

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
02/20/11 (3:33 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.)
Mtg. #1708

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Emily Christensen from the *Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier* was present. Also, Blake Findley from the *Northern Iowan* was present.

Chair **Funderburk's** comments included thanking everyone for joining the Senators today. He reiterated the topic for this specially-called Faculty Senate meeting and noted that Robert's Rules will be adhered to, with this meeting being a Committee of the Whole. He noted that as UNI has a collective bargaining unit on campus, some topics fall under United Faculty purview, and others to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate's domain includes anything that impacts the academic mission or academic side. No official action will be taken today. This is just an open discussion of the topic. Anyone present is welcome to speak. They were asked to raise their hand, move to the center table, and state their full name prior to their comments.

2. New Business/Special Topic: Discussion regarding "University Budget Priorities with regards to Auxiliary/Athletic Funding and Budget Cuts."

Approximately 100 guests attended this special Faculty Senate meeting, and many offered comments (see transcript following).

Actionable results: The Faculty Senate Chair will invite President **Allen** to come to a Senate meeting to discuss these concerns.

6. Adjournment

Chair Jeff Funderburk asked for a motion to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. (**Edginton/Dolgener**). Ayes were heard all around.

Next regular meeting:

Monday, February 27, 2012

CBB 319

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE SPECIAL
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 20, 2012
Mtg. 1708**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, James **Jurgenson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

Absent: Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** (3:33 p.m.): I'd like to call the meeting to order. (many voices visiting; some 100 guests in attendance) I'd like to call the meeting to order, please.

Breitbach: Ladies and gentlemen. (sharp whistle from audience and then quiet) Colleagues. Thank you. As our Chair is, has, and continues off and on to lose his voice today, I would ask that we try to keep things as quiet as possible so that we can hear him speak. If his voice goes out, I shall take over his vocal duties. (laughter)

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Emily Christensen from the *Courier*.
Blake Findley from the *Northern lowan*.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: Thank you very much. First, thanks everybody for joining us today. A couple of remarks just about how this runs. Many of you already know this. This is a special meeting of the [UNI Faculty] Senate. The Senate operates under Robert's Rules. This is considered to be a modified Committee of the Whole, with the modification being that I'll try to remain Chair today for this. We are here for one single topic: that is, to discuss the idea of budget priorities, particularly as it was mentioned in the original note, budget priorities related to Athletics and auxiliary enterprises, but I think anything that affects the academic area is appropriate for that.

We are a little bit different than our sister Universities, so that there are some guidelines because we have a collective bargaining unit on campus. And there are certain topics that are the domain of United Faculty and others which are clearly in the domain of the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate's primary responsibility is for the academic mission and academic side of the University, and anything that would impact the academic side winds up being fair game for discussion here. With that said, I guess the obvious thing to say at this point would be "Let the games begin."

I don't know that—we're here not to do official action today, but this is an open discussion, Committee of the Whole, and I don't know if anyone would like the floor first to make comments? Hopefully, most of you saw that we have many things on the website for information. Many of our colleagues have prepared reports through—fresh reports and also through recent years about various funding trends over the last 10 years as well as some specific funding issues related to budgets here. Those are available on the web, and if we need any of that, that can be called up also via the Secretary at any time [projected on a large screen]. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, Mr. Chair, you may want to welcome the guests—the people who are visiting—and tell them that they have a right to speak. How should they be recognized?

Funderburk: Absolutely. If you do wish to speak, just raise your hand so I can see it. I've asked some people to watch behind me, more for security than for recognition (laughter).

Breitbach: Let me add that, if you do need to speak, you will need to make your way to the table. You will need to state your full name for the record and for the audio receivers so that—so that we can get a transcript of our—of our meeting. So please raise your hand, and since we have so many people back there, maybe if you would make your way up here somewhere. Maybe this corner [near head table] would be a good place for guests to stand or sit while they have the floor.

NEW BUSINESS/SPECIAL TOPIC

“Discussion regarding University Budget Priorities with regards to Auxiliary/Athletic Funding and Budget Cuts”

Funderburk: [pause with no raised hands] No one seems to be interested in speaking. Everyone wants to come, but nobody wants to speak. [voices noting someone in the back wants to speak]

Breitbach: Senator—wait. Senator **Kirmani**, did you have your hand up?

Kirmani: No. [explaining he was indicating someone behind the head table wished to speak] (light laughter)

Frank **Thompson** [Professor, Finance]: [making his way to the center of the room] Would it—would it be possible to put up my report on auxiliary programs?

Peters: [running the laptop for projection] Which one would that be? [several voices attempting to help navigate to the correct file; **Thompson** sorting it out to identify the correct URL]

Thompson: Ok, it would be the “examination of general education funding support used for athletics 1997-2011”

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/an_examination_of_general_education_funding_support_used_for_athletics_1997-2011.pdf

Ok, scroll down. This—this is a report that’s an update of a report that was done in 2007. It provides a listing, and this is a summary of transfers that have gone out of the General Education Fund beginning in 1997, some 14 years ago. These particular numbers in this report--I give at the preface of it, to how you can get to these numbers. But, basically, on our particular online web system you can get--at the end of each year, they report what is called the “Supplemental to the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.” So these numbers are driven off of that, and if you look at any one—there’s—any one of the budgets for these particular areas, at the end of the report

Breitbach: Watch the wire, **Frank**. [warning of possible entanglement in cords]

Thompson: Ok. At the end of the report, they will give you the amount of revenues and the amount of expenses. The differences between the amount of revenues and expenses represent the loss in that ancillary unit for the year. Then at the very bottom, they will indicate the amount of money that went from the General Education Fund as support for that deficit. What is new is that, with respect to some of these particular accounts, they actually finished the year with a negative net asset balance.

So, for instance, in the Athletic Program last year, they ended the year with around a \$700,000 net negative asset balance. That’s very curious. What that means, then, is that, unlike an academic program where your Supplies and Services Budget has to be run in such a way that it balances out--you can’t spend any more than what you have available--apparently the ancillary units have gotten a different way of doing things. They can finish the year with a negative and carry it over into the next year. Now it’s not—

this report's not written on the basis that any one area--we dislike any one area.

What this is is—and I taught Financial Planning for 8 years—is this is a financial planning discussion. What the faculty, I believe, want to have is a— is a ability to be included in that discussion. What this indicates is that for a period of 14 years the faculty have not had that discussion, and this particular problem, what this data would indicate, is one that is not going away. It was not going way in 2007 or 2008, 2009, 2010, or 2011. What also we have with respect to this report is we have, as a final column, the total amount of money by which money was taken out every year from the General Education Fund and used to support these deficits. That amounts to \$102 million dollars--\$102 million dollars. Sixty per cent [60%] of it is in the athletic program, but I doubt very seriously if people would know when they walk into the Maucker Union that last year Maucker Union lost \$600,000, and \$600,000 was transferred out of the General Education Fund to support what was a deficit in that particular area.

Now, last Spring for the first time the University Budget Committee met, and in the Fall the University Budget Committee asked the Vice President of Finance an interesting question. For the first time, the Vice President was asked, “Where is the budget process for the University? We would like to see the budget process for the University.” Now, I’m not going to belabor it, but it’s in this—it’s in the list of—of—of programs. We have the budget process that we received. We didn’t receive it immediately. We received it in the next semester. We were told that they had to develop it. It was not available. It wasn’t available on the internet or online. They needed to develop and deliver it to us. So, in the Spring semester of last spring, they delivered it to us, and it’s on this particular website. So, I don’t know. If you want to click on it, we can get to it

Funderburk: I believe it is loaded perhaps separately as well and just says “University budgeting process,” **Scott** [for projection].

