to substitute. The Mission Statement is an important document. If we moved this to the head of the docket and discussed the matter today, faculty would not have been informed and would have had no chance for input. Furthermore, as a member of the Reconciliation Committee he thought there was plenty of time to bring this to the committee.

Haack stated that he did not think the Reconciliation Committee would get to the Mission Statement until later in the semester.

Motion to substitute failed.

Motion to docket in regular order carried. Docket 549.

624 Request for Emeritus Status from James L. Doud, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling.

Gable/Isakson moved/seconded to place at head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion carried. Docket 550.

625 Request from Senator Haack to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to collect and generate proposals for revision of the University Strategic Plan and to draft responses to proposed revisions that are generated by other constituent bodies.

Soneson/Gilpin moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 551.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

550 624 Request for Emeritus Status from James L. Doud, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling.

De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to approve with gratitude the request for emeritus status for James L. Doud. Motion carried.

547 620 Report on 1995-1996 Faculty Budget. Gable/Thomas moved/seconded to receive the report.

Gable, Chair of the Senate 1995-1996, reported that in 1995-1996 the Senate spent \$3,903.00, the Chair of the Faculty spent \$1,984.68, and \$582.92 of unverified charges were assessed against the Senate. The total expenditures charged to the Faculty was \$5,920.95. Of this reported amount, \$601.85 is still owed to the Department of Earth Science. A complete itemization of the expenditures is on file with the Secretary of the Senate.

Haack stated that the paperwork had been completed to reimburse the Department of Earth Science. He did not know if the actual transfer had been completed.

Cooper asked if the expenses of mailings of the Committee on Committees was included in this report. Gable replied that she was not able to ascertain this but they could be part of the unverified expenses.

Gable/Gilpin moved/seconded to recommend that the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate have separate budgets.

De Nault stated that in most years the Chair of the Faculty has few expenses. He questioned how the Provost's Office would divide the budget.

Gilpin stated that the spirit of the motion is to ensure that people who are accountable for the budget are in a position to be accountable. This has not been the case in the past. He was concerned that the individuals would be able to keep track of expenses.

Bozik stated that as Chair of the Faculty it is difficult to predict what type of budget she would need. The Chair of the Faculty runs the fall meeting, the expenses of which were approved by Chair Haack. The Provost has agreed to cover expenses for the Board of Regents President's reception from her budget. Last year the Faculty Chair had lots of expenses because of the forums and duplication expense with regard to the Quality in the Curriculum proposals. There is no way to predict when such expenses would be incurred. At present, Bozik does not see a problem with the present situation.

Motion to recommend that the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate have separate budgets failed.

Motion to receive the Report on 1995-1996 Faculty Budget carried.

537 610 Request from the University Committee on Curricula that the University Senate address the issue of how, when, and where students should acquire competency in basic computer skills.

Gilpin/Cooper moved/seconded to remove from the table the motion that the Chair (of the Senate) appoint an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of at least three faculty to study the issue of when, where and how students acquire basic skills, whether in discipline-specific or general courses.

Motion to remove from the table carried.

Isakson stated that there was a similarity between this request and the previous request for guidance on the Honors Program. This issue might be best addressed by the Educational Policies Commission. Haack agreed.

Isakson/Grosboll moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor a motion to send to the Educational Policies Commission a request to study the issue of when, where and how students acquire basic skills, whether in discipline-specific or general courses.

On a division of the house, the motion to substitute carried.

Reineke asked for a review of the history of where the Senate was on this issue because she had to leave early from the last Senate meeting.

Gilpin replied that the motion that was removed from the table was broader than the original question that was brought to the Senate by the Curriculum Committee. Though the Senate had not taken a consensus, there were some broader issues than the specific issue of computer skills that was in the original question. Some of the other issues included statistics, laboratory instruction.

Soneson stated that we could include writing as a basic skill. The question was how are we to structure things so that students are able to acquire basic skills. Should they be confined to specialist courses or spread out across the curriculum. This seems to be the issue here.

