

9-23-1996

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 23, 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, September 23, 1996" (1996). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 819.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/819

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
September 23, 1996
1508

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Haack at 3:31 PM in the Board Room, Gilchrist Hall.

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 VanWormer, Barbara Weeg, Sue Grosboll, Phil Patton, and Mary Bozik (ex-officio.)

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Gable/Grosboll moved/seconded that the minutes be approved as printed. Motion carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No members of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Haack. A handout was distributed outlining these comments.
 - Emeritus status was granted to Eleanor B. Crownfield, Library; Stanley Walljasper, Computer Science; and Robert L. Ross, Political Science; over the Summer.
 - Please save announcement of your alternatives until a permanent recording secretary is named. The President has agreed to identify a staff member to help with the recording of Senate meetings and associated clerical duties.
 - Wednesday, October 16, 1996, is scheduled for the Senate to have dinner with the Board of Regents.
 - Distributed Fall, 1996 enrollment data indicating 11,587 undergraduate and 1,370 graduate students. This is an increase of 175 undergraduate students and a decrease of 20 graduate students over Fall, 1995.
 - From the September Board of Regents (BOR) Meeting:
 - The fiscal year 1998 (FY98) and fiscal year 1999 (FY99) general fund operating budget recommendations were presented to the BOR at the September meeting. We are requesting a 3.2% and 2.9% increase in each year respectively.
 - The tuition increase recommendation is 3.9%, which will be voted on at the October meeting. Our NISG President, Threasa Harms, made a very good presentation to the Board.
 - A list of Board Office capital project recommendations was distributed. As part of an agreement with the Legislature last year, there are no capital projects requests for FY98. UNI is included in the FY99 priorities as numbers 3 (Deferred Maintenance), 6 (Lang Hall Renovation), and 8 (Physics Building Renovation); the FY00 priorities as numbers 3 (Deferred Maintenance), 7 (East Gym Renovation), and 10 (Steam Distribution System Replacement, Phase I); the FY01 priorities as numbers 2 (Deferred Maintenance), 4 (East Gym Renovation), 5 (Steam Distribution System Replacement, Phase II), 9 (McCollum Science Hall Addition), and 12 (West Gym Renovation); and in the FY02 priorities as numbers 2 (Deferred Maintenance), 4 (McCollum Science Hall Addition), 7 (West Gym Renovation), and 9 (Sabin Hall Renovation).
 - A schedule of upcoming Board of Regents meetings was included on Chair Haack's handout. He will plan to attend most meetings, if possible. If anyone is interested in accompanying him to a meeting, please contact him.

Senator McDevitt referred to the proposed uses of the increase in tuition, one of which states "... including initiatives that increase personal contact between students and faculty/staff and address student acclimation to the learning process." She asked for a definition of "student acclimation." Provost Marlin replied that this is meant to improve the freshman experience and address the retention issue by an increased emphasis on academic advising, a personalized learning experience, increased knowledge of technology, as well as other areas. Senator McDevitt indicated the need for this to apply to transfer students as well as new freshman.

Senator Weeg questioned whether the second initiative, which read, "Improve the level of services to students through access to expanded data bases and information sources that

support the instructional environment, student development, and student administrative support (i.e., advising, registration, financial aid status, academic progress toward degree completion)," included the library. The Provost replied that with reference to the expanded data bases, the list given was not meant to be inclusive and should be viewed as more of a "for example" list.

Senator De Nault asked the Provost what have been identified as problems with the "personal contact between students and faculty/staff?" The Provost indicated this was not as much in response to problems as much as to the ideas relating to retention. We want students to be able to adapt well to the institution. Also, the personalized instruction aspect, we want faculty to have access to technology that will somewhat personalize the experience students receive.

Senator Cooper asked where the discussion of these initiatives was taking place, on the Strategic Planning Committee or elsewhere? The Provost responded that different groups have had input in helping to identify budget priorities. The Strategic Planning Committee and the University leadership retreat were two such groups.

- Chair Haack distributed the University Committee on Committees roster, which will be completed by today's action of the Senate. It will then be updated and distributed to the faculty.

2A. Comments from Senator Gable.

- Senator Gable presented John Longnecker with a plaque in appreciation for his service as Chair of the Faculty in 1994-95.
- University Faculty Chair Bozik presented Barbara Lounseberry with a plaque in appreciate for her service as Chair of the Faculty in 1995-96.

3. Comments from Mary Bozik, Chair of the Faculty.

- Chair Bozik had no formal comments at this time but did want to extend a thank you to those who responded to her call for ushers for the Fall faculty meeting. The response was excellent and she was unable to utilize everyone who volunteered. She will call on those people at some other time during the year.

4. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost indicated that she would try to focus on one or two main topics during each Senate meeting to allow for more in-depth discussion of these issues.

- The first topic is the FY97 appropriations process. It's a long, arduous process between when the University submits their initial budget request and the time a final budget is approved by the Legislature. New monies for UNI this fiscal year include:
 - \$120,000 for Library inflation. This represents a 8.5% increase to the Library budget.
 - \$372,000 to enhance undergraduate education. These funds are directed toward efforts to increase the number of students engaged in beyond the classroom experiences (undergraduate research, experiential learning, etc.) A very conservative goal has been set to increase the number of students involved in these types of courses by 2% for next year.
 - \$50,000 for distance education to continue the 2+2 program at DMACC in Carroll.
 - \$250,000 to improve teacher preparation in the use of technology. This money is not limited to classroom work. It could also be utilized to bring expertise to the campus to demonstrate how technologies are being integrated into the classroom setting.
- The second topic is decentralization of the FY97 budget. This represents significant changes in this year's budgetary process. Historically funds have been held centrally and doled out by the Provost to cover needs on the academic side.
 - College/department budgets have been decentralized to these areas of responsibility. The funds represented in the budget are what the colleges/departments have to work with for the year. Nothing will be pulled back by the administration. Restrictions have essentially been removed and all the budget flexibility remains with the departments. Even salary savings, which have reverted to the administration in the past, will remain for the colleges/departments to spend as they see fit.
 - This year's budget adopted a historical model due to the late time frame for any modifications. However, work has already begun to establish next year's budget.

- Mini-grant funds and faculty computing grant funds were kept centralized. These will still be administered through the Provost's office. Also PDL replacement funds, search costs and moving costs will be administered centrally.
- Speakers, etc. have been decentralized. If departments want to bring someone in to speak, those funds are now in the colleges/departments. Funds for new classes, adjuncts, etc. are now in the department budgets.
- There are several significant advantages of decentralization, one of which is for colleges/departments to more directly see the cost of courses they want to offer. Another is this will allow for more involvement of the faculty in the departmental budgets.
- Salary savings has been the source of some departmental activities in the past. Salary savings can be identified through the budget book. Where there is an open line, someone hired at a lower salary than the line was originally, or was hired for less than the full time the line was intended for, are the places where salary savings will occur.
- Decentralization was based on actual budget rather than expenditures.

Senator Gable questioned why department heads weren't told until after their budgets were submitted for the year that there would be no money for adjuncts? Provost Marlin responded that adjunct money is now decentralized. Senator Gable clarified her question by stating that department heads were not able to "build in" adjunct money because this decision was made after their budgets were submitted. The Provost indicated the money for adjuncts is still available, it is just available through each departments respective budget rather than being "pulled back" to a central administration account. Salary savings have been decentralized and are available to be allocated as the departments see fit. Restrictions for the use of these funds have been removed.

Senator De Nault asked if there was a lag between salary savings dollars which were traditionally realized at the end of the year and the beginning of the new budget year? Provost Marlin responded that salary savings are available at the beginning of the budget year in many cases. Salary lines that are open, lines that have been filled by temporaries at a lower salary, retirements, etc. are all sources of salary savings that can be made available to the departments at the beginning of the year.

Senator Primrose asked that if many things were based on historical basis, as a faculty member does he have access to that historical basis? Provost Marlin responded that this information is based on the budget book. Senator Primrose asked if by looking at his department's budget will he be able to tell how much was set aside for adjuncts historically? Provost Marlin indicated that colleges/departments have the right to move funds around, but no funds have disappeared. In fact, this year's budget book is a more accurate representation of where the dollars really are. In the past you could look at what a college's budget was, but what the college actually had to spend was far less because some dollars were pulled back to the central administration. You couldn't see that in the budget book unless you knew all the little individual circumstances. However, with the new decentralization, the money that is in the college's budget is actually there for them to spend, the Provost's office doesn't pull any of it back.

Senator Cooper questioned if future budget books will show exactly how much has been spent for each category? Will we have any accountability for each college as to how much is spent on travel, etc? Provost Marlin responded by saying you should ask this question of your departments, "How are we spending our budget?" This should open things up for the departments to know how much they have to spend.

Senator McGuire commented that the Provost eluded to decentralization of the budget to the department level but he has seen no evidence of that. There has been decentralization to the college level but no initiatives to bring this to the department levels. Is this to be forthcoming? Provost Marlin again responded that this will be a decision made at the college level as to how things will be administered within their departments. Most colleges are saying they will be discussing this with their department heads. This decentralization has been pushed to at least the college level (from the Provost's level.) Hopefully this will result in more collective decisions.