Thompson: Ok. There’s a couple items there that—that we discovered and that we sent on to the Faculty Senate. What did we find? We found out

that nowhere in that document was there room for faculty input. There was nothing said that there would be faculty on this Committee to overlook the University Budget. It was a process that was more related to the way in which a budget was negotiated with the legislature as opposed to the situation which the faculty were in the room when the budget was made. In addition, this process—so you pulled it [an aside to **Peters** doing the projection]—this process basically says, “Ok, at the end of the year, you know, at the end of the fiscal year, there will be a budget. The budget will be set for each individual unit, and then it will be allocated and spent.” When we teach budgeting and we talk about budgeting, budgeting isn’t just setting the budget, it’s also determining whether or not the items have been spent appropriately and whether or not it needs to be changed. There wasn’t anything in this budget process to indicate where the faculty would have any input into deciding when the budget should be changed, for what reason and whether or not there needed to be changes in terms of what was allocated to one area over another—say, like an Athletic Department or the Maucker Union or the Wellness Center. These are units that have been make—making revenues but losing money.

The other sort of issue that you—you get into is whether or not these ancillary units are part of the mission and vision of the University. When a budget is set--when you set a budget, you’re setting a budget on the basis of what your priorities are, and your priorities are based on mission and vision. So we then--in this report, we go back, and we look at the mission and the vision statement of the University. Nowhere in the mission or vision statement does it have any reference with respect to an Athletic Program. Nowhere does it say anything with respect to, you know, a Wellness Center or a Maucker Union.

Now, what you also see in terms of these deficits is that the academic side is a very easy target for cuts. There isn’t anybody that’s representing the Academic Unit, but when the President’s Council meet, there’s plenty of people there that are going to advocate for the Athletic Department, the Wellness Center, the Healthcare, all of those sorts of things. So, to some extent, if you look at this from a historical standpoint, how we got here

should be no secret to anyone. Where we go when we move forward is the question.

Now, if we want to argue over what gets cut at--in an emergency meeting, we're in the wrong business. We're going to lose every time. Why? Because you—you create an emergency; you say you need a cut; then you say, "This is where the cuts are coming from." You cut; and then everybody's afraid that their area is going to be cut; so now we're arguing over cuts over opposed to what? The process. Somewhere along the line we have to get to a process that makes sense, not one that says the faculty are going to be on the outside whatever cuts there are, but one in which the faculty have oversight over how the money is spent.

Let's review. Our last budget crisis, we gave back—the faculty gave back money. Where was that money spent?

Breitbach: Frank, watch the wire. I'm sorry. (light laughter)

Thompson: Where was the money spent? The money was spent for a computer system. We were told that they had already spent money to develop a computer system for advising. Contract had already been written. I asked for a copy of the contract, and in getting that copy of the contract, what did I discover? Whenever you write a contract, what happens? You have penalties for--not—you know, deciding that you want out of the contract. But the penalties were nowhere near what the cost of the project was. So we need to go on with that project. So we wind up hiring a company from Colorado to do the advising system. Was that a—was that something everybody is happy? Do we have an advising—a computerized advising system everybody's happy with? (light laughter) That was the last cut.

Now another issue that faculty have never got into is the question about how much surplus there actually is—how much actuarial surplus there is in the Healthcare Program. The last time I looked, there was \$8 million dollars. Now, maybe it's a little bit less, but our healthcare benefits are nowhere as good as they were before. But there's our interesting question.

Who owns the \$8 million dollar surplus? If this is truly an emergency where we need to cut programs, why are we ignoring an \$8 million dollar surplus—actuarial surplus—in the Healthcare Program? We’re ignoring a \$102 million dollar losses coming out of these auxiliary programs, and we’re saying that the first area we’re going to start looking at cutting are academic programs, and we don’t have a process for any oversight as to whether this makes sense or whether or not, on a continuing basis, we’re going to have a place in the room as far as discussions about the faculty and budgeting, not just in terms of academics but also non-academic programs.

Now the AAU principles

Funderburk: I was going to say, if you could give us maybe a 2-minute summation, so that we can make sure we give enough people opportunity to talk for this first round.

Thompson: Ok. Well, the--the last I’ll—I’ll say about this is that to me—I’ve been thinking about it, and to me it sounds like the following: A husband comes back. He tells his wife that—that, in fact, where he works they have had some problems because of the 2008 meltdown, and there’s less income for them. There’s going to be less family income. But, he says, in going home he decided that we need—we need to have everybody in the neighborhood think that we’re in good shape, so I went out and purchased a Hummer (light laughter around). And because we don’t have any money in the budget to pay for the Hummer, what I’m going to do is I’m going to sell the dishwasher, the dryer, all of the appliances. I’m going to sell the beds, and we’re going to have a sale and get that, and then we’re going to pay for the Hummer so that we can feel good at the end of this process. That’s what’s happening right now, and the question is, “Are we going to have any change?” Thank you. [applause]

Funderburk: Anyone else who would like to speak? Dr. **Isakson**?

Hans **Isakson** [Professor, Economics]: Thank you. For those of you who don’t know me, I’m Hans **Isakson**, and a couple of years ago in 2009 I

brought a resolution to this Body regarding the University's spending on auxiliary enterprises. Could we bring that up? [for projection]

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/resolution_regarding_funding_of_auxiliary_enterprise_operations_at_uni_-_2010_0.pdf

And the indented text here indicates that particular resolution. In a nutshell, what it—what it said, and it accompanied some of the same kind of data that—that Dr. **Thompson** just presented to you—but basically what this resolution says is that the—the—the Faculty Senate wants to see the—the amount of General Education Funds devoted to support the Auxiliary Enterprises of the University limited to 3%. At that time, of this resolution, it was over 6%. If you go back in time, back to the—a little over 10 years, in 1990, it was about 3%, so basically what this resolution did—it just said, “Well, let's set back the clock on Auxiliary Enterprise spending to what it was proportionately in 1990.”

Now to the University's credit and credit of the Administration, they—they did make some cuts in 2010. It went from about a little over 6% to in the—about 4 ½% of the General Education Fund that was being transferred to the Auxiliary Enterprises. It ticked up a little bit in 2011.

Funderburk: **Scott**, could you pull up the spreadsheet that is....got it, yes.

Peters: Is that it? Second one? (voices agreeing)

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/general_education_funds_allocated_to_auxiliary_enterprise_operations_2000_to_2011_0.pdf

Isakson: Yeah, the top line there represents the—the proportion of the General Education Fund that goes to all of the Auxiliary Enterprise operations combined, and as you can see, if you go back to about 1990 is when it was about 3%. It has increased steadfastly up until about 2009 it peaked. In 20—and then it began to drop down a couple of years, and it's kind of headed back up again now. It's creeping back up again now. Do you think we can go back to the resolution? [to **Funderburk** and to **Peters**]

Funderburk: Uh huh. We certainly can. Then in 2010, I brought another resolution to this Body, the Faculty Senate, that basically said that if the—it was necessary to cut academic programs at the University, that before that happens, the amount of General Education Fund that goes to the Aux—Auxiliary should be cut to no more than 1%, from 3 to 1% before cutting any academic programs. And—and that was acted upon and passed by the—this Faculty Senate. And that was in the what—I think Fall of

Funderburk: I think it was March of 2010 [sic, 2009]

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/2009-03-23_minutes_0.pdf

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/letter_to_pres_re_athletic_funding.pdf

