

SPECIAL
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
03/19/12 (3:33 p.m. – 5:16 p.m.)
Mtg. #1711

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Press: Emily **Christensen**, *Courier*, present.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered no comments.

Chair **Funderburk** had no comments.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that both the Educational Policies Committee and the Bylaws Committee have been meeting and will be bringing procedures/recommendations to the Senate soon for approval.

2. Minutes for Approval

None.

3. Docketed from Calendar

None

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1122 1020 Consultation Regarding Auxiliary Enterprise Operations
(**Smith/Kirmani**)

Motion to move into executive session (Dolgener/Kirmani**). Failed.

A lengthy discussion ensued with President **Allen** regarding the University Budget and Auxiliary Enterprises on campus.

****Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes to 5:15 (Terlip/DeBerg).**
Passed.

5. New Business

****Motion to adopt the draft resolution for the Board of Regents that's been circulating (DeBerg/Swan).** Passed.

6. Adjournment

****Motion to adjourn (5:16 p.m.) (Edginton/everyone).** Passed.

Next regular meeting:

March 26, 2012

CBB 319

3:30 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March, 19, 2012
Mtg. 1711**

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** called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Ok, first, call for press identification, please.

Christensen: Emily **Christensen**, *Courier*.

Funderburk: Any others? [none heard] Ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** None.

Funderburk: None today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Comments from Chair **Jurgenson**?

Jurgenson: None

Funderburk: None today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: I'll have no comments today as well.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

Funderburk: And then comments regarding the reorganization?

Breitbach: Just to report that the Educational Policies Committee has met several times. They have worked very, very hard to hammer out the language. **Mike's—Mike** was on that Committee—excuse me, Associate Provost **Licari**—and so we are anxious to bring those guidelines for teachers [**Licari** said something helpful]—yes, yes, back to the Senate for their approval, and the Bylaws Committee, **Scott [Peters]** and **Jesse [Swan]** and I have also—and **Chris [Neuhaus]**—have also done a lot—a lot of work, and we are anxious to have a regular meeting where we can get those recommendations approved. That's all I have for today.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

No minutes considered for approval today.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

No items for docketing today.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1020, CONSULTATION REGARDING AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE OPERATIONS (**SMITH/KIRMANI**)

Chair **Funderburk**: Ok, so we want to first, of course, thank President **Allen** for rearranging his schedule to be with us today. We've got the single docket item, which is Docket Item 1020, Consultation Regarding Auxiliary Enterprise Operations that we asked to meet with the **President** about. As I said in the e-mail, we'd like to do part of this in executive session if there is consensus from this group, so that would first need a motion to move into executive session if we are going to do that.

Dolgener: So move.

Funderburk: From Senator **Dolgener**.

Kirmani: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Kirmani**. All those in favor of moving into executive session

DeBerg: Is it debatable?

Swan: Yes.

Funderburk: I don't see why not. Yeah, go ahead.

DeBerg: I'd like to speak against this motion. I think it's really important at this point in our University's life that our comments and the **President's** comments are on the record and are published as Senate meeting Minutes for people to read. I also believe that it's important that our colleagues

from across the University are here—who are here get to stay, so I hope that we will vote down this amendment [sic, motion]. I think it's time for a real transparency here, finally, and I hate to see the Senate playing—playing along with any kind of process that's not transparent. So I hope that we'll vote this motion down.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus** and then Senator **Roth**.

Neuhaus: Part of that I agree with. The only—only concern I would have is that I—I know at least everybody in our shop was under the belief this would be an executive session, and that—that's why there aren't dozens of folks from my neck of the woods here. I think—I think word had gotten out that this was probably going to be executive, for better or worse, and so I—I think that's why we have so few people in attendance right now.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**, Senator **Edginton**, and then Senator **DeBerg**.

Roth: Yeah, I would just add that, I mean, fundamentally I think it should be an open discussion.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Is the agenda going to vary from the docketed item? When you go into executive session, is the agenda an open agenda?

Funderburk: I—I think that anything that would be appropriate to ask the **President** would be on the table.

