

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/08/13 (3:32 p.m. – 4:38 p.m.)
Mtg. #1733

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

No members of the press were in attendance.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded everyone that the third candidate for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs position will be on campus tomorrow, April 9, and Wednesday, April 10, 2013. A public presentation will be made at 3:30 on April 10, 2013, in the University Room of Maucker Union. He asked that all feedback forms be submitted by Thursday at the latest for this candidate and any for the prior two candidates as well.

Chair **Peters** reviewed the remaining agenda items for the year. He pointed out the items today for docketing. He is hopeful that all items can be completed at the next meeting (April 22nd), but he advised Senators to keep April 29th open in their calendars in case an additional meeting is needed. He emphasized the importance of completing all the goals set forth for this year.

Chair **Peters** then recognized and thanked KaLeigh **White**, NISG Vice President, who has attended Faculty Senate meetings this year and has worked very hard for UNI students in many ways.

Next Vice President for Administration and Finance, Michael **Hager**, was introduced and expressed regret for the tone of the Enterprise Risk

Management Council's recent Building Access Policy draft which generated a great deal of faculty comments. He noted that the seeming harsh tone was not their intent but certainly became the impact. Chair **Peters** thanked him for his collaborative decision-making efforts in this situation, and both agreed that the current revised Policy was improved by that collaboration. [see Addenda 1 and 2 revisions following consideration of comments]

Peters then recognized Vice President for Administration and Finance, Michael **Hager**, and asked to report on information on next year in terms of changes in revenue, changes in expenditures, and different estimates with regard to enrollment in particular. A discussion ensued along these lines. See full transcript below for details of the discussion under the section titled Comments from Faculty Senate Chair Scott **Peters**.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

March 11, 2013, Minutes were approved as submitted without objection.
March 25, 2013, Minutes were approved as submitted without objection.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1190 1086 Election of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (head of docket Apr 22)

1137 1033 Policy Regarding Faculty Notification of Grade Changes—
Report and recommendations from Educational Policies
Commission (regular order)

1191 1087 Creation of faculty committees and procedures to implement
Master Agreement due process standards for dismissal of
faculty (regular order)

1183 1079 Recommendations of ad hoc Committee on Curriculum
Review—Final recommendations (regular order)

**Motion to docket all the above consistent with the Chair's

recommendations [in parentheses following each Calendar Item]
(**MacLin/Kidd**). Passed.

4. New Business

None

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1186 1082 Recommendation to change drop date to 10 class days after midpoint of semester (**Bruess/DeBerg**)

Motion to approve recommendation (Degnin/Strauss**). Passed.

1187 1083 Request for Emeritus status, John W. **Somervill**
(**Bruess/DeBerg**)

Motion to endorse request (Dolgener/MacLin**). Passed.

1177 1073 Curriculum changes—Geography (approval of GEOG 4390/5390 GIS Programming tabled at 2/25/13 meeting)

Motion to bring this from the table (DeBerg/Terlip**).

**Motion to approve this course. Passed.

1189 1084 [sic, **1085**] Improving faculty participation in university planning and budgeting process (**Terlip/Strauss**)

Motion to amend recommendations (DeBerg/Terlip**). Passed.

**Approval of recommendations with amendments. Passed

6. Adjournment

Meeting declared adjourned at 4:38 p.m. by Chair **Peters**.

Next meeting:

04/22/13

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 44 pages, including 4 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 08, 2013
Mtg. 1733**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Francis **Degnin** (substituting for Jesse **Swan**), Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Kim **MacLin**, Jerilynn **Marshall** (substituting for Chris **Neuhaus**), Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

Absent: Michael **Licari**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER (3:32 p.m.)

Chair **Peters**: All right. Let's come to order. Apparently Provost **Gibson** will be here in just a moment.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: I don't see any press in the room. Am I wrong about that? [none seen] Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Provost **Gibson**. We'll come back around to her. Chair **Funderburk**, do you have any comments?

Funderburk: Only to let everybody know that we have a third candidate for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs on campus tomorrow and Wednesday. That public presentation is at 3:30 tomorrow, and it's—this time it is in the University Room of the Union because of conflicts. So, if you can be there, that would be terrific.

MacLin: Is there a way to give feedback? Or should we just contact the Committee?

Funderburk: Thank you. I meant to say that. There is a feedback form that is given out in these sessions. And if anyone's picked them up in any of the other sessions, please be sure and get those back in by I would say Thursday at least this week. But there is a feedback form.

Peters: And those are the 3 candidates? There's no

Funderburk: Those are the 3 candidates.

Peters: Ok. I just wanted to make sure.

Funderburk: Uh huh.

Peters: Any other questions? [none heard] Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS [initial]

Peters: A few comments here. I did want to make one note about our remaining agenda for the year. As you can see when you look at our items for docketing up later today, we have a number of things left to complete. These are some of the things that are key for our goals of the year.

Remember, we had 4 key—4 major goals of the year. The Policy Process changes, which I followed up on today to find out where those are. Those could still be coming back to us, if the President and the Cabinet suggest something different than what we suggested. Today we have recommendations for future budget consultation. We've heard one—

we've heard the preliminary plan about curriculum process and policy changes, and that will come back to us at our next meeting. And finally, United Faculty did negotiate some standards for due process for faculty who are facing dismissal for cause, and there's a role to play for the [Faculty] Senate in that. And United Faculty has asked that we try to set up the basic process of that by the end of the year, if we can. So, that is also still on our agenda.

So, as we look at all these things, we'll certainly do our best to expedite these things and have good debates and get them done as thoroughly and quickly as possible, but keep April 29th open on your calendars just in case.

I also want to stress that it's especially important, I think, for us to get all of this done this year. Recent events, I think, have made me a little bit more optimistic that the University might be able to avoid the most negative AAUP action that might be pending this Spring. And, if that's possible, I think that the shared governance items that are on our plate could be important pieces of the puzzle.

KaLeigh **White** is in her last meeting as NISG Vice President, and I wanted to recognize her and just say that I, along with Jeff [**Funderburk**], Faculty Chair, and Dan **Power**, United Faculty President—we've worked pretty closely with NISG President Jordan **Bancroft-Smithe** and with KaLeigh, the Vice President, and they've both done fantastic jobs this year on behalf of the UNI [students]. But since KaLeigh is the one who comes to all our meetings, I want to especially single her out. She's done an amazing job this year advocating for students, and I can tell you that on some of the things we've talked about a lot here, including a lot of extra work she ended up with on the Educational Policies Commission, she put in a lot of time and effort on that and I think spoke very well and eloquently for students. So, I hope you all will join me in thanking KaLeigh for all her service to the University. [applause all around]

White: Thank you.

Peters: Before I recognize Michael **Hager**, I'm going to circle back around and ask if Provost Gibson has any comments for us?

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Gibson: I'm good this time.

Peters: Ok.

[return to] COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: All right. I have asked Vice President for Administration and Finance Michael **Hager** to come today to give us an update on the Budget. Before I recognize you for that purpose, though, I did want to convey to you the faculty's appreciation for the opportunity given to comment on the policies that the Enterprise Risk Management Council has been putting forward. As you know very well, faculty had some pretty strong opinions about the Building Access Policy, and I was quite heartened that the Council took those into advisement when it revised its policy, and I just wanted to say that's exactly what collaborative decision-making should look like. So, thank you for that.