Senator Haack stated he feels some of the strain being felt by the College of Education and College of Natural Science with regard to adjuncts this year because the budget book has largely been fiction the past five or six years. That it didn't accurately reflect how the money had been spent because the Provost's office had pulled back and reallocated funds. Therefore, the colleges that were net

beneficiaries under that policy are really being hurt this year significantly greater than the colleges that may have given more money back to the Provost's office than they received.

Provost Marlin responded that there were areas that felt they benefited from her reallocation decisions due to increased enrollments, etc. There no longer is the pulling back of funds and redistributing it elsewhere. Now they must work within their budgets. These budget allocation decisions now must be made at the Academic Heads Council. We have only been able to do this allocation process historically due to the time frame but some of the issues for the coming budget year will have to be sorted through and that process has begun.

Senator Bozik indicated her Dean has been informed that the next two years will be "rocky." Her translation of that is that there is less money to work with than there was before. She is "mystified" by that and was looking for an explanation. Provost Marlin indicated her interpretation is that the next two years would be a transition period. We have been used to functioning under one system, those rules are gone and we are working with a new system. It could take up to five years for everyone to get used to the new budgeting system and to have everything headed in the right direction. The "rocky" part is working through this. A lot of the things that have been done behind the scenes in the past are now going to have to be dealt with at the college and departmental levels. This does bring out differences people have in the directions they are headed. There is "no more money" other than the new initiatives indicated at the beginning of this discussion.

Senator De Nault questioned back to the \$372,000 allocation for enhancing undergraduate education. This was termed as for "beyond the classroom" but the measure of success for this funding will be the number of students in specific classes? Provost Marlin clarified that this applies to classes that have been identified as having an experiential learning component.

Senator Cooper, in follow-up to Senator De Nault's question regarding experiential learning, asked when you are asking for a 2% increase, is quality built in? For instance, Senator Cooper's class has a very large experiential component to her class, if it is smaller but more quality, does that fit into the 2% increase? Provost Marlin indicated we strive for quality at all times but with this increased funding there should be more opportunities, not that Senator Cooper's class has to increase by 2%. We track which courses have an experiential component, how many were enrolled and what we want is at least a 2% increase, not in any particular course, but overall. The quality control lies in quality faculty.

Senator Grosboll questioned if the "beyond the classroom" included the undergraduate research grants? She also questioned, just for her clarification, if each college is handling these grants individually? Provost Marlin indicated yes, this is part of the decentralization. If some colleges are notifying students that they are not available, notify the Provost's office if there is a problem. Each college is able to make their own distribution of these funds but there is money in each college for these grants.

Senator Gable asked how many students were involved in the 2+2 program. Provost Marlin didn't have those figures available at the meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

616 Report of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee.

De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 543.

617 Request from Senator Gable for the Senate to review the University of Northern Iowa report to the Board of Regents on Undergraduate Student Outcomes Assessment of 1994-1995.

Primrose/De Nault moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 544.

618 Request from Senator Gable for the Senate to invite the University of Northern Iowa Student Enrollment Management Committee to give a report.

De Nault/Thomas moved/seconded to docket in regular order. Motion carried. Docket 545.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Selection of a Senate representative to the Military Science Liaison and Advisory Committee.

Bud Bowlin, Accounting; Joanne Spaide, Design, Family and Consumer Sciences; Katherine van Wormer, Social Work; and Sarah Cron, Library, had been nominated prior to the meeting.

There were no other nominees.

Bud Bowlin was selected.

2. Selection of a Senate representative to the General Education Committee.

Paul Shand, Physics had been nominated prior to the meeting.

A question was raised as to which department was represented by the prior appointment. Paul Shand was the representative to this committee last year. Calvin Thomas, English Language and Literature, was nominated from the floor.

Paul Shand was selected.

3. Selection of a faculty representative to the Board of Regents Faculty Excellence Award Committee.

Suzanne McDevitt, Social Work, and Ralph Scott, Educational Psychology and Foundations, had been nominated prior to the meeting.

The ballot incorrectly identified the committee as the "Board of Regents Faculty Excellence Awards Nominating Committee." The ballot was modified to read "Board of Regents Faculty Excellence Awards Selection Committee." This committee is charged with selecting the award recipients from the nominations presented.

There were no other nominations.

Ralph Scott was selected.

4. Selection of three faculty to the Reconciliation Committee of the University Strategic Plan.

Scott Cawelti, English; Ken De Nault, Earth Science, Sherry Gable, Educational Psychology and Foundations; and Andy Gilpin, Psychology; had been nominated prior to the meeting.