Edginton: Ok.

Funderburk: Wherever the discussion leads. As I mentioned in the e-mail that I had said that primarily the type of things when we discussed this at our last meeting were primarily budget-related type questions that were being raised for issues, so that was the prep I offered. Senator **DeBerg** and then Senator **Smith**.

DeBerg: Well, I think it's unfair to the—all—to the tons of people that were at the meeting in which the discussion about auxiliary spending happened to have this meeting be closed in which the **President** is going to address those concerns. I think that's fundamentally unfair to all the people who came to that meeting. The other thing about people from your—from your shop who didn't come because it was closed, if the Minutes are public and published, they'll at least have some access to what happened here. I know there is a broad interest around campus, and that's why I think we should publish Minutes.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I agree with **Chris's** [**Neuhaus**] point. I think it is important if you are going to have an open session that you announce it beforehand as an open session, and I think it's only fair to the **President** that if he's told that this is going to be executive session, that in fact it be executive session. I don't think we should change the rules in the middle of the stream here.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator—I'm going to go with Senator **Wurtz** because she hasn't said anything, and then Senator **Roth**, Senator **DeBerg**. Senator **Wurtz**.

Wurtz: I think it might help us if we keep in mind that we can always make a motion to arise from executive session if we decide that we are not comfortable with where it's going.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: I felt it was very clear from his e-mail that it was only a suggestion for executive session and would need to be voted on, so I—I read it very clearly as just a suggestion.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I'm quoting **Jeff's** [**Funderburk**] e-mail to us. It said, "The President is willing to proceed as we choose." So I don't—I don't believe a

promise had been made to the President, or at least according to **Jeff's** e-mail it didn't read as such.

Funderburk: Any further discussion? Senator **Neuhaus** and Senator **Swan**.

Neuhaus: You had—**Jeff**, you had made a suggestion that we might find some sort of compromise, too, in which we would take note of some of the things that were said but not go down to the certain transcript-like.....I don't know whether that's something that would—would appeal to more people or whether that—that—that would be unacceptable as well to some, but that—that some of the things that might be said at the moment when taken in that larger context might—might—you know, I think what we're after is where did we end up at the end of the day, rather than what did we say at that moment and wish we hadn't.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**, and then if it's appropriate, I'll make what clarification I can. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Because there are some guests here, and because Professor **Allen** indicated that he would be willing to speak quite openly, I wonder if we can have the first part of our discussion open, as one Senator noted if we are in executive session we can always rise. If we are in regular session, we can always go into executive session. So we could accommodate, hear from the people who are present, hear from Professor **Allen**, confers, and then move into executive session 30 minutes from now or some other point later to discuss further matters that seem that perhaps we shouldn't discuss in an open session. So, I suppose this is just all happening. We're just back from Break, right. We're thinking we should give ourselves time to think. I think that I'm going to be voting "no" on this motion with the expectation that we can go into executive session subsequently, and then, of course, Professor **Allen** would never say anything he feels uncomfortable saying in a public forum. And if we go into executive session that's where he or any of us would say things that we might want to say in private. So I'm going to be voting "no."

Funderburk: And then for clarification, this meeting is the result of a meeting that Secretary **Peters** and I had with the **Provost** and the **President** back before any of these announced cuts or anything else happened, which part of the idea was to start exploring whether we could get greater faculty input into budget issues, starting with the Senators being able to understand more how the University Budget works. We do know that part of the activities of the last couple of weeks have now kind of changed the climate over where we began this discussion of how—what this session would be like. That was just offered as background. Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, another reason I'm opposed to executive session is I felt badly used by this expectation of secrecy when these program cuts were dumped on us, and I don't want to be once again having to keep secret things that were said in a University Faculty Senate meeting. I think that's an abuse of us. So I hope we will vote this motion down.