Hager: Well, I will share, Scott [Chair **Peters**], that I called you on Friday, and I guess I'll share with the whole Senate that sometimes when you're writing policy, we're looking at the worst-case scenarios. And I think that happened when we wrote that particular policy, and it came across with a pretty strong tone. And that wasn't the intent, and so I apologized to Scott, but I apologize to you all, too. But I appreciate the feedback, Kim [Senator **MacLin**], that you supplied. And I think we were able to respond to all of those elements and revise the policy. It has a better tone about it. And so that wasn't the intent, but clearly that was the impact, and so we have changed that, and I think it's looking much better now than what it was before. [see Addenda 1 and 2 revisions following consideration of comments]

Peters: And with that, I guess I will just recognize you. I asked you to give us some basic information about what we're looking at next year in terms of changes in revenue, changes in expenditures, and different estimates with regard to enrollment in particular. And we'll have some time for questions after that.

Hager: Ok. Well, the short answer is I don't know what the budget looks like for next year, but that doesn't really instill a lot of confidence, so I'll expand a little bit. As you may be familiar with on the University Bu—when most people talk about the Budget, they're referring to the General Education Fund, and that's the part that is made up predominately of State appropriations and tuition, and that's what most people think of as the University Budget. There's this other element that has Auxiliaries. The largest Auxiliary would be the Department of Residence where they receive no State appropriations and no State funds. And so that's the whole University Budget, but most people, when they talk about the Budget, or want to know how we're doing, are talking about the General Education Fund. And so that's what I'm going to reference today.

From the part that does have the State appropriations, things are looking very encouraging there. The Governor's original request put 2.6%, which was the request of the Board [of Regents] into the Budget, and he also included a line item specifically for the University of Northern Iowa for our second of our 3-year request of \$4 million. That was important because last year he just gave a lump sum in his Budget presentation and said the Regents could divide it up how they wanted. Now, in back calculating, we could figure out that we thought the \$4 million was in there, but he wasn't clear with it. This year he was very explicit with that, and so that was a good statement from the Governor's Office.

The Senate and the House have both come out, and it looks to us like we will have no problem getting the 2.6% increase and the extra \$4 million for most of our funding. The special appropriations, which include things like the Metal Casting Center, the Real Estate Program—there's a list of 5 or 6. I'm sorry, I can't remember all of them. Those were flat funded, and they did not have that 2.6% increase. And that's—I know they're still working—our State Relations Officer, Jeneane **Beck**, and the other two, Joe **Murphy**

at Iowa State and Keith at University of Iowa, are still working to get that because those are smaller budgets, but that extra 2.6% is critical for them, and so we're optimistic that we can keep something moving along. So, we're—I would envision that we should have very good news once the legislative session adjourns, that we will have the 2.6% and that second \$4 million. So that's good news. That amounts to about a \$6.1 million influx of revenues, if that comes in.

The other component that I'll share real quickly that relates to the Legislature is the—you may recall the Board [of Regents] asked for about \$39.5 million of student financial aid. The intent was to replace the tuition set aside, which is where we take about 18% of our tuition money and set it aside for student financial aid. And the Regents were saying, "Why doesn't the State just fund that, because Iowa is—it's either the only one or one of two that doesn't have State Financial Aid for students?" It's kind of an embarrassing position given the history of the State and how we tend to support higher education. The Governor put \$5 million in his recommendation. We are hearing—there's no press in here, right? We're hearing that the Senate might come up with \$10 million. If that comes up, the Board will decide how that gets allocated to the 3 Regent Universities. The agreement with the Legislature is that whatever they put into that financial aid—student financial aid pool—there's a reversion in the, or a rollback, in the price of tuition. So while it's not new money that's coming to us, it's new from another source. It's not a net gain to our Budget. So, if you hear that Student Financial Aid Package, if it's \$10 million or whatever it comes up to be, a certain portion of that will come to us and the other two State Universities. But everybody will agree to roll back the tuition so at the end of the day, it's a zero net gain for the Budget related to the Student Financial Aid. The upside to it is it takes some of the burden off of the students paying for their tuition and puts it onto the taxpayers, which some would say is what the purpose of a State University is.

But back to the General Fund, the appropriations are looking good. The other part of that equation then is enrollment or tuition. Tuition is driven by enrollment obviously. It's a little early to say where we're at with that. The projection models for enrollment—there's quite a bit of variance in there right now, because we've had the last couple three years vary

because the publicity last year didn't help us. We had the NCAA effect from when the basketball team went to the Sweet Sixteen. And so the—they throw off the projection algorithm a little bit, and so I think there's 4 or 5 projections out there. Some of them are higher than where we are this year. Some of them are close to where we are. And some of them are lower than where we are.

If you dig a little deeper, the orientation numbers—as orientation comes in the summer, that's probably a better indicator of where we're going to be, and so we'll know that as we move into the summer. But as of this morning, I think, when I looked, orientation numbers for new freshmen are up 3%. Housing contracts is also an indicator because students have to pay a \$250 deposit, and sometimes once you actually put money on the line, that's a better indicator of behavior. The housing contracts are about flat compared to where we were last year at this time. And then the number of admitted students was actually down 1.2%. So there's variance in that enrollment model right now, so we just kicked off—Bruce [Rieks] just sent an email this morning to Department Heads and others. And we just kicked off the budgeting process, but we—at this stage, it's so early, we will start to put together models that kind of show some on the lower end and some in the middle; probably not as much on the high end because it's, quite frankly, a little easier to respond to that when you have extra money than if you have to find money. So we'll kind of start looking at that, those ranges, and as we move towards the summertime with orientation, we'll winnow that down to know exactly where we're at with tuition revenue.

[pause] Oh, the other piece that we're just now coming through is advanced registrations. I think we just—we're in the middle of juniors now, maybe, registering for next Fall, and so we're hoping to see some of those numbers from the Registrar pretty quick here as well.

Peters: And so, in terms of planning for different tui—for different enrollment numbers, every 100 students is a net gain or loss of roughly.....?

Hager: Roughly, I think it is \$557,000. And just in the last 2 weeks, from the last time we looked at it at Cabinet—I think in the last 2 weeks we've gone up maybe close to 40 students. So all of the sudden there's another—

probably shouldn't do this _____ --I think it's another, what?, two hundred and some thousand dollars (\$2xx,000), and so it's—this is that time where that yield rate makes a huge difference for us. And I think what we've seen in previous years is the—what happens between now and when census data rolls around makes a big difference on those admitted students, because some of them get admitted to multiple schools. And so the phone calls that I know faculty are making, the outreach from Admissions Office, all of that makes a huge difference right now. This is kind of the end game in the recruitment cycle as I understand it. And so they don't work so much on the applications and admits as they work on yielding those that are already admitted.

Peters: Questions? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Yeah. When you said that orientation reservations were up, what, 3%? Is that from last Summer?

Hager: They were up 3.1% from its—date-to-date. Same time period.

DeBerg: Same time. Ok.

Hager: Yeah, and that was for new freshmen. Transfers are down, but it's still very early for transfers.

DeBerg: And my second question is, do you know if there's talk at the Cabinet level about things like the University of Iowa's billboard campaign in Cedar Falls? At least I haven't seen it in Waterloo. Best value, undergrad—I mean, is there talk about how they are kind of picking at our carcass?

Hager: There's been discussion. It hasn't been phrased that way Betty, but I do [loud laughter all around]—it is—no, there's been discussion that the—there's increased, particularly from the University of Iowa, there's increased focus on undergraduate students, and part of that's because the Regents have called out President Mason specifically on—they haven't focused on Iowa students.

DeBerg: Right.

Hager: And so—and part of this probably [pause]—I’m cognizant of the recording here—part of this might be perceived as discussions that we’re have—oh, I’m sorry, they were having a public forum in Iowa Press where President Rastetter—or President Lang and President Pro Tem Rastetter talked about questioning the appropriations to the 3 State Universities, and if they were divvied up the right way. And they thought they would look at that. So I don’t know the impetus for putting those billboards in town, but some have extrapolated that perhaps it’s a shot over the bow in response to that sort of thing, about discussing the re-appropriations.