Isakson: March of—March of 2010 [sic, 2009]. So, historically this Body, this Senate is on record already with some recommendations to the Administration on—on where to save some money, where to save some—some money in the Auxiliary Operations. And, as—as **Frank** pointed out and in—in my presentation as well, I made no recommendations regarding which area in the Auxiliary Operation should be cut. Athletics gets the lion’s share—and I think **Frank** has already pointed that out—of the General Education Fund, and probably the football program in Athletics gets most of that, because they’re the biggest. They’re the largest. But, you know, this has come to a point where something probably needs to be done. You know, some—it—it’s—it’s probably about time for the faculty to stand up and—and give the Administration some—some loud and clear signals regarding the support of the Auxiliary operations on this campus. I think the Senate has already done that. I’m not too sure the faculty at large is aware of what the Senate has done or the extent to which the Administration is implementing the Senate’s resolution. Thank you.
[applause]

Funderburk: Maybe restating the purpose of what we’re doing today may help generate more discussion, also particularly from the Senators. The

point of today's discussion is to see if further action from the Senate is appropriate, desired, and if so, what form that might take. We do have the document already on record from 2010 [sic, 2009] that was talked about, and there's additional data that's on later down that spreadsheet, if you want to see more of that. If anyone has a suggestion about that, or if anyone else wants to speak just in generalities.

DeBerg: Well, let

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Let me say, as a Senator, how discouraging it is to have this resolution on Auxiliary spending, as well as, for instance, a resolution on how the Senate believes the merger, closing, and reorganization of academic programs needs to proceed. How discouraging it is to have the Senate act and send resolutions forward and have them, seemingly, completely ignored at that point by the Administration. It's just very, very discouraging. I—I—I'm used to being at a campus where, you know, the Senate and faculty really do have a voice in how the University is run at the level of budgeting and program structures and what not. So, I just want to express frustration as a Senator. I think this Body works very hard. It has pretty high-level debates on these issues. I don't think that any of these have been passed cavalierly without a great deal of study, and they seem to go nowhere. I mean, we send them, but at that point they seem to go nowhere. So, I'm expressing as a Senator my immense frustration at what happens to the—the careful and deliberative actions of this Body.
[applause]

Funderburk: It is also probably worth noting that the—the Bylaw—the group that is working on the Bylaws of restructuring committee structure for the Faculty Senate is bringing forward a new charge for the University Budget Committee that will be on the Agenda for Monday's meeting for docketing. So that's—that's a topic in more places than just this moment. So, there has been a call working on that for about a year as well. [pause with no one asking to speak] Such interest, and no one wants to—Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Well, Dr. **Thompson** made some recommendations, some possible ways to address UNI's budgeting deficiencies, and--and maybe that would be a good anchor for discussion. Maybe we could look at these recommendations and—and discuss the feasibility of them.

Funderburk: Shall we call them up? [for projection]

Gallagher: Sure. [voices assisting in locating the correct file]

Funderburk: That seems to be a “yes” for that one, **Scott**. An examination of General Education Funding.

Peters: It's—it's loading....or not. (light laughter) [voices directing to the location within the document] Where—where are the recommendations?

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/an_examination_of_general_education_funding_support_used_for_athletics_1997-2011.pdf

Gallagher: Down at the bottom. Toward the end. Toward the end.

Terlip: Page 4 or 5. There, yeah, start there.

Thompson: Now—can I make comment?

Funderburk: Yes, go on.

Thompson: Also, in this packet is the statement of AAUP principles and standards we—which clearly identifies the faculty are supposed to be i--the direct relationship with the faculty in terms of the budgeting decisions, particularly when it gets into programmatic cuts. And so there's actually, within the statement of things you can look that up, and it's attached to this article. The other thing that I want to mention here is that the—the new wrinkle that wasn't available in 2007 was that the Board of Regents did not state that they wanted the Athletic Program self-sustaining. It turns out that the—the Board of Regents has gone on record saying that the

Athletic Programs at each of these institutions should be self-sustaining, meaning their revenues and donations should be equal to the expenses, and no General Education Funding be taking out to support Athletics. And, in fact, sitting there on the table is a report that was done September of 2010 in which we now have a situation where the University of Iowa is self-supporting and Iowa State is very close to that. We are an outlier, and it's referred to.

Funderburk: Still want to speak?

Gallagher: My point was simply to take these one by one and—for example, Number 1 says “According to the AAUP principles and standards, faculty must be significantly involved in budget, oversight and evaluation.” Can that be done? That's the question. And—and if it can be, great. If there are impediments to that, this would be a good place to hear about that. So, what I'm trying to do is open the floor for discussion from everybody involved to hear all those perspectives.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: As Senators may recall, last semester many of us had breakfast with President **Allen** in a series of breakfast meetings that he had, and at one of those that I attended, he indicated not just a willingness but a—I would say, a—an interest in having more faculty involvement in discussing budgeting priorities. He mentioned that when he was Provost at Iowa State, and I believe the system at Ohio State work—or, sorry, at Iowa State --I believe the system there was that as Provost he was actually the Chief Budgetary Officer, and he regularly met with faculty to discuss the budget, and he felt that it worked quite well. So, one of the things that our Committee on Bylaws and Committee Reorganizations is going to put before this Body within the next couple of meetings is a recommendation that the Budget Committee be specifically charged with meeting regularly with President **Allen** to discuss the budget, discuss our--our priorities and our concerns.

Gallagher: So, that's a "yes"? And no problem? And good, it can be done? Is that right?

Funderburk: There are actions moving on that front. Number 2?

Gallagher: Should I read it?

Funderburk: Please.

Gallagher: Ok. "UNI's budget process must have accountability and transparency allowing faculty to annually evaluate administrators, particularly those responsible for protecting the academic budget, on the basis of their performance."

Funderburk: And I'm assuming, not having seen the charge, that that would be part of that same charge to the Budget Committee, but I couldn't say.

Peters: The Committee would be invited to report to the Senate at any time they wanted to and required to report to the Senate annually. That—that's the current language that we're—we're working on.

Russ **Campbell** [Associate Professor, Mathematics]: Including evaluation of the Administrators' roles?

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus** I think has a draft in front of him of the Budget Committee draft. But my recollection is, yes, that it specifically said that. [pause while they collaborate] The current language—the current draft language says the report—"The report shall assess the Administration's openness to faculty input on these matters."

Funderburk: Anymore comments on that Number 2? More questions or—Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I—I think that if the University moves to an annual post-tenure review system for tenured faculty that Administrators should have

an annual review system. I think if assessments [applause drowned her out] If assessment is that vital to how we run as a university, then everyone should be assessed every year, is what I think. So I'm in favor of Number 2 in a much stronger way than this language in the Budget Committee's Resolution that's coming out.

Thompson: Well, can I—can I speak to this issue?

Funderburk: Yes.

Thompson: One of the things that I got to thinking about when I wrote you was what about these Administrators that spend more money than what they have? Department Heads have always been accountable to the notion that, at the end of the year, their Supplies and Services Budget has to zero out. They can't spend more than what they have. So, my question is: how are you going to hold Administrators accountable, if they wind up spending more money than what they take in? If money's taken out of the General Education Fund, and then we say, "Ok, well, we're going to start over the next year." There needs to be some teeth, if you're going to have accountability transparency, so that Administrators know that if they overspend their budget, there are consequences, just as there are consequences for a Department Head and the faculty, if they overspend the budget. And certainly in this regard, the faculty have not—they've lived with it in their budget. The problem is is that these other units haven't lived within and by a large amount.