Funderburk: I will comment that I thought I had that in the e-mail to everybody that our intent was to vote to have a report from executive session, but under our consti—as I understand it from the people I consulted with, under our constitution that's where executive session says it's secret. But at any time we are able to vote and say we would like to have a report prepared. And that was always the topic that we had with President **Allen** discussing that. The issue has been trying to figure out how to work within our somewhat antiquated system of the Constitution and Bylaws here within the Senate and make it follow our procedures. Only commentary. I saw Senator **Gallagher**, and I thought I saw somebody from over there.

Gallagher: In any event, I think one of the—the issues is that there hasn't been a--a real good dialogue between faculty and administration, and if we're trying to sort of get that started and inculturate that, we're the faculty representatives as Senators, and sometimes it's easier to sort of shift that culture in a smaller venue rather than a larger one, with the idea that we start out small and get a little bigger. So I'm—I'm thinking that executive session is fine.

Funderburk: Other comments or are we ready to vote? Ok, all those in favor—we'll need a hand count on this because it requires a super majority—please raise your hand. The Secretary will help me count. This is in favor of executive session.

Peters: I have 8.

East: I have a question. You said a super majority is required? (several voices clarifying two-thirds) Two thirds?

Funderburk: Yeah. It fails. Ok, so the consultation regarding auxiliary enterprises. [to President **Allen**] I don't know if you want to make any comments first, or just start with questions?

Allen: Well, this is the--the topic that was given, so we'll start with this. I would like to say a few words, and then we can open it up to questions that are obvious (?) and—and hope to have a discussion. And I don't have the resolution in front of me, but there was a resolution passed in 2009, I believe, that basically said that University Auxiliary Enterprises should receive no more than 3% of the General Education Fund, and when you aggregate the following enterprises, and it's not clear why it falls under auxiliaries, but it includes Athletics, Gallagher-Bluedorn, Maucker Union, Wellness and Rec. Center, Field House Enterprise, Health Clinic. These are the ones that are listed normally as the "auxiliary enterprises." And in the most recent time period, in 2011 we had actual data, it was 4.8%, so I think the resolution was passed in the context of given that difference. Have a discussion about auxiliary enterprises and forecast when that 3% might be achieved. And so, **Jeff**, I would like to make a few comments in the context of that.

I was not privy to those previous discussions about how the 3% was selected. Since I've been here, it's never been close to 3%. And since 2000 since that's when the data I have, it's not been 3%. But it was 6.7% when I got here in 2007, fiscal year 2007, which is 2006-2007, and that percentage has declined over the past 6 years, even with the denominators getting smaller and our General Funds had gone down by \$12 million, which is

tuition plus State Funds to 4.6 budgeted this year, although we had to wait until the final year to find out what was actually spent, but it should be close. When I got here in—that's approximately \$7.5 million dollars. It was \$10 million back in '07.

The other thing here is, of course, as you know, the Board of—of Regents not looking at just—not looking at Auxiliaries but looking at Intercollegiate Athletics, requested Iowa State and UNI to either eliminate or substantially reduce the amount of General Fund money going to Intercollegiate Athletics, and I expanded that to all auxiliaries here, but that was their request. That was back in, I think, March of 2010, and in September or sometime in that period of time, we came back with a plan to reduce it to—this is just Athletics now—to 2.4% of the overall amount of General Funds to go to Intercollegiate Athletics as General Fund money. They approved that, and so—and then as you probably know, a couple of weeks ago I added to that charge a \$500,000 additional cut. That's on-- in addition to getting to the 2.4%. That was again approved.

Secondly, if I understand the Minutes from the meetings or from other materials--maybe this is not important, but I think the way it's characterized is somewhat incorrect how this is done. The General Fund support is indicated in some of the messages, not out of this Body necessarily but from I think Professor **Thompson**, that at the end of the year there is a deficit that's found and there is then money from the General Fund rushed in there to cover the deficit. That use of General Fund money is planned. It is discussed with the Vice Presidents who have those auxiliary enterprises under their control, and so—and in—then if the auxiliary goes over the amount, which includes General Fund money, they are responsible for covering it. I mean, they—we do not use additional General Fund money to—to—to cover it. So, it sounds like it's kind of like at the end of the year, "Oh, my goodness. There's a deficit, unexpected."