DeBerg: Well, it seems like a pretty serious message, and I just wanted to know what—you know, I think some kind of strategy—I hope we have a strategy, that’s what I’ll say, about how to deal with that.

Hager: And that would be University Relations. I know when I talked to—University Relations is working on marketing, and I—they were running low on funds for the year, and I managed to find a little bit in my Division, and I passed it over to them, and one of the areas that was going to expire was the billboard sitting right outside Kirkwood College’s entrance. And I said, “Boy, I’d sure love to fund that,” because we’ve got those transfer students, and Kirkwood seems to have a good program, from what I’ve heard from people. So I think they are aware of it, and I think they’re doing what they can given the resources that are available to them. But I can’t speak on behalf of University Relations.

DeBerg: Ok. Yeah, I just wondered if you knew what was going on in the Cabinet, since you sit there.

Hager: Yeah, it’s been discussed.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: This is a question for both Provost **Gibson** and Vice President **Hager**. If there is a shortfall—I’m not sure you can answer this specifically, you know—what strategies are being put in place, since there was a

financial shortfall, to address that financial shortfall? Are we talking about additional layoffs? Are we—you know, there was an email that was sent out by Christine **Twait** about, you know, incentive fund monies and enterprise accounts and looking at those as potential revenue sources, which caused great alarm, you know, in and amongst certain faculty members. Can you comment about, you know, if we have a financial shortfall? I mean, in general, what are we going to do?

Hager: There's a couple strategies that we can look at. We're in a different position now than we were—was it 2 or 3 years ago when we had a major shortfall, because then they carried over—they, I'm sorry, I was here at the time—but the University carried over a deficit from the previous year into that year. We've been able to deal with this year's reduction in student enrollment. We were short about \$3.6 million this year. We've been able to deal with that this year, so we won't be carrying that over into next year. So, it's not the same position as where it was maybe 3 years ago when we had that serious situation. But what we're looking at now, and we're just starting to put the pieces together is if we have some carried forward money from the current year in terms of supplies and services money or salary savings that's not spent now, the Legislature changed the Iowa Code a few years ago where the Regents can carry that money over. It used to be at the end of the year that money just went back to the State. So it's called Carry Forward, or Advanced Commitment money is the Code definition. So we're trying to gather up as much Advanced Commitment money as we can right now and carry over to next year, and that will help now next year offset any enrollment decline. The challenge for that is it is one-time money, and so it gets us by 1 year. It's really not a good strategy to build a Budget based on one-time money, but it's a strategy that helps offset ups and downs related to that.

Gibson: I'm not sure which email you're referring to. I mean, are you saying from Christine **Twait**? [**Edginton** nodding.] Ok, I

Edginton: It went out across campus as I understand it or to at least those who receive grants and contracts on campus, and she said there was no....

Gibson: Ok, I'll have to get a copy of that and look at it. So I can't comment on that email, but what I can comment on is the fact that Academic Affairs does have salary savings, and it would be my hope not to have to use those, but I have salary savings.

Edginton: I really—just the question was, you know, do we have contingencies in place that will allow us to avoid situations that we've dealt with in the past. And it sounds like from both the Provost and the Vice President that some thinking has gone into this, and if we're going to be challenged with it, we're going to move forward in a way that's not going to be terribly disruptive to the University as a whole.

Hager: I think that's the goal anytime we can do that, Chris [Senator **Edginton**]. There's, you know—we're culling the accounts. There's some energy savings to be had for next year. We've been doing some energy—some lighting upgrades. We've got some very favorable bids on some lighting upgrades, and we took advantage of a loan opportunity through the—I think it was through DAS, the Department of Administrative Services at the State, and we're seeing some margin there where we think the bids are coming in lower, and we think the energy savings are going to be even more than what we—we're going to use to pay off the loan, so that extra money will go into the offset. People that were on the early retirement program from a few years ago, unfortunately some of them have passed away, and so there's a cost savings associated with that, so we're kind of combing the Budget looking for ways to save funds that don't impact operations or programs. So that's the first-line strategy, and that's kind of where we're at right now, is looking at those sorts of things.

Peters: Other questions? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Well, I'm not sure if I should direct this to you and the Provost or anybody who's on the Enrollment Management _____ program. I was just curious if anybody's looked into whether progress has been made on the speed at which we admit students. And the reason I'm asking the question is I've had a number of parents whose kids have applied, and it took a week to 2 weeks to hear back, which at other places they're hearing back in a couple of days. So—and I know we had a concern

expressed about that last year, so have we done—made any progress there, or can somebody speak to that?

Peters: My understanding from the Enrollment Council is we are supposed to have a 24 hour, I believe, response to applications right now, based on self-reported data. So, if you apply—the student applies and reports his or her GPA, class rank, ACT, whatever they require, then you get a response, I believe, within 24 hours, maybe it's 48. That's what we're supposed to have in place this year as far as I knew.

Terlip: Maybe it's just abnormal, but I have had a few people ask me about it, so I thought it was worth asking the question.

Peters: I will say that I do think that one place our competitors are beating us is on the financial aid side of things.

Terlip: Right.

Peters: They get back to them much quicker with scholarship offers than we do, much quicker.

Hager: I think that process is in place for undergraduate admissions. For graduate admissions, it's an entirely different situation.

Peters: Correct. Good point. Yes. Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Yeah, I have a question that's sort of related to this. And I don't know if we could categorize it as a loss leader to draw in more students, but our daughter's at Iowa, and we just got a very nice email a month ago telling us that she can go to Summer School for free up to 12 credit hours. This is great! I mean, bad for me because I'm actually the one who pays for her education, and I'm at UNI, but for her to go to Iowa and get up to 12 credit hours, that's just remarkable. Do you have any idea if, as we expend resources on recruitment and so on, what kind of return Iowa could expect out of this? I—they're not doing it out of altruism [laughter around], I imagine, but have we done any projections or any modeling for something like that?

Hager: Well, I think part of—I can't speak for Iowa. I don't know what their motivations for doing that are. I do know that there is increased—an article I was just reading I think over the weekend, they're working on their 4-year graduation rate. I know, it was another—it was a neighbor that forwarded that email, that same email, similar situation. And they're working on improving their 4-year graduation rate, and I think this is one of the ways they are doing that. In that same email I was reading, they also have a—I don't know if they are calling it a 4-year guarantee where a student pledges to take certain courses and they sign this at orientation, and then they agree to meet with their academic advisor on a regular basis, that they're guaranteeing that the University will offer those courses so they can graduate in 4 years. I believe that's what I read over the weekend, so....

Bruess: I have a follow-up on that. Do the other 2 Regents schools follow the same policies we do, that is, credit hours after a certain number are basically free? So after 14, that they [voice agreeing]

Hager: I think they use 12. I think that they do. [voices still agreeing]

Peters: And, Greg [Senator **Bruess**], I think that brings up a really good point, and this is something that I argued at the last meeting of the Enrollment Council, and that's that the Regents set the tuition, and tuition is the same among the 3 Regents' Universities, but the fact is that the size of the Foundations and the sheer amount of money that the other Universities have—are able to devote to their tuition set-aside scholarships—basically allows them to set different price points than we can for where the, you know, the Regents set the sticker price, but they can—they have a lot more flexibility than we do in setting the price you actually pay. And that's a long-term challenge for us, I think.