Funderburk: Dr. Schmitz.

Alan **Schmitz** [Professor, Music]: A question: we have a Budget Committee, and how is the representation—or what is—what is that comprised of? And to the point, are there faculty members on the Budget Committee of the University, or is that not possible, or how does that work?

Funderburk: [to Provost **Gibson**] Do you want to comment on that?

Gibson: No, he should direct that question to the President.

Funderburk: I don't know that answer, and I understand that that's a question to be directed to the President.

Schmitz: Thank you.

Gallagher: Ready for 3?

Breitbach: Yes.

Funderburk: I think so.

Gallagher: "Number 3. The UNI Faculty Senate must insist on adherence to its previously passed resolution on ancillary enterprise units and the requirement that UNI administration reduce general education funding in these enterprises to set levels of the total UNI budget before making any cuts to academic programming."

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah. This is where I start to get bothered, and the tenor of a lot of what's been done here kind of bothers me in the sense that it seems—it's almost like a Republican debate where you're kind of playing to the crowd. I know you don't like to hear that. But, you know, we can't set ourselves apart from everything else and say "All the financial troubles in the University are on the Auxiliary Enterprises, and they've got to make all these cuts before we even think about doing anything on academic programs." We've got lots of academic programs in the University that don't have the student demand needed to justify their existence. Now, I would separate the issue of cutting academic programs from cutting faculty. I agree with that. The Univ—the institution, the University should not be using the cuts to academic programs as a vehicle for firing faculty. But, cutting academic programs in many instances is called for here, and I think the Faculty Senate should be on record as saying, "Yes, we support, you know, cuts to programs that really don't serve an adequate,

demonstrated student need.” We do that so that we can have resources to support other academic programs, and we need to recognize this University for students, and for everybody else, is more than just academic programs. Students do care about athletics. They care about the Union. They care about those things as part of the student experience. And Ben **Allen** is thinking, “Gee, we’ve got to provide a full student experience if we want to attract students.” We can’t just dismiss this stuff as utterly irrelevant to our existence as an institution. So I would hope we can take a more-balanced approach here than just beating on the non-academic side of the University.

Funderburk: I think it is also worth the information if you want to pull up the spreadsheet. **Hans**, what is the name of the one that was charting to

Isakson: It was updated certainly. (?)

Funderburk: You can track it starting at roughly the point we—whether it’s a coincidence or not, roughly the point that we made that resolution, the funding for Auxiliaries dramatically decreased over the following 3 years, as a percentage of total budget. If you (**Isakson**) would help him (**Peters**) navigate to where that—you have a very good chart in there to show that. [collaboration on how to locate electronically the 4th item of the listing under Resources for Faculty and listed as Background Materials for the Feb. 20, 2012 meeting; an Excel spreadsheet titled: General Education Funds Allocated to Auxiliary Enterprise Operations 2000 – 2010. xlsx] Ok, it’s not—there’s a graph someplace, but it doesn’t matter. Senator **DeBerg**.

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/general_education_funds_allocated_to_auxiliary_enterprise_operations_2000_to_2011_0.pdf

DeBerg: I agree with a lot of what Jerry **Smith** says. It’s just that we’re—we’re not arguing to—we’re not arguing the elimination of these Auxiliary Enterprises. We’re arguing, I think, the extent to which they drain money out of the General Education Fund. I—I certainly would never argue for the elimination of these programs.

Smith: But, **Betty**, some of those programs just can't exist on their own.

DeBerg: I understand that, too, yeah.

Smith: And they just can't exist. And I think there should be discipline, and the evidence suggests that there has been improved discipline. Maybe there's room for more. But, I mean, my major concern is that we kind of say, "No, don't touch academic programs." And I just don't think that's a defensible position for any responsible, you know, person in this univ—in this institution.

DeBerg: I also appreciate that you made the distinction between all majors, minors, certificates, and faculty

Smith: Yeah.

DeBerg: because of the rather stark increase in administrative positions and the decrease in faculty positions here. I think that's a cause for concern at a university like ours. And that data seems pretty irrefutable to me.

Funderburk: Dr. **Thompson**.

Thompson: One of the things we need to keep in mind, as I said, that if we get to the point where we're talking about cutting this program versus cutting that, we're—we're going to get way off track. The issue is the process, and the issue is whether faculty have—have been able to provide any meaningful input into the process. This—the paper that I wrote with the recommendations, they're—if you read it completely you'll see, I'm not saying that we eliminate football. I'm not saying we eliminate Athletics. I'm saying that they should be living within a budget, a reasonable budget, and what—what I think is particularly difficult for this University is that both Iowa State and Iowa, once they were told by the Board of Regents they had to have their programs self-sustaining, they went about doing that and accomplishing it. And so the question is, you know, if we are talking about eliminating academic programs, where when—where and when are

we going to get serious about athletic programs and ancillary programs that are draining significant dollars away from what we have in academic programming. It's not a question of a zero-sum game. It's a question of whether or not we get the advantages of any cuts that will actually lead to a stronger University. And the question is, "If the faculty are not actively involved, how can we—how can we actually achieve that? How can we achieve a better University when faculty are left out of this oversight process and the ability to be able to monitor results and provide input?" The Faculty Senate's already provided input. They said that if they get to the point where we're cutting programs, then we go back to this particular resolution. So that that particular request is merely saying, "Let's go back and request that they live up to the particular resolution."

Funderburk: Thank you. Senator **East**.

East: I'm—I'm very sympathetic to these arguments about process, but I—I think that—that focusing on process issues at—while at the same time saying that they're about to cut things and you have to reduce spending at other—in—in—in other categories before you can cut anything in—in academics—and it applies a reasoning about process to decision-making about what's going to happen tomorrow that—that's just not applicable. And—and reasoning people shouldn't—shouldn't get caught up in an emotional argument like that, and all—allow that to sway their decision-making about decisions that have to be made tomorrow saying that if we didn't have the process of the decision that came—that—that they're talking about making tomorrow can't be made. Fight for the process continually and bring forward some resolution or some action that you wish the Senate to make that deals with the decision-making, the immediate decision-making process right now. Thank you.

Funderburk: Thank you, Senator **East**. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: In my experience, this faculty has been and continues to be very keen on giving the administration all of the benefits of, you know, free range and doing what is needed to make the University the best that it can possibly be, and that's why there's been reticence to have keen oversight.

This faculty by and large feels that it's not here to be oversight to the Administration, perhaps to review the Administration's actions and recommend it. And that's why we do have the processes that we have, and so, unlike my colleague Senator **East**, I feel that we do have processes now, and that what seems to be distressing faculty across campus is that they're not being engaged. So, for example, the President, when he announces that he's going to make cuts that none of us know about, we feel that the processes haven't been engaged. We have a Faculty Senate, in which the President is always welcome, even in Executive Session, to come discuss momentous events so that people are not shocked, so that people are not left wondering what's going to happen next week so that they can know that he has heard from the—the highly-expert opinions who are to be (?) affected and who are in charge of the education of the University. And so one of the things I've been hearing that people are hoping might come out of this is just a clear—a clearer communication, that as much as we want the President and his Administration to have all of the powers and—and confidence that he and they need to advance us in difficult times as well as good times, we also do want to contribute, especially when it comes to absolute cuts and to be participants along the lines. And so that we can invite him again to the Senate, perhaps in Executive Session, whatever it takes for him to communicate even more. He has communicated with us. He has met with us. We have not asked him questions that perhaps now we would be keener to ask him, but that's why perhaps he should meet with us again.