McDevitt argued that this is an issue of technology. Where do students acquire technology, such as basic

computer skills or library skills. These are narrower skills than a basic skill such as writing. Students should be writing well in all their courses, whereas they may be using computer skills in only a few courses. Technical skills may change with time. This is a more time-limited, specific question than skills in critical thinking. Technical skills may be only learned to complete a specific project and they may then become outmoded. She would like to see technical skills separated from more durable skills. She questioned whether students should get credit for learning technical skills, such as library skills.

Gable asked if there were any data available showing what skills students had and did not have.

Bill Dibrito, Coordinator of Institutional Research, replied that for the last three years his office had surveyed graduating seniors. In this survey, graduating seniors were asked their about their competence to undertake basic tasks, intermediate tasks, and advanced tasks. This survey was a self evaluation report. There is no testing of competence. This information is now on the World Wide Web.

Reineke sees a philosophical conflict as basic skills in computer use is going to become outmoded. We have domain specific application of computer skills as an entry point. An analogy is that at some universities, basic writing is not taught because writing is domain specific. Generic university-wide writing would be a misunderstanding of the use of writing skills. As we move forward, the question is whether the University of Northern Iowa is going to make a commitment to general skills in computer use or whether basic skills in computer use is a basic skill at the University. The University has identified basic writing but this discussion has not taken place on computer use. The question of basic skills in computer use will not be an issue in five years because students will be arriving with these skills. At this time, basic computer skills will be a moot point.

Gable wondered if we do not now offer workshops for students to acquire or improve basic computer skills. She wondered if these were being utilized to the maximum.

Gilpin replied that the problem is that these workshops are being offered centrally. However, there is a substantial financial commitment to discipline-specific computing. The student computer fee is used to fund discipline-specific needs. The problem is that there is no central mechanism for orienting students to use of these discipline-specific resources. If departments are to make use of these resources, they must instruct in their use. Yet, the curriculum process does not acknowledge this. It basically says that we are offering orientation to computing.

De Nault stated that there was a broader issue that should be addressed. One person's basic skill is another persons advanced techniques. He wondered about the definition of terms. The specific course that caused concern to the Curriculum Committee is listed as a 100-level course so presumably there are prerequisites. However, the broader issue of where students should acquire basic understanding or knowledge should be addressed. It is not in the best interest of a liberal education to have discipline-specific introductory courses. In the College of Natural Sciences there are several of these. There is a special introductory course in Chemistry for Industrial Technology students. The Mathematics Department has a special introductory analysis course for business majors. He does not find this practice in keeping with a philosophy of a liberal education. Analysis is analysis whether it is applied to physics or to business. The equation for a circle is the same in both disciplines. Basic skills, or perhaps basic concepts would be a better term, are best taught in the appropriate department. It would not be in the best interest for geology to teach basic mathematics, but for our students to learn this in courses taught by the Mathematics Department. It is our responsibility as teachers to show students how to apply this knowledge or these skills in our specific disciplines. Students are better served by being exposed to other departments rather than becoming provincial in one department.

Gilpin/Shand moved/seconded to add to the communication with E.P.C. a copy of the original request from the Curriculum Committee.

Bozik wondered how this works with the General Education Committee. The General Education Committee is responsible for students acquiring basic skills. The University has answered this with regard to writing. There is a required writing course. The issue is the acquisition of computer skills. The present motion is too broad for the Educational Policies Commission to consider.

Reineke spoke in favor of the amendment. The question is not the acquisition of basic skills in general education but the application of basic skills in domain-specific courses. This is certainly an issue of broad educational interest that is appropriate for the Educational Policies Commission to study.

McDevitt stated that the question was whether the instruction of a basic skill should be in a course that has little content.

Haack stated that should the motion pass, he would send a copy of the Senate minutes with his communication to the Educational Policies Commission so that they would have the background of the Senate's discussion of the issue.

Motion to amend the motion to add sending a copy of the original request from the Curriculum Committee carried.

The motion to request that the Educational Policies Commission study the issue of when, where and how students acquire basic skills, whether in discipline-specific or general courses and to include a copy of the original request to the Senate from the University Curriculum Committee, carried.

527 600 Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council.

Gable/McDevitt moved/seconded to receive the report.

Haack asked if there were any representatives from the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council in attendance. There were none.