Bruess: And another related point is that in terms of also studying abroad in London this summer 10 students, 2 faculty, with full salary expenses covered, 10 was their minimum that they needed to go. And that they—she's paying probably around \$4.5 thousand for that program, which we cannot do here. That's impossible.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: I keep hearing that, particularly with regard to Iowa, but maybe to some extent with regard to Iowa State, that in so many respects they have so many more resources than we have, and I'm wondering is that the result of their size, a result of their heavier reliance on out-of-state students, or a result of historical inequities in funding? And is there any way of kind of equalizing those resources? Is there any prospect for that other than the _____ [squeaky chair made it sound like "full moon"?]

Hager: Well, I think there's probably at least several things factoring in there, Jerry [Vice-Chair **Smith**]. One would be size, so sometimes there's economies of scale associated with that obviously. I think the amount of State appropriations on a per student basis, some could make the case that that has an impact, and particularly a compounding impact over time. I think the size of the Foundation endowments probably contributes to that. If you look at—historically, a large percentage of our—for a long period of time, our alumni were teachers who are not known to make a lot of money. Now our business alumni has grown over the years, but again the compounding effect, I think, the large size of the Foundation makes a difference. And I think graduate programs and out-of-state students are significantly different, too.

Back to—I'm sorry, back to your question [to **Bruess**], I think the price per tuition is the same above 12 for the 3 schools, and I'm stepping out of my area—and Gloria [Provost **Gibson**], you might know—I do think there's some variance on how the 3 Universities treat students that are repeating courses and when they can drop courses. And I think that has an impact into availability of courses and people taking up seats that's not a revenue-producing seat. So I think there's some variance there.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I was —this is just for your information, I was at a faculty meeting at Iowa State last week, and their faculty are complaining that there's too many students. They've had a 25% increase in enrollment in the last 10

years, and their President has promised that over the next 2 years he will add 200 members to the tenure/tenure-track faculty to deal with this enrollment increase. And it was such a stark contrast to UNI. I thought it was worth mentioning. They're bursting at the seams, and the faculty feel abused by having to deal with so many students.

Hager: It's interesting—I think Texas I've been reading about has put a cap on the University of Texas. Texas, the State, put a cap to try to manage some of that a little bit.

Peters: Any other questions for Vice President **Hager**? [none heard] Ok, well, and you're welcome to stick around for our discussion about the

Hager: I will.

Peters: budgeting process, and I—and I apologize, I forgot to introduce Bruce **Rieks** [who sat next to Vice President **Hager**]. Most of you know him already, but Bruce **Rieks** is the Budget Director.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: All right. With that, we will move along on the Agenda. Minutes for approval. We have actually two sets of minutes for approval this time around. March 11th and March 25th. Are there any additions or corrections to the March 11th minutes? [none heard] Seeing none, if there is no objection, we'll consider those approved. Are there any additions or corrections to the March 25th minutes? [none heard] Seeing none, if there is no objection, we'll consider those approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1190 for Docket #1086, Election of Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (head of docket Apr 22)

Calendar Item 1137, Docket #1033, Policy Regarding Faculty Notification of Grade Changes—Report and recommendations from Educational Policies Commission (regular order)

Calendar Item 1191 for Docket #1087, Creation of faculty committees and procedures to implement Master Agreement due process standards for dismissal of faculty (regular order)

Calendar Item 1183, Docket #1079, Recommendations of ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review—Final recommendations (regular order)

Peters: You'll see the items for docketing up there [projected as the Agenda]. We have two items that are coming back to us. One from about a year ago actually, and that's that the EPC will be giving us their recommendations on policy on administrative grade changes and reporting to faculty if the grade is changed. And then the ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review will be doing its final recommendations. And then, of course, we have two new items: the election of a Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, which I've asked to be docketed at the head of the docket, and then the due process standards, the Senate's role in setting up these new due process standards under the Master Agreement. Are there any questions about any of—docketing any of those items? Senator **East**.

East: Do we know when we'll get results from the College elections for Faculty Senate?

Peters: Good question. We've got results from the Library and SBS. CHAS results, I believe, will be in about a week from today. And I don't remember now what the—what—Education is going to be in around the same time, about a week from today as I recall. And that leave Business, and I don't think I've heard a date for Business. Or, Business doesn't have anyone for the Sen—coming up for the Senate.

Smith: No Senate.

Peters: Business doesn't have any Senators coming up, so I think about this time next week we should know all the new Senators. I will be in touch with all of them, too, to remind them that they are eligible to come and vote. Under our Bylaws, the new Senators vote for who shall be Chair, in addition to the returning Senators.

DeBerg: Do the departing Senators vote?

Peters: I don't remember. I think not, but I'm not positive. If there are no more questions about these, could we get a motion to docket these consistent with the Chair's recommendations? Senator **MacLin** [who indicated]. Is there a second? Senator **Kidd** [who indicated]. Any discussion? Any further discussion about this? [none heard] All in favor, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] The motion carries, and they will be docketed in that order.

NEW BUSINESS

Peters: Is there any new business to bring to our attention today? [none heard] Seeing none, we'll proceed to the Consideration of Docketed Items.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1082, RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE DROP DATE TO 10 CLASS DAYS AFTER MIDPOINT OF SEMESTER (**Bruess/DeBerg**)

Peters: This first item came about as a result of kind of an occasional issue with the calendar. Registrar **Patton** emailed me about it and suggested that, if we were amenable, it would be appropriate to change the policy to indicate that the date to drop a course should be revised to "10 class days" after the midpoint in the semester, rather than just "10 calendar days," because this time 10 calendar days was during Spring Break. So, if there is any discussion about this, we'll need a motion first. Can I get a motion to

approve this change in policy? Senator **Degnin** [who indicated]. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator **Strauss** [who indicated]. Any discussion about this? Registrar **Patton** didn't really see the need to come, but he did want me to convey that he fully supports the change.

MaLin: Since it was his idea. [quiet voices in addition]

Peters: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: I just think it's a great idea. It's like what happened this semester is that I had my mid-term exams scheduled two weeks before the Spring Break. Because of snow days, I had to reschedule some of them. As a result, students don't get back their mid-term grades in time to make that decision. This gives them the extra flexibility that I think they need.

Peters: Other quest—other comments or discussion on this? Seeing none, shall we proceed to a vote? All in favor of making this policy change to change the date to drop a course to 10 class days after the midpoint of the semester, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1083, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JOHN W. **SOMERVILL**
(**Bruess/DeBerg**)

Peters: Next up we have a request for Emeritus status of John **Somervill**, and I apologize for the typo on the Agenda that initially went out. And we have Professor **Hildebrandt** from Psychology, I think, who wants to speak—or, sorry, we need a motion before we can do this. Can I get a motion to recommend or endorse his application for Emeritus status?

Dolgener: So move.

Peters: Senator **Dolgener**. Is there a second? Senator **MaLin** [who indicated]. Professor **Hildebrandt**?

Hildebrandt: Yes, I'm the Head of the Department of Psychology, so I'll just read some things about John **Somervill** first. Dr. **Somervill** earned his Ph.D. from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, in Clinical Psychology in 1970. He served his clinical internship in the Department of Psychiatry at the Ohio State University Health Center. In 1969 he joined the Department of Psychology at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and as an Assistant Professor and was granted tenure in 1973. He joined the Psychology Department at the University of Northern Iowa as an Associate Professor in 1975 and was granted tenure in 1978.

He served as the Associate Director of the Gerontology Center at the University of Northern Iowa between 1977 and 1979, as Interim Dean of the Graduate College from 1988 to 1989, and as Dean of the Graduate College from 1989 to 2004. I'll just go over some of his key administrative accomplishments:

He initiated a highly successful minority recruitment program and did a lot of traveling to bring students back from historically Black colleges and universities, and they had a wonderful graduation rate and over 30% of those completing Master's Degrees went on to be accepted into doctoral programs at other institutions.