DeBerg: Was he invited to this? Was he invited to this session?

Funderburk: As—as everyone was invited from the University community. He was not specifically sent an invitation, no. But if I hear from you that there is interest, there is a possibility of inviting President Allen again, because, of course, we invited him earlier in the year for a consultative session, and he was kind enough to come join us. If we should reconsider doing that as a Body, with the possibility of it being an Executive Session so that it would be a closed forum, so keep that in mind as we are deciding what we will be doing today. Other speakers?

Jody **Stone** [Professor, Price Lab School]: I have a comment.

Funderburk: Yes, please. I can't see back there.

Stone: Hi, my name is Jody **Stone**, and I'm a—a—I have a joint appointment in College of Ed. and the College of Natural Sciences, and I'd like to talk about the process of informed decision-making, because that's what the process should be, and it frightens me that I agree with you, **Frank**, (laughter around) because it hasn't happened a lot over the years, but I do—but I do agree with **Frank**. We—all of us were hired because we have expertise, and that expertise needs to be used by the President's Office and the Provost in making decisions. So when—and communicating with faculty. So when the faculty learn of important decisions by reading the newspaper instead of by face-to-face communication, that is a problem. When decisions are made without consulting experts in the College of Ed. that know all about data-driven decision-making, that's a problem. So, what—what I want to know is how all of the expertise we have here on campus appears not to be used—being used, and—and at what point do you say, "What data are you making that decision on? And who have you talked to about that decision? And—and the fact that you are in the President's Office gives you a—a—a get-out-of-jail-free card. You don't have to answer that question." So, I'm concerned, and after being here 34 years, I'm—I'm now at a point where I feel like I'm devalued as a person, you know. After recruiting the top teachers in our State to teach at our school, now we find they are all worried, and they quit their jobs to come here, and they are good, you know? So, I would like the Senate to do—you know, we—we keep recommending things, and nothing—I agree with you, Dr. **DeBerg**, nothing happens, because nothing has to happen. It's: "Do whatever you want." So—and I'm sorry if I was a little blunt on this, but that's the way I feel, and I think other people probably feel the same way. [applause]

Funderburk: Other speakers? Do we wish to go back—yes? Over here some place?

DeBerg: Senator **Kirmani**? Oh, I'm sorry.

Kirmani: Yeah, I have a question. Is the President of the University required to consult the faculty? The President holds office at the pleasure of the Board of Regents, so he can just say, “I don’t care.”

Funderburk: I don’t have a good answer for that. Dr. **DeSoto**.

Cathy **DeSoto** [Associate Professor, Psychology]: I have somewhat of an answer, but I don’t know if it’s a good answer. I don’t think it’s a question of being “required.” I think it’s a matter of the norms of colleges and universities in America that usually when there are—are changes, programs cuts, you know, major budget decisions, eliminating of—of an academic program, that there just is consultation, and that that’s the way that it’s— it’s done. As far as like “required,” it’s certainly not in the Master Agreement. It can’t be done under Iowa Law, but it can be done and it should be done. And I also want to echo what Jody **Stone** was saying, that I think that it is—and—and what **Frank** was saying—that it’s the—it’s the process that is the biggest concern. That, you know, when—when elected Bodies of the University are consulting with the Administration but yet they get calls from the press, and for the first time from the press they are hearing and being asked questions like, “Is Price Lab going to be closed?” And like, “No, I haven’t heard anything like that.” But the press has heard it. I think it’s a problem of process. [applause]

Funderburk: Another speaker? In the back, please, Dr. **Degnin**.

Francis **Degnin** [Associate Professor, Philosophy and World Religions]: You know, I—I have to support, I think, everything that’s been said so far. I mean, for example, what **Jerry** was saying that—that we can’t be isolated. And certainly we to recognize that some of the programs need to be closed, but at the same time that doesn’t mean that those faculty should be fired. They should be reallocated. I mean, there are other, you know, ways of balancing this, I like to think _____

_____ **Cathy** has said. But what I want to also note is that one of the problems we have when we don’t have wide input is the problem of unintended consequences. And there are

going to be lots of unintended consequences to a lot of the decisions that are being made, and because we're not even having discussions about them—you know, for example, increasing number of course loads or increasing class sizes, that changes how we teach our courses. I, for example, have writing assignments for my students, all my students, short ones all—every week. And, if you start increasing my class size, my students will love it if I take those assignments away, but they will actual—their education will suffer. And so, you know, there're lots and lots of unintended consequences to what is being done. If we fire faculty that we may need in other areas, instead of keeping them, besides it being demoralizing to the rest of us—hopefully it would be the rest of us, it wouldn't be me, I don't know, but besides demoralizing as a faculty, again, we don't have as many faculty, then, to use in other areas, and so I—I mean, I do really believe we need to focus more on our central mission, on our core mission, and to use the expertise that the faculty have, and that requires that you listen to them. The other side of that, too, is it's just demor—I—I've found it very demoralizing what I've seen going on between what's proposed, for example, as a program, when I compare it with—to a program the Administration is proposing as defining a program, because that says to me they're looking at getting rid of people. I suppose a broader or more thoughtful definition says where the people will actually be reallocated. And—and again, it needs to be a more and inclusive process.

Breitbach: Good point.

Clausen: Courtney **Clausen**, College of Ed, Malcolm Price Laboratory School. With the unintended consequences and as a 3rd generation graduate from UNI's College of Ed. program, I find it interesting that the only thing that was said about the Level II participates that come from the College of Ed. is that it being—might be sent into a program or a framework of a virtual school. In my classroom with my 9th graders and my participants, I voice the importance of a continuum of learning and perspective, and, yes, they are placed in schools in the community and that is one perspective of education. Then they come to Price Lab to do their Level II experience where they see teachers that are trying different things, teachers that have research that they have done, the one-to-one that were

out there getting input and going out and presenting and coming back and saying, “Ok, today we’re going to restart.” The participants see this, and this might not be an experience that they will see in their Level III or Student Teaching. That is an uninten--unintended consequence that where will we put these students, these Level II’s that do go out into the community? Does the community surrounding us have the capacity to train these teachers, because when my grandmother went here, it was the Iowa State—Iowa State Teacher’s College? And I can tell you that that is in our core mission, and if that is taken away, and the Level I’s that come down 3 times a semester. Where will we send Level I’s to get the input and the round table discussions? That’s what Malcolm Price Laboratory School does. So think about where—where would these students in the College of Ed. go?

Funderburk: [waiting] It’s very quiet again.

Gallagher: Should I read Number 3?

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I’ve heard several people mention the idea of—of reducing or— or eliminating programs, but not reducing or reducing or eliminating faculty, and I guess my—my only point is that budgetarily if the issue is saving money, you know, there’s no money to be saved unless you get rid of faculty. So, it’s not being ab—you can’t separate one from the other.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I think—I think you can talk about reassigning faculty, and then the issue I think is attrition, because many faculty are in my generation. We’re getting old, and we’re going to be out of here one way or the other. (laughter around and a few groans) And so the question I actually had for the Provost is—sorry (after hearing a few groans from what he’d said about “one way or the other”)—does—do—does the Administration have manpower or a resour—a human resources plan that identifies the faculty, their ages, their intended retirement plans, where

they could be transferred within the University? Do you have such a plan, that kind of information, and is it used in new hires to the point so you don't hire people that could instead—for positions that could instead be filled by somebody else who would be moved from a program that was being discontinued?