Senator De Nault expressed concern over the fact that the faculty were now one of four groups (students, faculty, staff and Cabinet appointees) comprising this committee; rather than one of three (students, faculty and staff) as in the past.

Senator Haack pointed out that the faculty would now have five representatives to this committee because one of the Cabinet appointees would be a Dean and another would be an academic department head. The strategic planning process has been developed as we move along. An ad hoc committee was appointed to construct the strategic plan and it was submitted to various organizations for response. There is not yet in place any routinized process to review the strategic plan in the future, this step seems to be part of the continuing process. The Reconciliation Committee is to respond to the different responses received from the constituency groups.

Senator De Nault indicated that the last draft of the strategic plan specifically stated that any changes therein would have to be approved by P&S, faculty and students. Senator Gilpin agreed but indicated his understanding is that if the Senate doesn't send people to this committee, the operational document is the most recent draft disseminated. So, if we choose to take that stand, it would be with the recognition that we indeed have a plan.

Senator Reineke questioned the number of appointees in each of the three/four categories. Would each group have three representatives? Discussion indicated that there would be three appointees from each of the four categories. However, because two of the Cabinet appointees are from the academic side, there would actually be five academic representatives to the committee. The other Cabinet appointee would be a Student Services director.

Senator Haack stated the staff representation would include two merit employees and one P&S employee. Three students would also be appointed.

Senator Gable questioned whether each group would have just one vote or whether there would be three votes from each group. The answer is unknown. However, it is presumed the group will act by consensus rather than specific vote.

Senator Haack indicated it might be very appropriate for the Senate to discuss at an upcoming meeting mechanisms by which faculty could propose input or changes to the strategic plan for the future. It's a very wide open setting right now and if we came up with a proposal it might be a very appropriate way to get a jump on the review process.

Senator Reineke indicated that representation from all sectors in the strategic planning process is very important but perhaps more weight should be given to faculty representation given that this is an academic institution. She has on-going concern about the place for faculty leadership in strategic planning and it would be appropriate for us to work out a statement of concern requesting terminal planning in the on-going development of the plan to ensure that our voices are accurately represented.

Bozik asked for a clarification of "reconcile responses." This is not a group doing strategic planning, correct?

Senator Haack explained that last year when the strategic plan was put out, it was submitted to the Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs Council, Northern Iowa Students Government, and a P&S and Merit Staff Council, to consider the plan. The Senate response was drafted by the members of a committee who are nominated for this Reconciliation Committee. They met with the Academic Affairs Council to jointly submit their response. The students and the staff council also submitted suggestions for revision. Not surprisingly, there are differences, and the President is looking to this committee to reconcile the responses.

Bozik then asked what happens to the responses? Provost Marlin responded that the responses will be incorporated into a new "Working Draft" strategic plan. The document will always be a "Working Draft." That is its intent, to be an ever-changing, progressing document which is always under review.

Senator Soneson questioned the results of the Reconciliation Committee. These individuals may have reconciled the responses, but what about the rest of us? Provost Marlin responded that everyone has had input to this point and the work the committee will be doing is a result of our input. They are to look at it from a group perspective. They can make changes to the current "Working Draft," however, they are not representing themselves, rather the suggested changes put forth by their constituency groups.

Senator Gable stated she hopes there would then be a process for this Reconciliation group to come back to the various constituency groups for further input.

Senator Soneson wondered about the importance of this next stage. Is this next stage one in which we are trying to bring closure to the document or are simply bringing together responses.

Provost Marlin reiterated this process will be part of the on-going evolution of the "Working Draft."

Senator Reineke, in summary of Senator De Nault's concern, pointed out that of the twelve voices on the committee, only five represent the academic experience and formal training, which is not half.

Senator De Nault's concern was more the change in representation from a one-third to one-fourth, which comes to the same end as Senator Reineke.

Senator Reineke was nominated to the Reconciliation Committee ballot from the floor.

Senator Reineke raised concern if one of our nominees was unable to attend a portion of the committee deliberations for any reason. Discussion then focused on naming alternates as well as the regular nominees

Senator McDevitt moved that the Senate nominate three persons to the committee and the other two on the ballot be listed as alternates. Motion died for lack of second.

Bozik questioned whether the make-up of this committee is set for this go-around? Senator Haack could not respond definitively for President Koob but indicated he has always been receptive to suggestions. Senator Haack indicated the staff council put forth four names for consideration. Therefore it would not be inappropriate for us to send our nominees and ask for four persons to represent the faculty. Again, the Reconciliation Committee will not be writing the plan, its more a matter of reconciling responses. It doesn't call for representation as much as a willingness to consider the input.