He presided over the development of new interdisciplinary masters programs in Public Policy, Women's Studies, and Environmental Science.

He provided incentives and emphasized the development of recruitment strategies which has led to the highest increase in graduate enrollment in the history of the university at the time that he was working on that.

He began an exchange program through the auspices of the American Council of Teachers of Russian in 1989, which led to over 100 Russian students pursuing Master's Degrees in graduate programs at the University of Northern Iowa.

He initiated and provided support for a Russian Graduate Student String Quartet that performed at private schools, public schools, colleges, and universities throughout the State of Iowa. And that quartet of students

would come from St. Petersburg, and the quartet would change membership over the years that it existed.

He greatly expanded the staff of the Grants and Contracts Office and provided additional resources to encourage faculty to pursue grants. And the grant funding increased from \$3,592,373 from 1988-89 to over \$20 thousand—\$20 million in 2001-02, so he really put a lot of emphasis on that at the time that he was an administrator.

He is a very popular and well-respected professor. He consistently receives high teacher evaluations from his students. He's taught Introduction to Psychology which is our big course that brings in lots of majors, Abnormal Psychology, and Child and Adolescent Psychopathology. His most recent research has been in the area of pet therapy. And by that I don't mean therapy for pets [laughter around] but pets to do therapy with people of all ages and abilities and disabilities, and he has done that with a number of graduate and undergraduate students. Since coming to UNI, Dr. **Somervill** has supervised numerous honors and Master's theses and continues to stay in contact with his students, many of whom have gone on to successful careers in psychology and other disciplines.

So with this, I highly recommend that Dr. **Somervill** be granted Emeritus status at the University of Northern Iowa.

Peters: Thank you very much. Any other discussion of Professor **Somervill's** Emeritus application? Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote. All in favor of endorsing Professor **Somervill's** request for Emeritus status, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries.

I would ask consent of the Senate. I would ask if there is any objection if we skip order here and do one more quick—what I expect anyway to be a quick—piece of business, and that's the approval of a Geography course before we do the budgeting? Is there any objection to that? [none seen] Thank you.

DOCKET #1073, CURRICULUM CHANGES—GEOGRAPHY (GEOG 4390/5390
GIS PROGRAMMING TABLED AT 2/25/13 MEETING)

Peters: We'll need a motion to take this off the table. The approval of this particular course was tabled at our February 25th meeting.

DeBerg: I so move.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg** moves to take this off the table. Is there a second?

Terlip: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. You'll recall that this was a course that had not gone through the Grad. Council level yet, and it was listed as a 4000/5000 course. It has now gone through the Grad. Council. There were also some programmatic changes, but I take it, Professor [Patrick] **Pease** [Geography Department Head], that's going to go through next year?

Pease: Yes.

Peters: The changes to the MA program are going to go through next year?

Pease: Yes.

Peters: Ok. So the only thing

Pease: [10-15 words spoken but audience position made it too quiet to hear on recording]

Peters: So the only thing before right now then is the approval of this course.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: The Agenda talks about 2 courses.

Peters: Yes, I apologize. That was a mistake on my part. I got confused with—there were two 4000/5000 level Physics courses, you might recall, a few weeks ago. It was just one Geography course. So it's Geography 4390/5390 GIS Programming. Any questions? Discussion? Seeing none, we'll proceed to a vote. All in favor of approving this course, Geography 4390/5390, GIS Programming, please say, "Aye." [eyes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries. Thank you.

DOCKET #1084 [sic, #1085], IMPROVING FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS (**Terlip/Strauss**)

Peters: And that brings us to the motion to improve faculty participation in University planning and budgeting, and since this is being presented as a report from a Committee, I'll just recognize Professor [Adam] **Butler** [Chair, Senate Budget Committee] to lead our discussion for us.

Butler: Thank you, Chair **Peters**. I am back again as Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, and one of the things we were asked to do is generate a process for consultation on the University Budget. My understanding right now is that there is no process in place currently for that to occur, even though I can't speak to how common it is. But at other universities, particularly other State universities, they have processes in place for consultation, particularly with faculty on the Budget. So, this is a rough proposal because this is something that would have to be negotiated with our incoming President [**Ruud**] and the Provost [**Gibson**] and other stakeholders.

What we are proposing [go to:

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/unibudgetconsultationprocess.pdf>]

very generally is that a consultation process be developed that follows the AAUP recommendations for faculty consultation on budgetary matters.

[see also: <http://www.aaup.org/report/role-faculty-budgetary-and-salary-matters>]

Our goals with the consultation are to in—basically to increase communication, both upward communication from the faculty to the President and lateral communication from the faculty who would serve on

this Consultation Committee or Council to other faculty and also receive input from other faculty. The other main goal would be to engage in budgetary monitoring, which really up until probably last year most faculty didn't spend a lot of time doing. So, we would look at historical trends in budgeting, compare spending to peer institutions, monitor spending of discretionary dollars, and provide some accountability in terms of spending that's consistent with the Strategic Plan.

Again, the consultation process here is something that needs to be negotiated, but we do propose what we're calling a Planning and Budgeting—Planning and Budget Council. We also propose that membership in the Council would be drawn to reflect the ratio of dollars that are allocated to various Units within the University. So, for example, given that the Academic Affairs constitutes about 35% of the University Budget, about a third of the members of this committee would be faculty. That would be consistent with a few [?] recommendations for faculty consultation.

And, I guess, Chair **Peters** had shared with me a document that was from the SUNY system [found at: <http://www.suny.edu/facultysenate/Budget%20handbook%202012.pdf>] where they found that when these councils have greater proportions of faculty representation, the budgetary process is perceived as more fair. So, we would like to see pretty significant faculty representation on the committee. So that's all we have. Questions?

Peters: Questions? Discussion? This SUNY document that Professor **Butler** referred to, somewhere in here—I can't seem to find it now—but there's kind of a nice summary—there—there it is. It starts on page 15 of the document, if you have a chance to look at it. It just kind of gives a nice summary of best practices in budget consultation. Questions? Discussion? Senator **Heston**.

Heston: Well, I just had a clarifying question. I guess I was—I misunderstood. I thought Academic Affairs was something closer to two-thirds of the Budget? [Provost **Gibson** nodding] Ok, and so I just was confused about that. Thank you.

Butler: Ok.

Peters: We can make a change to reflect that.

Butler: Right.

Peters: And I saw another hand, I know. I think it was you. Maybe it was you? Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I notice that you drew the notion of the Planning and Budget Council from our incoming President's structure at Shippensburg, but I didn't notice in looking at their document how they determined the membership of that Council. Do you have any sense of that?

Peters: It—I'm sorry

Butler: Go ahead.

Peters: I've looked up individual members on that Budget and Planning Council in the Shippensburg Directory, and it's very heavily tilted toward administrators actually. It's—there's a lot of overlap between that Council and what we would call the Cabinet. He doesn't call it the Cabinet. His Cabinet is a bigger set of advisors, but I think the basic process, though, that he's used at Shippensburg—you know, we can negotiate about the make-up of the Council—the basic process, though, is one if you look at the document where the different units of the University come up with their Budget Proposals early on, demonstrate how it furthers their strategic goals, the strategic goals of the University of a whole. It gets presented to both what we could call the "Cabinet" and to this Planning and Budgeting Committee, both of which pass on reports to the President. And then the Planning and Budgeting Council follows up later as well, as does the Cabinet, I believe.

Smith: Thanks. See, the question I have is if you've got the Cabinet and it covers all dimensions of the University, and if we're concerned to have faculty input, why would we want another body/committee/council

whatever that wasn't just faculty that in some sense was again covering all the units of the University? I guess I'm wondering just about the structuring of that—of those bodies and what the intent is. Why would we want full University coverage in this Council? Why not a separate thing just for faculty? What's the rationale in there? That's what I'm wondering about.