McDevitt asked why this committee reports to the Vice President of Administration and Finance. De Nault responded because the Athletic Department is not an academic department and is under the Vice President of Administration and Finance.

McGuire, who has served on the committee in the past, stated that the committee is interested in the academic aspects of athletics and the athletes. The committee is to balance the interpretation of N.C.A.A. rules which can be interpreted in different ways. Often these rules are skewed in favor of athletic competition rather than the betterment of the student athlete. Faculty on the committee are very serious that student athletes meet their academic responsibilities.

Haack stated that he had a communication from Chris Ritrievi, Director of Athletics, that he had a conflict but would be happy to meet with the Senate when our schedules would allow.

Reineke would like to receive the report when Chris Ritrievi could be present to discuss the report. This once-a-year report is important to faculty and there should be an opportunity to discuss the issues.

McDevitt pointed out that this report was scheduled for this meeting last May and notice had been circulated.

Patton stated that because this committee is supposed to report to the Senate, the chair of the committee should also be present when the report is discussed.

Cooper stated that she would like this report discussed as soon as possible. It will soon be time for this year's report. There are issues that need to be addressed.

Gable/Soneson moved/seconded to table the report until the Director of Athletics and the Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council can both be present.

Motion to table until the Director of Athletics and the Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Council can both be present, carried.

538 611 Report of the General Education Committee.

De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to receive the report.

Bozik asked about item two which states; "Increasing numbers of transfer students are being admitted to

UNI, and the quality and comparability of the background of these students in General Education coursework is a matter of concern to the committee." She asked what was the concern.

Darrel Davis, current Chair of the General Education Committee, replied that the concerns were based primarily on anecdotal evidence. Another area of the report addresses the vacuum of real data. Davis continued by expressing concern about the governance of the General Education Program. There is a lack of someone with continuing responsibility to the program to coordinate data about the program.

Thomas asked about item three which states; "The use of adjunct and other 'non-regular' faculty to teach General Education courses is of great concern to the committee. In the fall semester of this academic year, 34.5% of General Education sections were taught by instructors classified as 'temporary'. In the spring semester, 25.7% of the sections were taught by instructors classified as 'temporary'. In at least one area of the General Education program, nearly 85% of the sections are being taught by adjuncts." He wanted an articulation of why and what exactly were the concerns about the use of adjuncts.

Davis stated that there was a feeling that something is missing when an adjunct teaches a course rather than a full-time faculty. There may be less support, commitment, or monitoring on the part of the department.

Thomas asked if there was a question about the way adjuncts were treated by departments.

Davis stated that was another issue. The Committee was only interested in the quality of the courses offered.

Gable asked if the problem was a lack of sufficient resources.

Davis responded that when the new General Education program was developed, faculty were told to not worry about resources. Though faculty felt guilty about developing a program without regard to resources, that was the charge. There has been a change in administrations and with that there has been a change in the way support is allocated.

Isakson noted that the report listed several areas of concern. Should the Senate anticipate recommendations coming from the Committee?

Davis replied in the affirmative. The Committee had been waiting until the recommendations in the Quality in the Curriculum Report had been dealt with. Now that they have been completed, the Committee will bring forth specific recommendations.

Gable stated that there were three recommendations in the Quality in the Curriculum Report that dealt with General Education. Davis stated that the issue of greatest concern to the General Education Committee is the problem of continuity. The members of the General Education Committee have three year terms and there is no overall director or coordinator for the program.

Gable asked if this function was not formally filled by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs on a continuing basis.

Davis replied that it was.

Bozik asked for an update on the request from the Non-Western Studies Committee request.

Haack informed Bozik that the Senate had approved that request last year.

De Nault asked about the status of the request from the Senate to study dividing the General Education program in to a skill component and a liberal arts component and requiring the skills component be taken the first semester of enrollment at UNI. The skills component was to include writing, mathematics, speech, and Humanities I.

Davis states that he was not aware of the request.

Motion to receive the report of the General Education Committee carried.

539 612 Request from Senator Cawelti that the Senate Examine Administrative Costs at UNI.

McGuire/Van Wormer moved/seconded to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to Examine Administrative Costs at UNI.