Gibson: That—that's a loaded question. (laughter)

Smith: That's a George **Bush** answer. (more laughter)

Gibson: Not George **Bush**. (laughter continuing) Part of your question implies looking at people's ages, and you cannot do that. You know, you're looking at age discrimination, and so we would—so that—that becomes problematic in

Smith: So you can't ask people if they intend to retire within the next 5 years? You can't? That's crazy because it makes it so much easier to plan for hiring.

Gibson: That's—that's a slippery slope. That a ver—I mean, it's—it's age discrimination if a faculty member is 60, 62, 63, and I walk up—64 and I walk up and say, "Hey, how 'bout retiring?"

Smith: No, you are not asking them to retire. You are asking when they plan to retire.

Gibson: Well, ev—just to even imply that, I—I cannot do that, legally, I mean, because faculty are entit—are entitled to teach—I mean, we had a faculty member who we celebrated a couple weeks ago who has been a faculty member for 50 years, 50 years, so I—I legally cannot say to that faculty member, are you thinking about retiring?

Funderburk: Yes.

Laura **Kaplan** [Associate Professor, Social Work]: Hi, I'm Laura **Kaplan**, and I—I—this keeps coming back to communication, it seems to me. It seems

to me. I'm not familiar with the procedures of the Senate or how the communications go in there, but my sense as an outsider is things come down; we have no idea where it came from. It's like we are all kind of waiting for the sky to fall, but we don't know if it's coming from up here or back there or over there. And the only announcement we've heard is, "The sky is going to fall, and nothing is off the table." So the contradictory statements that we're getting—I have sort of two parts to this. A couple of years ago, nothing was going to happen to Price Lab. So, I think that's kind of a red herring, that whole thing about closing Price Lab. We have to go through the Legislature. There's—everybody is going to get upset about that in the community. And yet just a few years ago we heard that is absolutely an invaluable program. We are going to be primarily a College of Education and teach the best undergraduate education we have. So we are getting contradictory messages. We don't really seem to know what the criteria is. What is a "small program" as opposed to "one I don't like"? Or one that's—I might _____ (clueless?, sounds more like clewess??) the first speech about—when we welcomed President **Allen**—about "We're not going to use 'entitlement' anymore. It's going to be 'entrepreneurship.'" I'm a social worker. There's only a few people who use those distinctions. Entrepreneur versus social welfare kinds of stuff—that we're all getting away with something, or we're not going to slide anymore. What I'm hearing here, it sounds like you've been making plans and having committees and making offers, but it's kind of going into an empty well. So, I'm not—I'm confused what this meeting is about. Is it about that we're supposed to try to take some action? Or is it about that we're supposed to—we're—we're trying to open communication lines and say, "Don't just keep dropping these vague statements, which kills morale." On that, the Administration is very good at, I think, at this point, certainly, from what I hear around. So that it's, you know, not paranoid if they're really after you? But not feeling like—if nobody is safe, then how can we be told "small programs" will be at risk. I don't think anybody is disagreeing that cuts would be necessary—programs—but I don't think moving one person over to another job and giving them those jobs, I don't understand how that's saving any money. I think there's a lot of a shell game. This is my impression. I don't know. I want to be educated here. So tell me what's really going on. What information does anybody really have? I

assume that you've gone to the President and said, "Look, you know, we need to be in on this. Give us the evidence of your arguments or what you're going to do. What is the criteria for cutting?" I don't want to just to be told "small programs." What does that mean? Small people? I'm short. I don't know. (laughter around) So, I don't think we're getting clear information on the criteria. I don't think that we're getting clear conversation, just as **Francis** says, on the—the consequences of what we're talking about were really happening. And I'm not sure if here today—we're here to come up with another list of—for the Faculty Senate to go to the President with? And have you done this before? And if it hasn't been paid attention to before, then why are we talking about doing this again?

Funderburk: Thank you. I think part of that we can come--and that's part of what we're here for, is to find out—determine if there is any additional Senate action that we can take? If so, what should we do? And—and what type of action will be appropriate? Maybe the decision will be that we've done what we're supposed to do, and that's it. Or perhaps there is something more we should be doing. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So I'll just very quickly reiterate what I've already said. Dr. **Thompson** and Dr. **Isakson** have reminded us of the faculty positions in this area, and so we could ask, forcefully, the President to come to the Senate and explain in advance of public announcements how his cuts match the faculty position. And I think that's something that—that is the process. So we do have the process. I think we should use it, and thereby ask him to—to meet with us, to discuss our positions, how he's matching the faculty positions in his cuts.

Funderburk: Senator **East**, and then Senator **DeBerg**.

East: With all due respect, Senator **Swan**, I don't think we have a process, if the process is "We'll ask the President and see if he does what we want." It—it seems to me that if the Senate wishes to have a process that involves the faculty in budgeting, then they do, in perhaps more detail than is being done currently, proposing a budget meeting that will—will meet with whatever administrative budget process is and that not only do we propose

that but that we get the Administration to agree to it. We've proposed a number of things. They have, in my view, not—typically not agreed to it. In some cases they said, “Yeah, we'll—we'll—we kind of feel the same way,” but they didn't say, “We will do X.” So I—I think we have to build a process, and the process, I think, is what we're currently doing only we have—if--if we really want to require that this Budget Committee that we're proposing be involved in real budgeting, then it has to say that, and it has to say something besides, “He'll meet and confer.” Meet and confer doesn't work at—unless you have a contract that backs it up. And so, I—I think that that's the process that we'll have to do. And, again unfortunately, the process that you want to build takes longer to build than the time between now and this—the time when decisions are made, although we've been hearing about these decisions for 2 years now, and so far as I know nothing's been done about it. So maybe we can just—maybe it's not going to happen. I don't know.

Funderburk: I've got Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Wurtz**, and then Dr. **Depken**.

DeBerg: Well, I agree with Senator **East** that we need a—a proposal for strong participation for the faculty in the budgeting process. That goes without saying. I believe for the immediate—for the immediate situation, though, that I—I would like to have the President here at the Senate. I would like to see him look specifically at the Senate resolution on auxiliary spending and on the Senate recommendations regarding program reorganization. And I'd like to have him specifically tell us what he thinks about it. What's he going to do about them? Why or why not? I think he—I think he owes us that. I'm appalled that he's not here today, frankly. Like, where could he be rather than here? [applause] And I—I would like him at the Senate as soon as possible.

Funderburk: Senator **Wurtz**, Dr. **Depken**, and then Senator **Kirmani**.

Wurtz: The document we need to look at, if we are going to put teeth into the confer and consult, is our Constitution, which is approved by the Board of Regents _____ come from. That document, and

I'm not certain of the dates, was written in the early '70s, I believe, and it has not been amended, as far as I could tell, since the mid- 1980s. We are not the same institution now that we were when the document was written. We're not the same institution we were when the document was last amended, and that's one of the things that we've been nudging at for a couple years, is that we need to revise our Constitution, that defines the relationship.

Funderburk: [to **Depken**] Go ahead.

Diane **Depken** [Associate Professor, HPELS]: I support the process and procedures. I think they are crucial and important, but as a couple of other people have said, in the here and now, I would like to see that ancillary issues be addressed and perhaps revisited and reminded that—that the resolutions that have passed have been passed. Ask for some transparency and accountability. But I would also like to see this Senate continue to—and I sometimes read the detailed transcripts, but the academics, if you had an academic vision and a way to hold—if our—hold their feet to the fire regarding our academic mission, so to speak. That, if it is in our mission, how do we keep on honing that and calling that as central to what this Body does and to what this University does.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani** and then Senator **Edginton**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I—I wanted to say that I support what Senator **DeBerg** has just said. I—I think it's—it would be highly appropriate that the President visit the Senate or at least the Senate Chair convey to the President that this is the general sentiment of the faculty here, so that he knows that there is a concern and that this sentiment is pretty strong.