Edginton: Can I respond to that very quickly? If you go and look at

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: If you look at the AAUP Guidelines, I think it's clear and answers that question. There are two requirements in the Guidelines. One is that we have clearly understood channels of communication; then second participation by each group—governing board, President, faculty—in the process, and that preparation of the or review of the total institutional budget as well as the proportionality of the budget for each of the fiscal decision divisions should be addressed in that structure. So, I think, you know, if in the Academic Affairs area 70% of the Budget is reflected, then we should have some influence that reflects that 70%, according to AAUP Guidelines as I—that's the way I understand them. So

Peters: Professor **Butler**, anything to add?

Butler: I have nothing to add.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I want to commend this proposal for one thing that I think is absolutely crucial and that there are public arguments and public data shared when people are making claims about what the Budget is and what actions need to be taken on it. I'm excited about a group in which starting from relatively small units on up people have to do that. They have to talk about what their goals are. They have to make Budget Proposals in the context of that. So, I really like this part of the process, something that I don't think we've had before.

Peters: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I have a question. I know that with the SUNY system a lot of the decisions are made at the Chancellor level up in Albany. Does that—does it work—I mean, is it convertible? Is it scalable to take a system that’s so much of that budget work is done up in Albany, with shared governance in mind, and then how does it work with these specific institutions? I don’t—the same system applies in Minnesota, with the Minnesota State University system. Decisions are made at that State level and then I think the money just kind of—it goes down to the universities and then at that point, I suspect, then the President or the Provost and the Vice President of Finance would start divvying it up.

Peters: I—I mean, I don’t know the details about the SUNY system. The—I thought the part of this document that was—that might be useful as we talked to incoming President **Ruud** about this was this part that starts on page 15, Best Practices in Campus Budget Processes, to talk about. They’re pretty broad actually. You have a committee, that the committee is broadly representative, it meets frequently, it has scheduled meetings, it keeps minutes, it has agreed upon procedures. They’re pretty broad goals, I think, broad guidelines in terms of what, within the SUNY system, what their experience has been about what works more effectively than other things. And you’re actually right that there could be unique situations within the SUNY system that makes some of these things work better there than they might work here, and that’s something useful to keep in mind. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I also think it’s a good proposal. But one of the things I know that would have to be negotiated with President **Ruud** in terms of the communication, I always get a little suspicious when it says “when necessary,” so I think it should also include an annual report at minimum to the [Faculty] Senate or something like that, or “upon request of the Senate” so that that language is also built into the proposal so that we can ask for the information as well.

Peters: So you’re look—you’re talking about the

Terlip: In terms of the goals where

Peters: the goals, “report to the Senate when necessary,” so maybe “report to the Senate regularly” or something or to the Senate?

Terlip: Yeah, or even an annual report so that at minimum. I mean, I’m hoping times get great and we won’t have to worry about this [light laughter around]. My suspicion is that we at least are going to want some sort of feedback every year.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: It seems to me that there’s some confusion between our Senate Budget Committee in this process that—I mean, Senator **Smith** suggested that, you know, our Committee should be us, should be faculty. The heck with everybody else. I think that this—and I agree with that with respect to our Budget Committee, that our Budget Committee should be our Budget Committee. What we think we’re asking—what I think we’re asking for here is that the budgeting process be more transparent and include a broader, a more representative body of folks doing that planning and that regular meetings, minutes kept, presumably available to faculty and others, that those things would be important and in that case it seems to me that—not clear to me that this is our committee. This is the University thing. They would not necessarily be reporting to the [Faculty] Senate. I mean, they would be doing a job. They would be keeping records. They would be doing it in public. They would be arguing rationales and providing rationales for their decision-making, I presume, and that we would still have our Budget Committee who is monitoring and making recommendations that come from the Faculty Senate that would—and go before that Committee and argue things that the faculty think are important and that we may still want both of those bodies. That if this is approved and is put into practice, we may well still want our Budget Committee working to sort of watch these people and make sure that they—they’re doing the kind of job that the [Faculty] Senate thinks they should be doing, rather than the Senate as a whole trying to do that.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, Phil's [Senator **East**] point goes on to something I said, and it is a concern I'm having here that I can understand how the Academic Affairs aside that if you just go at the Un—at the Senate—not the Senate, the Cabinet level, that faculty wouldn't feel that their interests were necessarily reflected in how academic administrators express things at that level, and so you need some way of getting faculty involvement. But when you set up this Council, Planning and Budget Council, and now you're including the whole University in it, what I'm wondering is for the non-Academic Affairs part of the University, how is what you're going to have on there—the discussion, the goals, the agendas, whatever—how's that going to vary from what those parts of the University would express at the Cabinet level? It seems to me it's going to be essentially the thing, and you're just now having that in conjunction with the faculty, and so it's almost like—it's like duplicative on the non-academic side of the University, it seems to me. Why not just have a faculty body that had input into the process and that was something analogous to the Budget Committee we've had? I guess I don't see how the Planning and Budget Council does things for the non-academic side of the University that are adding value over and beyond the advice that the President would be getting through the Cabinet? That's kind of my question.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I think that's a good question, but what comes to me is that the Cabinet meetings aren't public. We don't know what arguments are made on the part of non-academic units, and I would be really well educated—I mean, I would be educated to know what their arguments are, what their case is. So, I think having a more public forum for all parts of the University to make arguments about money is—would be really good for everyone.

Smith: Ok.

DeBerg: So, that's what I like about it.

Smith: Ok. Good.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: Look further. Aren't there approximately 13 individuals that sit in the Cabinet?

Gibson: Aren't there what?

Edginton: Thirteen individuals that sit in the Cabinet, or something like that? 10?

Gibson: Thirteen seems high.

Edginton: Too high?

DeBerg: I think everyone but you, Chris [Senator **Edginton**]. [light laughter around]

Edginton: Yeah. Well, eventually. [more laughter around] But, you know, all we have is the Provost's voice competing against all these other elements, and so, you know, the question is, in a proportional sense, how do we increase our voice as faculty where those decisions are being made? I think that's the critical issue.

Smith: We could have done that with just a faculty committee.

Edginton: Possibly.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: Well, I guess I'm confused. I thought this would replace the Cabinet as the Budgeting Process, rather than provide input to them. If the President has a Budgeting Committee, then he doesn't need a Cabinet to do budgeting, I would think.

Peters: That—I guess I would say that's largely up to the incoming President about how he'd structure things. The way the Shippensburg system works, as I understand it, is he has a—like I say, he doesn't call it the

“Cabinet.” I think he calls it the “Executive Committee” or something like that, but it’s kind of the Vice Presidents. And I believe, if I remember the document correctly, he gets advice both from the Vice Presidents as a group and from this Planning and Budgeting Council, which includes the Vice Presidents as well as faculty and students. And he gets advice from both places, and then, of course, the President makes the final decisions about those things. But how that would transfer over here exactly, who knows what kinds of changes he might make? I mean, I stress that even like at Iowa State University, when President Leath took over, I recall reading in the paper last Fall that he had reviewed the budget process and decided he liked about, oh, 90% of it, and, eh, there was this one little thing he didn’t like, and this one little thing he didn’t like, and he just changed those. So, you know, it’s hard to know exactly what he [incoming President **Ruud**] will want to do once he gets here. Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: It strikes me that another way to think about this after I’m following it. I’m just thinking about the model you just mentioned. If the— yes, there might be some duplication there, but it’s—let’s say, we’re talking about the model you’re talking about there that the Executive or the Vice Presidents there, at least when they were initially putting the Budget together, they’re hearing a lot more input and a lot more discussion, so then when they get together with the President, they have a much broader base of ideas already there. And if that’s the kind of process that we’re setting up, then, yes, there’s going to be some duplication, but at some point you also have to keep narrowing things down just to get the work done. So....