Senator Gable stated that this process has already begun. The Universities are already tying monies to the Strategic Plan.

Senator Haack indicated this had already been done for this fiscal year. Provost Marlin agreed, that is the intent of the Strategic Plan.

Senator Gable stated the constituency groups are not yet in agreement on the strategic plan/budgeting process unless the items already budgeted for are those which had no responses to reconcile.

Senator De Nault stated that in the last draft, items appeared that were not there before and other things disappear which the Senate had felt strongly about. This is part of the change process, but to think this is a committee sorting through a few minor details is not correct.

Senator De Nault suggested that we proceed with voting, given that much time has been spent on discussion; however, perhaps this subject could be considered at another time.

Bozik/Gable moved/seconded a motion to send to the President a recommendation that the faculty have four representatives [to the committee] to better represent the academic side.

Senator Gilpin indicated there are two levels of concern. One is a philosophical one that you can have a university faculty without student services or someone cleaning the classroom. You can't have a university without a faculty or students. The point is the centrality of the different constituencies isn't, in fact, equal as we look at the role of the university. The other level is a more practical one in terms of how does this committee function, and unfortunately, what in a practical sense, happens when this committee is influenced by the fact that we do have a de facto document in place. I think it's very important that we influence what this committee does as best we can without conceding the philosophical point. I suggest that we articulate our concerns about the importance of the different sectors as effectively as we can.

The motion to send to the President a recommendation that the faculty have four representatives [to the committee] to better represent the academic side carried.

Scott Cawelti, Ken De Nault, Sherry Gable, and Andy Gilpin were selected.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

537 610 Request for 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.

Senator Haack indicated possible action might be to form an ad hoc committee to look at this issue or to send it to this year's Curriculum Committee for further examination.

Senator De Nault sees this as a very important question that comes up with areas other than just computer competency. If the Senate plans to dismiss at 5:00, he didn't feel there is sufficient time to discuss this other than to form a committee to review the issue.

Senator Haack is not anxious for the Senate to spend its time coming up with policy. It would be preferable to act on something presented to us.

Senator Grosboll questioned how many other courses are on campus that are equivalent to this Computer Applications course? Other departments are developing similar courses, it might be helpful for us to know which ones.

Senator McGuire indicated that in light of the new initiatives from the Regents to enhance technology applications in teacher education, that's another process that will come into this and need to be considered.

Senator De Nault questioned if someone was in attendance from last year's Curriculum committee? Had they discussed this, were unable to come to a solution, and brought it to the Senate for resolution? Discussion indicated it was presented to the Senate to resolve the issue.

Senator Isakson pointed out two issues: first, a broader issue of what to do when issues of this type cannot be resolved; and second, the specific issue about what we do about this particular case. He was unsure if the Senate wants to get involved with particular issues to this extent or not. The broader issue might be the one to focus on.

Senator Gilpin agreed there is a broad issue here. The Senate should not get into a discussion of any particular course. The intermediate issue, which we may want to address, is how we deliver information about technology in our curriculum. It seems this intermediate level concern is the one being raised by the Curriculum Committee. If it were an issue of the specific course, it would have been better to deal with it as part of the formal curriculum proposal.

Senator Gable stated it appears we have two aspects. One is where, when and how should students acquire basic computer skills. This course basically asks for applications in discipline-specific areas. So, she thinks the first question to answer is where, when and how are we going to determine how the student obtain basic computer skills. Are they going to gain these through a single course?

De Nault/Gable moved/seconded that the Chair 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.

Senator Gilpin indicated the motion covers the most broad issue here. The Curriculum Committee would be the most appropriate to address this issue. Therefore, he doesn't feel we should undermine our committee structure to form an ad hoc committee to perform the same function.

Senator Grosboll agreed that another committee is not the solution when more work should be done by the Curriculum Committee. Yousefi stated that the Curriculum Committee was not concerned with where basic skills were taught, but they were concerned with duplication of courses.

Senator Cooper indicated that there are several committees across campus which look at these type of issues.

Senator Haack stated the Educational Policies Commission lists as part of its goal, "... research and report to the Senate on issues that have implication for broad curricular and education policies."

Senator De Nault indicated he felt it might be appropriate for the Senate to have a committee to look at the issues since the Curricular committee was unable to resolve the issue and therefore brought it to the Senate.

Haack pointed out that it was now past 5:00 pm.
Gilpin/Cooper moved to table the motion for this meeting and bring it back for further discussion
at the next meeting. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Primrose/Krieg moved/seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cindy Carlson". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Cindy Carlson
Recording Secretary