The—the other thing that is somewhat misleading is probably—well, I'll get to it. But anyway, the Vice President overseeing the particular auxiliary allocates the funds from his or her budget, and those monies are

transferred to those auxiliaries every month, one-twelfth of it every month, SO.....

The third point is—and this is the fault of us, obviously. We have not been—in sharing the—the kind of—about how we do budgets. If you kind of look at the Financial Statements document, it doesn't provide much insights on what we have and what we don't have. It is a document that is guided by accounting rules which are not necessarily reflective of reality or very helpful at all in terms of doing the budget. In this case, for instance, if you look at any of the auxiliaries, there will be a deficit in the end that is really there because you have—if you have 20 people working in the auxiliary, they will have accrued vacation time; they will have all these things that are considered responsibilities, but they are not really paid for. We have the same thing for academic units, except that in the academic units they have gathered that up, and they put it in central administration, the same type of big gapping—gaping deficit, it looks like, but it's really an accounting thing. So, I would hope that maybe one of the outcomes of this discussion, and maybe discussion in the future, is how do we—and we talked about this, **Jeff**—how do we—we'll probably not dis—agree on everything, but at least we can maybe agree on the documents that we could use to get that recognition (?). So that is something which I think there is—and I'm not sure if there is or is not a Budget Committee for the Faculty Senate, but that is something which I think would be helpful.

Four, and this is not about the financial piece, but there is, in my opinion, value in each of these auxiliaries to a campus that is residential, to a campus that is largely undergraduate, and a campus that has students that take off on weekends too much, and it's sure nice to have them stay here. The question is how much value and thus how much support do you provide for the auxiliaries, and secondly how do you fund those services? Give you an example, in Athletics, all the Missouri Valley teams—the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Departments—basically have the same size budget. Illinois State and Southern Illinois are much larger, but—quite a bit larger—but all the one other of those have—and I'm not sure what they do in their other auxiliaries, but have much more of that covered by student fees, not by General Funds. It's the same amount of money, and

the students still have to pay it one way or the other, but it's not in the General Funding. Charge a lot more per student. And, of course, Southern Illinois has a lot more students, and so it adds to a larger _____ (sounds like "valley") _____ --a larger money, so—and so I'll stop there and try to answer any questions on the auxiliaries that you might have.

Funderburk: Questions from the floor? Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I don't have a question, but I do have a observation that I have a slightly different perspective on, both the Intercollegiate Athletic support through the auxiliary funds and the Wellness Recreation because we are very close to that. Over time we have built interdependent relationships with Intercollegiate Athletics to advance our academic programs, and only when we would be able to advance our academic programs did we build these kinds of relationships, and I want to make that very clear. Only when it was to our advantage to work with Intercollegiate Athletics on facilities or human resources did we enter into any kind of an arrangement.

I look at this—and I've said this before—over an extended period of time. If you go back 40 years, all the coaches were members of the faculty hired into a teacher-coach model when we're in Division II. And for us to get to Division I academics, those people all had to be replaced over time. The last person to go was a Iradge Ahrabi-Fard, and to be frankly honest with you, he's a better physical education teacher and scholar than he was a volleyball coach, and he was exceptional at doing that. So, you know, if you think about the replacement cost of bringing an entire physical education faculty in who have the—the teacher-scholar orientation and then at the same try—time trying to build a Division I athletic program and, you know, in some cases, at the beginning, move those coaches over, but incrementally move those coaches over as the retirements occurred and as people change their—their portfolios, I actually think we've done a pretty extraordinary job of decoupling ourselves, and the word that former Vice-President John **Conner** liked to use was "re-engineering" the relationship between HPELS and Inter—Intercollegiate Athletics. And I think—I think we've done that, and I think you have to look at this issue in that context, that if you took all the funds that were going into the academic programs

that are in the School of HPELS that now maybe are consuming a little bit of those auxiliary funds, or a large part of those auxiliary funds, we've done pretty well in terms of building our academic programs.