Peters: Other questions or comments? Seeing none. Shall we proceed to a vote? Shall we have a motion to approve this with the only change I heard being to reflect that about two-thirds of the Budget comes from Academic Affairs? And, oh, and also modify the language in 1-d up there [see Addendum 3] to indicate some sort of regular report to the Senate or regular, rather than just when necessary. Can we get a motion to approve that with those 2 changes based on the discussion I heard?

Kirmani: I have a question first.

Peters: Yes, Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Is there going to be any student representation on this?

Peters: There very well could be. We don't have that proposal in here, but President **Ruud** used a number of students on the Committee at Shippensburg, I know that. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I had one other, I guess, question. I know—I'm really glad that under the process the faculty members of the Council would be chosen by the faculty, so I guess I want it on the record we're assuming they will—there will be some sort of election rather than appointment, or.... Yeah, that's sort of hazy, isn't it?

Peters: Professor **Butler**, do have any—your thoughts on that?

Butler: I think that there would have to be an election because I'm not sure how the faculty in general would appoint.

Terlip: Well, sometimes it gets delegated to the [Faculty] Senate, and I don't know that that's the same process, so....

Peters: I think, I guess what I would say is that the most important thing is that it's not picked by the President himself, and that everything after that would be up for negotiation, but certainly if the [Faculty] Senate feels strongly that it should say "elected" not "chosen by," then we could move to modify that as well. Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: What are we approving exactly?

Peters: This—we are—would be approving this set of recommendations [Addendum 3] for President **Ruud**—for President **Ruud**.

Strauss: So we would forward an approved set of recommendations that has no teeth to it. It's just hope that this next President listens to us, factors these recommendations into his

Peters: Well, perhaps—perhaps—that’s a good point. Perhaps we should have, along with it, a motion to, I don’t know, authorize the Chair to negotiate a process consistent with the—but, I mean, I think that’s kind of the—I guess, I thought that was kind of assumed, that over the Summer that the Chair would

Strauss: Carry this to the President, and say, “Let’s....

Peters: And say, “Let’s sit down and do this.” But if we want to make that explicit, then I don’t know. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: This is back to the prior topic. I very strongly support adding “elected” to the text, and it’s because the [Faculty] Senate doesn’t know everyone, and I would very much hate to see a group this important and this large be appointed by the Senate. I think that would be a mistake.

Peters: Should I take that as a motion to amend the report?

DeBerg: I amend the report to say “faculty chosen by—members chosen” but I don’t know how—I don’t have the text in front of me.

Terlip: Just change “chosen” to “elect” so “would be elected by the faculty” rather than “chosen by the faculty.”

Peters: All right. Yes. This line here.

DeBerg: Yes, to substitute “elected” for “chosen.” Thank you.

Terlip: Seconded.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Is there discussion about this “elected” versus “chosen”? Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: The only question I have is I assume this doesn’t close off the possibility that, for example, it could be—that the positions could be proportionate to Colleges, etc., etc. And it doesn’t say—I wouldn’t want to

see them all just elected at large because different groups know different people, depending on how many there are.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**, do you—to leave open—to leave open the

DeBerg: Yeah, I'd just like—let's just put—I—to me “elected” is general enough, and that can be worked out.

Degnin: That's fine.

Terlip: And it's a sub-point of the proportional major point, so I assume it's taken care of.

Degnin: Yeah. Ok. Good, thank you.

Peters: Any further discussion about the amendment? Seeing none, should we proceed to a vote on the amendment? The motion is to amend the report by substituting the word “elected” for the word “chosen” in little Roman Numeral iii [light laughter around]. That's—let's make sure I get this right—under “Proposed Consultation Process,” it's number 1-a-iii. All in favor of the amendment, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries. Were there any objections to the other two changes to the document that we talked about earlier: the change to the language about reporting to the Senate or the change to the language about the share of the University Budget coming from Academic Affairs? Senator **East**.

East: I think that's a—it's a fine bargaining point, but it doesn't seem to me to be a pla—the reporting to the [Faculty] Senate being necessary or regularly or whatever. It's a fine bargaining point, but again while I think the Senate does a fine job, or can do a fine job, it's not clear to me that they—everybody on campus needs to report to the Senate. If this Council's records are clear and available to the Budget Committee, it's not clear to me—I don't see a need to have the Council report to the Senate. That seems—there's no time for the Senate to do any business if we're receiving reports from everybody on campus.

Peters: Other comments? Seeing none, shall we proceed to a vote? All in favor of approving these recommendations that will be forwarded on to President **Ruud**, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries. [see Addendum 3 for approved version of recommendations]

ADJOURNMENT [4:38 p.m.]

Peters: And that brings us to the end of our Agenda today. If there is no objection, we will stand adjourned.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

04/22/13
Maucker Union Oak Room
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 4 addenda to these Minutes.

University Building Access Procedures and Guidelines

DRAFT

General Statement:

The University of Northern Iowa is actively concerned for the safety of all UNI faculty, staff and students on campus. Safety is best achieved when members of the campus community work together to promote a safe environment. The following provides guidelines for access to UNI buildings. It is intended to promote discussion and share responsibility in providing safe access to academic and administrative buildings on campus. Auxiliary units or programs designated with responsibility to run specific facilities are responsible for having written guidelines and procedures that address access, safety and security.

- Building Hours
 - Standard open hours for academic and administrative buildings are Monday through Thursday 7am-10pm; Friday, 7am-5:30pm. These buildings normally will be closed during weekends and university holidays.
 - Standard open hours for academic and administrative buildings when classes are not in session are Monday through Friday 7am-5:30pm and closed weekends and university holidays.
 - Buildings may also be closed at other days/times when the university is unexpectedly closed or all classes cancelled (i.e. closed due to weather) based on the time of day of the university closure.
 - Operating hours for auxiliary units or programs with designated responsibility to run specific facilities are to be determined by each area, with approval by their respective supervisors.
 -
- Approval and Handling of Requests for Non-Standard and Special Building Hours
 - Requests for permanent changes to standard operating hours should be submitted to the appropriate dean or vice president.
 - Requests for temporary exceptions to standard operating hours should be submitted to the point of contact identified for the specific building.
 - Evaluation of such requests should consider:
 - Is another facility open to allow for the same function to occur? Minimizing the number and hours of open buildings allows conservation of energy and financial resources.
 - Are others on campus at the proposed time and place? Consider what student safety issues may be germane if the proposed access is allowed.

- How can student and staff safety be assured if access is granted? It is strongly recommended that any areas with extended, non-standard operating hours create a safety plan in consultation with UNI Police.
 - In order to insure proper heating, cooling, ventilation and appropriate locking/unlocking schedules, approved changes to a building's standard operating hours should be sent to the Registrar, UNI Police, and Physical Plant. It is also suggested that all department heads within the facility be notified of any substantive changes.
- The University Registrar may adjust standard building hours to accommodate requests for specific classes or activities. Any changes initiated by the Registrar shall be sent to UNI Police, Physical Plant, and the specified building contact person.
- Requests for after-hours access:
 - Faculty and staff (including graduate assistants) who are issued keys or electronic access may enter facilities at their discretion. Others (i.e. student employees, assistants, etc.) issued keys may enter facilities based on the parameters of their identified responsibilities. Individuals in buildings after hours may be asked to show their university identification.
 - After-hours access for students is at the discretion of the appropriate building contact who is also responsible for notifying UNI Police and Physical Plant of such decisions.
 - Students who are allowed access to specialized areas in UNI academic buildings must follow established safety guidelines for those areas. Specialized areas are understood to include science labs (research and teaching), art and theatre production areas, machine shops, studios, practice rooms/rehearsal spaces and other areas where specialized equipment or materials are kept. Department heads are responsible for making sure that faculty, staff and students are aware of the safety guidelines for the specialized areas in their buildings.
 - As a general practice University Police will not provide after-hours access.
 - After a building is closed, no door shall be blocked open. Nor will any individual not approved for access be admitted to the building. Individuals in buildings after hours may be asked to show their university identification.