Cawelti stated that there is a public perception that the cost of a college education has been spiraling upward. We have been told by the administration that we need to be more cost-conscious. Courses and programs are to be examined for cost effectiveness. Some advanced courses have not been taught so that those instructors can be moved back into general education courses and thus save money. It seems unequal for the administration to be cutting courses and programs and moving instructors without also examining administrative costs. In the interest of fairness and equality, administrative costs should be studied. Also in the interest of public relations, it looks good if we examine administrative costs. And, we might be able to save some money somewhere.

Patton asked to what and to whom are we going to compare the administrative costs and once this information is obtained, what was to be done with it.

Cawelti responded that U.S. News and World Report listed UNI as one of the most efficient colleges in the country. This speaks well to our stewardship when compared with other institutions. However, there may be ways we could save even more.

Soneson asked if costs mean number of administrators, the salaries they receive, their personal or departmental budgets, their travel? What is it that you would like compared or discussed?

Cawelti responded that those would be issues the committee should discuss and decide.

De Nault stated that the motion asks that administrative costs be examined. The proposal does not ask for a comparison.

Grosboll asked whether Cawelti was using "administration" in the broadest sense so that anything that is not course work would be included. Would this include all the support units?

Cawelti replied that he had purposefully not been specific because he felt that the committee should be free to make those decisions.

Bozik asked for clarification of what constituted administrative costs.

Cawelti replied that they would be as Soneson had iterated, namely number of administrators, the salaries they receive, and their expenses. How efficient is the administration by whatever measures of efficiency the committee would like to adopt. After the committee prepares a report, we can then talk about these issues.

Bozik asked if release time would be considered an administrative cost.

Cooper replied that it would include anything with a "B" behind it in the Budget Book. Faculty are clearly distinguished from administration in the Budget Book.

Grosboll expressed surprise at this request because when there have been cuts they have been on the administrative side. As far as she knew, these cuts have not been replaced.

De Nault stated that he thought this was a good thing to do. There were no secrets to the budget. The University's expenditures are reported each year in the Financial Report, a copy of which has always been placed in the Library. What has been spent is public information.

Reineke expressed confusion that if we were not doing a comparative analysis, who would have the expertise to perform this study. The U.S. News and World Report article stated that we were administratively "lean". She wondered who would have the skill base to conduct the study.

McDevitt replied to Reineke's concern. She stated that one could look at job descriptions to determine budget categories.

Isakson asked whether Cawelti intended for the proposed committee to restrict itself from comparative

analyses.

Cawelti replied that he did not intend to restrict the committee. The committee could do both a comparative study as well as an internal analysis.

McGuire stated that the motion is to examine and there is lots of public information including internal audits for the past few years. All of this information could be used in this examination.

Grosboll stated that though the proposal calls for examination it puts the question out there whether there are ways to cut administrative costs. There have already been a number of studies done and the auditing and reports indicate that we do come out very favorably. Nonacademic departments are using every creative way you can possibly imagine to get slave labor to run their departments because most of them have been cut about as much as they can. These departments support the academic program. She was amazed at the way the University runs on a tremendous amount of student and non-traditional help. She is surprised that someone would want such a study. If they took the time to study it they would be impressed at everything that gets done on this campus on the little bit of money that goes to administrative departments. This study would be a waste of time. Administrative departments have been given the seal of approval.

Shand asked if the Pappas Report addressed this issue.

Reineke remarked that it was now 5:00 PM and wondered if a vote could be taken.

McDevitt stated that such a study would be exhaustive and we do not have the CPA's to do the analysis.

De Nault stated that one of the impetus for this study was a study conducted at Penn State that showed that though academic costs had risen, administrative costs had risen far greater. Everyone at UNI feels that they are doing the best and most efficient job they can. The academic area is under great scrutiny. He did not see why the administrative area should not be scrutinized. It does not take a CPA to go through the Financial Report and add up administrative expenditures versus academic expenditures for the last five to ten years. He supported the establishment of the committee

Motion to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to Examine Administrative Costs at UNI carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Thomas/Primrose moved/seconded for adjournment. Motion to adjourn carried. The Senate adjourned at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth J. De Nault

Kenneth J. De Nault, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

Approved October 28, 1996