Funderburk: Ok. Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I think there's a tremendous amount of anxiety in the academy today and over the last several days, and I'm just—I'm wondering if the timeline for decision-making, or the announcement for the decision-making is going to be reviewed? And I know I'm sure there are additional

consultations, Board of Regents and legal consultations that are taking place, but can that timeline be made public so that we can deal with the anxiety that exists amongst the faculty?

Funderburk: I'm thinking that's directed to the Provost?

Edginton: Well, I don't know if it's directed at the Provost or at the President or, you know, whoever is appropriate, but I think we need to deal with that—that anxiety. I mean, it may be happening today. I don't know. (voice agreeing, commenting, and then laughter)

Thompson: I want to point—I guess I want to point something out, because I kind of think it got lost in discussion. The Faculty Senate has a University Budget Committee. The problem is is that the University Budget Committee was never called to order, and it was only in the Fall of last year that I was able to get the Committee convened to begin looking at this issue. And at the end of the ballgame we did have a resolution that we put forward, asking for the very things now that we're talking about wanting to do in terms of a process. But the—the point is is on the one hand, **Phil** is right. They—there's a process. There is a University Budget Committee, but also **Betty** and **Jesse** are correct in that we have got the process, but the process is clearly dysfunctional, because nobody wants to recognize the process and actually use it. There was a comment made about, "Well, what recourse do we have as faculty?" Well, one of the things that—that I think if you look at the document related to the AAUP principles is that the faculty has a direct relationship not only to this Administration but to the governing Board. So, the Faculty Senate can meet with the governing Board. And, in fact, I will tell you that part of what drove the decision that the University of Iowa would no longer be on General Education support was that, in fact, the Chair of the Board of Regents met with the faculty leaders, because I attended that particular meeting, where they discussed some of these issues. So, the Faculty Senate does have a lot more power than what it thinks, particularly in regards to this particular issue. And the Board of Regents has already gone on record as saying they would prefer that the athletic programs be self-supporting.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Well, I appreciate Professor **Thompson**'s comments, and—but I think that this is a very complex issue, much more complex than it had been revealed on the analysis that had been done, because I think you have to go back almost 40 years. Forty years ago the entire athletic programs were embedded in men's and women's physical education. When the decision was made to go to Division I and the School of Health, Physical Education, and, at that time, Recreation was created, some of those athletic positions were removed to a Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, but many were retained inside the School of HPELS. A lot of them were retained, and—and the budgets were buried inside of what we do academically. It—the last negotiations that we had with Intercollegiate Athletics concluded in 1999, where we continued to move positions out of the School of HPELS into Intercollegiate Athletics, and they moved positions into HPELS and out of their program. I don't know that there's any, you know, easy resolution on this because it's been a 40-year process of us trying to become disengaged from Intercollegiate Athletics, and Intercollegiate Athletics becoming disengaged from the School of HPELS. As they moved to Division I Athletics, we moved to Division I Academics, at least that's what I like—like to say. I mean, it's—it has been a real challenge, you know, to try to get all this straightened out, organized, get the lines in the right places. I don't think when we moved to Division I, like when we built the Bluedorn Gallagher, we really had any idea of the cost of going to Division I. And I think we've been saddled with that over a 40-year period of time, similar to the challenges and operating expenses for the Bluedorn Gallagher. And these—these are historical issues that we've had to, I don't want to say "live with," but we're—we're having to live with the consequences of those decisions that were made. And it's lack of good planning 40 years ago, to truly look at the true cost of what it was going to—what was going to happen as a result of having a Division I athletic program.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: I'd like to add to what **Chris** just said relative to the fact that when you look at the deficits from the athletic program, we—we—we only

think about athletics, but there's a real synergy and, in fact, a big portion of some of our academic programs are embedded in the athletic program in terms of Athletic Training and in terms of our—our Movement and Exercise Science Major and the Strength and Conditioning area. Those programs could not exist without the athletic programs.

Funderburk: Senator.

Edginton: One other comment I would make. You know, **Frank**, you are going to have to tell me if this is accurate or not, but my—it's my understanding that somewhere between \$3.2 and \$3.3 million dollars is returned from athletics into the General Fund in terms of scholarships. So, when we look at that deficit, you know, we really are talking not, you know, \$4.5 million or \$5 million dollars. Subtract the amount of money that's being paid in scholarships that's going right back into the academic—into the General Fund in support of academic programs and you get a different picture. If the athletics, in fact, is cut, I will—I believe they will be cut significantly, and if you take that \$3.2 or \$3.3 million off the top, the--that deficit doesn't really look so great. In fact, it—it could very shortly be less than the deficit some—in some of the other ancillary, you know, programs that are being offered. But, you know, I—I may be wrong.

Thompson: Well, let me—let me follow-up. Ok, very quickly. If you scroll up this document, you are going to see just before this, I—I look at—“Examination of Common Myths Associated with the Athletic Budgeting”—I have there a section that deals with this very issue.

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/an_examination_of_general_education_funding_support_used_for_athletics_1997-2011.pdf

DeBerg (?): Scholarships?

Thompson: Yeah, scholarships. And it explains why I think that this—this argument is wrong-headed. So if you'll look at it—but basically I say here [reading] “Universities, as institutions of higher learning, provide scholarships to students on the basis of academic performance. While

there may be room for athletic scholarships that do not depend on academic merit or financial need, those who [sic, would] have to be paid on the basis of donor funds.” In other words, in an academic program, if I’m offering a scholarship, can I take General Education funds for, say, Communication Studies and provide, you know, 20 scholarships? No. So, why would Athletics be given a free pass on a full ride?

Funderburk: Can we get a direct answer and then come back to you, Senator **Terlip**?

Terlip: That’s fine.

Lisa **Jepsen** [Associate Professor, Economics]: Well, my name is Lisa **Jepsen**, and I’m an Associate Professor in the Department of Economics, and I’m the UNI’s NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, so I just wanted to speak to Senator **Edginton**’s comments and give the exact numbers. I did bring those with me. It is not my intention today to defend Athletics but rather to be a resource for faculty. My role is to be a liaison, so my intention is to just bring facts to the debate as I can and then to go back to the Athletic Department and research questions that have not been answered. So, regarding Senator **Edginton**’s comments, I have those numbers. For fiscal year 2011, the Athletic—now, they gave me numbers that were rounded to the thousands—but for fiscal year 2011, the Athletic Department returned to the General Fund \$2.324 million dollars. For fiscal year 2012, they will return \$2.534 million dollars. So, Senator **Edginton** is correct that if you eliminate all funding to Athletics, you will not save the dollar amounts that have been showing up in the \$4.5 million dollars.

Thompson: But let me ask—let me just follow this up. But doesn’t that take into consideration we’re talking about the students that are coming here. We’re giving them scholarships that they’re putting back into the Fund, and that assumes that they would not be coming here putting in money of their own dollars, if they didn’t have the scholarship.

Jepsen: And that is correct, and I think the Athletic Department would use the baseball program as an example. Once we canceled the baseball

program, virtually all of those students left the University, even those who were not on scholarship. So, I think they would use that as an example that speaks to the draw that Athletics brings to those students

Thompson: But did our total enrollment actually go down?

Jepsen: Well, the baseball program was very small, so they—they would argue that you would see a decline in total enrollment.

Thompson: But—but that didn't happen.