And I—I just think we have to sort of keep that in mind, and we have to look at this as a journey that maybe get us to a total zero configuration at some time. I mean, if we pay—played more Wisconsin and Iowa in football and get half a million dollar payouts, maybe at some point we'll be there. But it's just not something that can happen overnight. And I realize that there are, you know, tradeouts. You know, we're saying we're going to let some academic programs go and continue this process, but it's been an ongoing process for 40 years now, and I think we made great progress, you know, toward the separation that needed to occur.

Funderburk: Questions or comments? There was a lively discussion about

DeBerg: I have a question.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I was kind of upset when I heard Troy **Dannen** brag about how they weren't going to have to use their gift from **Wasendorf**. "That's—we won't have to use that. That's there for a rainy day. We're so lucky that he gave us this generous \$2 million gift." I mean, if this is not a "rainy day," what is it? That he would not expect Intercollegiate Athletics to use that \$2 million gift to help return to the General Fund \$2 million that the General Fund had given Athletics.. I—I—I don't understand that at all. What's that gift there for?

Allen: Yeah, I don't know. I didn't hear him say that.

DeBerg: Well, he said it in public. I heard him on TV say this.

Allen: I think the first thing is you'd have to go—not to say we can't do this. You go back to the donor and make sure the donor intent was followed, which we could do for us. And I think the Rainy Day Fund was either in the

context of the University or at least Athletic Department. Again, I didn't hear the quote.

DeBerg: I don't—I haven't seen the memorandum of agreement with **Wasendorf**. I don't know what it says. But Troy **Dannen** called it a kind of Rainy Day Fund. Glad you have one. So do you have any other comments on that?

Allen: Well, we could go back to Russ (?) **Wasendorf**. I'll go back to **Troy** and say, "Do you want to visit with **Russ** and say 'Do you want to reallocate?'" I really believe—and this is probably when you start going into executive session when you talk about donors—but I do know that there are donors who have started their gifts here at the University of Northern Iowa in the Athletic Program, Dick **Jacobson (?)** comes to mind, who has now given \$14 million for academic programs. So maybe another thing—I'm not just talking about **Russ** here, by the way—but to say I hope that we can work with him to say we'll have these great academic programs, some of which match up with his interests and can we expand his giving in the way that would help the University in that respect.

DeBerg: Well, I just want to know for the executive session concern, Troy **Dannen** mentioned the \$2 million gift from Russ **Wasendorf** in the media, so it's not like I'm breaking some kind of a horrible Development Office privacy here by mentioning that gift.

Allen: Well, I'm not—I'm not talking about the privacy, I'm talking about moving forward with a particular donor.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I—I want to make one other comment about the Wellness Recreation Services program because in a sense it has the same trajectory or path that Intercollegiate Athletics had. When I came here, the bulk of Campus Recreation was under the direction of the School of HPELS. All of

the people involved in professional positions were in split appointments where they taught 50%, and then they carried out their responsibilities to Campus Recreation. When we built the Wellness and Recreation Center, a year before we transferred Campus Recreation out of the School of HPELS to Student Services, and we had some negotiated settlement there that enabled us to retain certain resources. Then it gave other resources away. The individuals, you know, that are working in Campus Recreation at this time, they don't teach for us anymore. We've lost their—that teaching capacity. And, of course, we don't have anybody that's in any kind of administrative position. It costs money. You know, when we built the new cen—Wellness Recreation Center, it cost money to do that. I—I don't think—**Jeff** and I have talked about this—I don't think when we built the Bluedorn-Gallagher Center, when we built the Wellness Recreation Center, when we went from Division II to Division I, we really had a clear understanding of the costs that were going to be involved in running these programs, and now we're living with the end product of not really sitting down and calculating out what the consequences are—were going to be of building a fantastic Wellness and Recreation Center. Now—now—now we have a problem.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I'm trying to figure out how to phrase this as a—as a question. But, I mean, one of the things I think we all have to do on the administrative side and the faculty side as we go from here is try to have a—a—a clear direction of where we want to take the University and try to figure out a better way to communicate that, both to one another and to the public. And within the last month we've announced the closing of programs. We've announced the closing of Price Lab. We've announced a \$500,000 cut over 3 years to Athletics. And I saw the interview you did in the *Register* in the past week or so where you talked about—a little bit about your “frustration” perhaps would be fair to say, with NCAA requirements and with the amount of resources that athletics takes from universities. And as we think about budgeting, and as we think about trying to figure out where we move forward as a University, how—how do you see our priorities? How do you see the amount of money we spend on Athletics