XX.XX After-Hours Building Access Policy

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide faculty, staff and students with convenient and safe after-hours access to university buildings, in support of academic and student programs and activities. It also seeks to insure that university property is safeguarded.

Policy Statement

Faculty and staff (including graduate assistants) who are issued keys or electronic access may enter facilities at their discretion. Others (i.e. student employees, assistants, etc.) issued keys may enter facilities based on the parameters of their identified responsibilities. Individuals in buildings after hours may be asked to show their university identification.

The University takes seriously its responsibility to provide students and university employees with safe facilities, and well maintained equipment and materials. Individuals accessing University buildings after-hours also take responsibility for their own safety by following policies and procedures established for access and usage. Individuals should also follow all site-specific requirements (i.e. for specific labs or work spaces) that have been developed.

This policy applies to all exterior doors of UNI administrative and academic buildings on campus. Programs or auxiliary units given responsibility for managing specific facilities must have their own set of written guidelines for building access which meet the minimum requirements of this policy and which have been approved by their respective department head.

Points of contact will be identified for each building and will be responsible for processing all requests for after-hours access. For purposes of scheduling the University Registrar is also authorized to grant exceptions.

University buildings covered in this policy will have established, standard operating hours. These hours will be listed at www.uni.edu/xxxxx. Special events, weekend classes or other such events that occur outside these hours are allowed, provided they have been approved by the building point of contact or the University Registrar and communicated in advance to Physical Plant and University Police (to insure proper heating, cooling ventilation and the appropriate schedule for locking/unlocking the facility). Building hours may be adjusted based on unexpected university closure or cancellation of classes (i.e. weather related changes.)

Requests for permanent changes to standard operating hours should be submitted to the appropriate dean or vice president. Requests for temporary exceptions to standard operating hours should be submitted to the point of contact identified for the specific building.

Students (both undergraduate and graduate) may not be in a building after hours unless they have been approved or are under the direct supervision of a faculty or staff member who is actively monitoring the student's work or activities. Procedures and guidelines can be found at www.uni.edu/xxxxx

As a general practice University Police will not provide after-hours access.

Any person in University buildings after hours may not prop open doors or allow unauthorized persons into the facility. Individuals authorized to be in University buildings after hours are authorized only for specifically designated areas and are not allowed free access to all areas of the building.

Students who are allowed access to specialized areas in UNI buildings must follow established safety guidelines for those areas. Specialized areas are understood to include science labs (research and teaching), art and theatre production areas, machine shops, studios, practice rooms/rehearsal spaces and other areas where specialized equipment or materials are kept. Department heads are responsible for making sure that faculty, staff and students are aware of the safety guidelines for the specialized areas in their building(s).

Additional Resources:

1. Safety website: <http://www.uni.edu/resources/safety>
2. UNI Public Safety: <http://www.vpaf.uni.edu/pubsaf/>
3. Environmental Health and Safety: <http://www.vpaf.uni.edu/ehso/index.shtml>
4. Key Policy: <http://www.uni.edu/policies/962>
5. Building hours: www.uni.edu/xxxxxxx

Vice President for Administration and Financial Services, approved month, date, 2013
President's Cabinet, approved month, date, 2013

Addendum 3 of 4

Proposal for Budget Consultation Process
UNI Faculty Senate Budget Committee

Faculty Goals for Consultation Process

- 1 Communication:
 - a Communicate priorities of the faculty to the President
 - b Communicate to faculty about budget
 - c Receive input from faculty regarding budget
 - d Report to Senate
- 2 Monitoring:
 - a Track budgetary and spending requests across university
 - b Compare budgets over time
 - c Compare spending to peer institutions
 - d Monitor spending of discretionary dollars
 - e Ensure spending tied to strategic plan; provide accountability

Proposed Consultation Process

- 1 At President's discretion, University would form a Planning and Budget Council
 - a Membership in the Council would be drawn to roughly reflect ratio of dollars allocated in budget
 - i According to [this budget document for the SUNY system](#), the budget process is perceived as more fair when faculty predominate on the budget committee
 - ii The role of faculty in the budget process should be consistent with [AAUP recommendations](#)
 - iii Faculty members of the Council would be elected by the faculty
 - b As administrators have other opportunities to influence the budget process (see model document linked below), Council members for Academic Affairs would be drawn from the faculty
- 2 Function of Committee
 - a Council's work would be similar to [the model](#) used by President Ruud at Shippensburg University (see p. 6)
 - b Process would be developed to accomplish objectives above

Approved by University Faculty Senate, April 8, 2013

Addendum 4 of 4

Testimonial for John W. Somervill

Dr. John Somervill earned his Ph.D. from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville in Clinical Psychology in 1970. He served his clinical internship in the Department of Psychiatry at the Ohio State University Health Center. In 1969 he joined the Department of Psychology at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale as an Assistant Professor and was granted tenure in 1973. He joined the Psychology Department at the University of Northern Iowa as an Associate Professor in 1975 and was granted tenure in 1978.

Dr. Somervill served as the Associate Director of the Gerontology Center at the University of Northern Iowa from 1977-1979, as Interim Dean of the Graduate College from 1988-1989, and as Dean of the Graduate College from 1989-2004. Here are some of his key administrative accomplishments:

He initiated a highly successful minority recruitment program. While he was Dean, 70% of minority graduate students completed their degrees and over 30% of those completing masters degrees were accepted into doctoral programs at other institutions. (I think I made a parenthetical remark about his trips to the South to recruit students from HBCU's (historically black colleges and universities).

He presided over the development of new interdisciplinary masters programs in Public Policy, Women's Studies, and Environmental Science.

He provided incentives and emphasized the development of recruitment strategies which led to the highest increase in graduate enrollment in the history of the university (as of 2009).

He began an exchange program through the auspices of the American Council of Teachers of Russian in 1989, which let do over 100 Russian students pursuing masters degrees in graduate programs at the University of Northern Iowa.

He initiated and provided support for a Russian Graduate Student String Quartet which performed at private schools, public schools, colleges, and universities throughout the State of Iowa. New students from St. Petersburg were admitted to the School of Music on an annual basis.

He greatly expanded the staff of the Grants and Contracts Office and provided additional resources to encourage faculty to pursue grants. Outside funding from federal and state sources increased from \$3,592,373 in 1988-89 to over \$20 million in 2001-02 with 76% of the proposals funded.

Dr. Somervill is a very popular and well-respected professor. He has consistently

received high teaching evaluations from his students in Introduction to Psychology, Abnormal Psychology, and Child and Adolescent Psychopathology. His most recent research has been in the area of pet therapy. By that I don't mean therapy for pets (audience laughter) but the use of pets in doing therapy with people of different ages, abilities, and disabilities. He has done this research in collaboration with both graduate and undergraduate students. Since coming to UNI, Dr. Somervill has supervised numerous honors and masters theses and continues to stay in contact with his students, many of whom have gone on to successful careers in psychology and other disciplines.

I highly recommend that Dr. Somervill be granted Emeritus Status at the University of Northern Iowa.

Carol Hildebrandt
Chair, Department of Psychology
University of Northern Iowa