Jepsen: But the baseball carried like 20 players.

Funderburk: Ok, so I've got Senator **Terlip**, Senator **DeBerg**, and then Mr. **Carignan**.

Terlip: I think that Senator **Edginton's** remarks underscore the need for consultation. I don't know how we decided to go to Division I. I don't know where that expertise came from. I think we're at another critical point, as Dr. **Stone**, pointed out where we need to use all the resources to make this place work in the future and avoid the unintended consequences. I don't want 10 years from now to try to have to rebuild that Lab School, if we close it now, because--because it will be impossible to do. So, I think we need to look and draw on everyone so that we have transparency in the process and we get faculty and the best input we can into it so that we make the good decisions.

Funderburk: Good. Senator **DeBerg** and then Mr. **Carignan**.

DeBerg: Well, I—taking off from Frank **Thompson's** comment about the Board of Regents, I would like some good minds in this room to think best about how the faculty can relate directly to the Board of Regents. I—I think it's really important that we as a faculty work directly, or have some direct communication, with the Board. I—I—I no longer am content with hearing "the Board says this," "the Board says that." I don't believe that our concerns get to the Board. They may. I don't know. So, I—I—I would hope

that some of us begin to brainstorm about what the best approach to the Board might be and who might best make it.

Funderburk: Mr. **Carignan**.

Steve **Carignan** [Assistant Vice President/ Executive Director of GBPAC]: My name is Steve **Carignan**, and I'm the Executive Director of the Gallagher Bluedorn, and I also oversee another auxiliary or ancillary unit, the UNITIX, which does run on a balanced budget and actually saved about 2 FTE when we created that. I did want to speak a little bit to Senator **Edginton's** comments and that is—and frankly the comments that have been expressed by several people here, which is please do take the time to understand the multiple issues around, I think, the unintended consequences. I think—for example, I've never been brought before this Body to give a presentation about the business model and how it works. I think you'd find that edifying. We did a program review about a year ago, which unfortunately was not shared broadly. It was done at the same time Athletics did its review for the Board of Regents, and we did comparison studies. We looked at things. We looked at expenses and stuff, and I'd love to share that information with this group, and I do think in terms of being in a positive way engaged in the budgeting process, that kind of information would be very important to the faculty, if they want to engage in those conversations. Thank you.

Funderburk: Thank you. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I—I'm not sure this is a question. Is the Senate the only one who has that connection, or could we ask the Chair of the Faculty to invite the Board to a general faculty meeting? I don't know how it works.

DeBerg: Anyone can petition.

Terlip: Ok. Thank you.

DeBerg: I think.

Breitbach: Can I get in the lineup?

Funderburk: Great. You are the lineup.

Breitbach: I would like us to, as we look at the time, to keep in mind the reason that this meeting was called. It was called because of a petition that was brought before the Senate over a week ago. Unfortunately, things have happened within that week, as **Laura** said, “the sky fell” with not a lot of details accompanying it. But we do need to address the purpose for this meeting, and the purpose for this meeting was the petition that dealt with—what it addressed, the auxiliary funds and the funds being transferred from the General Fund to the Auxiliary Programs. So, we need to bring that to closure. We need to have some resolution about what we want to do with respect to that resolution. And I know that the waters were muddied by what happened on Thursday, but what happened on Thursday was not the reason that this meeting was called initially.

Funderburk: Ok, so we have 5 minutes left. First, I want to thank everybody for a very large, what could have been contentious meeting, for actually showing the responsible comments that a group of professionals like this can make, and I very much appreciate that it has been a very easy meeting to be in without a voice. So thanks to everybody here. I’ve only heard one thing that I perceive as actionable from this Body—it is a repeated request, I believe, to the President to meet with us to discuss perhaps our previous petition and his stance on that and also the call about the consideration of program closures. Is the sense of the Senate that I as Chair should proceed asking on that? Is that the majority? Can we do a show of hands of that? All in favor of requesting that? Very good. The other question about—that seemed to be raised, is whether that was going to be an open session or an executive session. Is there a particular feeling on this? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I think it should be open. I would propose it should be open. I think the campus community should hear.

Funderburk: Any other comments about that? Senator.

Swan: Of course, I want it to be open, and I want everybody to know about it. But if the President wants to discuss with the Senate in executive session, perhaps for a portion of the time, I think we should be open to that to foster further communications. But perhaps to have another part of the time that certainly is open for any faculty member who comes to the Senate who wants to address the Senate and/or its guest could do so. But I wouldn't make it just one or the other.

Funderburk: I'll point out that we have only 4 Senate meetings left this year. So, in all—I mean, I would think in all likelihood we would be talking about another special meeting to do this, so make sure as we're discussing it that's what we're talking about, is finding another time to schedule.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I—I don't know. I also thought I heard Senator **DeBerg** request communication with the Board of Regents? Was that not a direct request that we should look into that? Or no?

Funderburk: I don't know how we would operate on that at the moment. I mean, I understand.

Terlip: I don't either. I'm just trying to make sure we sum up the meeting.

Funderburk: Right. I mean, I think the only thing we could do in that case would be to have a committee form to figure out how we want to proceed with that. Clearly, the idea of requesting the President to visit is something the Chair could do. I—I can call a meeting, and if that's your sense, then I'm happy to write a letter and ask him. Dr. **DeSoto**.

DeSoto: Yeah, I just—I probably would not go myself one way or the other. And I—I don't mean to be inserted into (?) the affairs of the—of the Senate, but if the question about having President **Allen** come has—is, in part, due to the concerns that faculty feel about a lack of transparency that I've

heard and a lack of communication, I would strongly encourage it to be open.

Funderburk: Thank you.

Terlip: You've got a hand back there.

Funderburk: Yes, please.

Dan **Power** [Professor, Management]: It's my understanding that the President is going to make an announcement within 2 weeks on cutting things like University police, possibly other changes. Given those tight deadlines, and I—I'm not certain why we have that deadline, I think it'd be a wise thing for the Senate to consider requesting the President to hold off on that action until we can have more consultation, that there's no reason to enforce a 2-week deadline to make decisions that are fairly momentous and that the Senate should be listened to on that. [applause]

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: That's why my request that we consider was to have the President—have him discuss with us well in advance to his announcing it publically and receive our feedback, too, then before he were to announce them publically.

Funderburk: Yes, please, **Lisa**.

Jepsen: Could I just offer one final point for consideration for the faculty which is just a reminder that there have been a lot of comparisons of our Athletic Department to Iowa and Iowa State, and I just wanted to remind people that we play what used to be called 1AA Division football or FCS football, and they play FBS football or what used to be called 1A football, and the revenue streams from those two potential categories of football are very, very different. So I would suggest that we consider wheth—how appropriate and to what extent we can compare ourselves to Iowa and

Iowa State when we are looking at our Athletic Programs, particularly their expenditures. Thank you.

Funderburk: Ok, so we are at the 5:00 o'clock mark within a moment— actually, we just hit it. I will be writing a letter to the President requesting that he set up a meeting with us. I will leave open the Monday afternoon timeslots, telling him when our regular meetings are. Is it my sense that I should be willing to postpone business currently before the Senate if he should select one of those dates? (voices responding)

Terlip: I think the Senate would be willing to meet with the President, if it was convenient for him, on a non-regular date.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Edginton: So move.

Dolgener: So move, second.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton** and Senator **Dolgener**. All those in favor, "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Thank you for a very good meeting. (5:00 p.m.)

Submitted by, Sherry Nuss, Administrative Assistant, UNI Faculty Senate