fitting into our priorities, and how do you make those decisions when you are at the table and you are faced with this much shortfall from the General Assembly that you have to cover? How do you make those decisions about how we're going to cut this back? And we're going to cut, you know, \$500,000 over 3 years from Athletics. Because I'll tell you frankly as someone who is not particularly hostile to Athletics, not a huge booster necessarily, but not particularly hostile, that seemed paltry to me.

DeBerg: That's a slap in the face.

Peters: And—and—and so, I mean, how—how do you make those--those trade-offs and those decisions? Those are the kinds of things, I think, that we need to—we need to be talking about.

Allen: Yeah, we actually cut \$1.5 million from Athletics over these 3 years, including \$500,000. Now, you can disagree that that's paltry, but that's—but to them it's pretty meaningful. My comment about the NCAA is about the NCAA. It's a cartel run by BCS schools, and we are not a BCS school, and—and our conference is not a BCS conference. And so that explains to some degree the fact that—I'm getting back to your question here--that schools of our level, so to speak, are going to be in a financial stress for the foreseeable future.

Getting back to **Chris's** point, my guess they never anticipated how the NCAA would look and how these—well, it's probably not a business model we can produce back then. So if we say if you go to Division II to I, can it be sustained here? I was not here, and I don't know what groups of people were engaged in that. Were there faculty members engaged in that? I—I—I don't know. But I think our 5-year plan, it may not be as eloquent as you would like—it pretty well captures the vision I have for this University. I still believe our comparative advantage is, as having some really good graduate programs, but it is undergraduate education, and that it is based upon our history. But this is also creating financial challenges of small class sizes, not using teaching assistants, and—and—and so that is something which I think is part of the mission.

Beyond that, I think it is a matter of the pre-K through 12 which I think I mentioned was not in the 5-year plan before and that is something which, again, we have a comparative advantage over the other two State institutions, and I could probably argue any other institutions in the State. So when you try to get down to if you are facing a deficit from the State in terms of State funding and our own cost levels, how do you make those decisions? _____ will that Athletic piece play in—and this will open up another debate in how the University is--is viewed by people. If you go to Division II to Division I is different than going from Division I to Division II, in my opinion. You still have scholarships in Division II. You have 44 football scholarships. We'd lose all the _____ contracts. I would say we'd have to go Division III, and—and I think that's where institutions have to go because Division II is not very viable, in my opinion. **Chris**, you probably know more

Edginton: No, I think you're absolutely correct. I—I think we—we'd have the same financial situation.

Allen: Yeah, and so the question is then—and I know if we've had somewhat this same discussion before, what impact would that have on our enrollment. We have about 400 student athletes. About two-thirds of those are funded by private money scholarships. 1.2 is funded by set-aside, which is General Funds. But our experience when baseball was cut, I think it was about all but 2 left, I think. They left pretty quickly after that, so I don't know if **Chris** can talk to some of these areas close to HPELS in terms of Athletic Training and all the Physical Education programs. Large number of students. Will that be affected? And—and—and my concern would be that some of those students would be affected. So, if you lose about 500 students given that—well, maybe about I'll say 700 students—you end up with the same financial situation without Division I Athletics. And—and—and we'd have to probably restructure our whole—how do we—how do we position this University in that context? I'm not saying it can't be done, it's just

Peters: I have one—one follow-up to that. If—if—one follow-up to that and that's that you—you mentioned that you don't think—if—if I heard you

correctly anyway early on in your answer you mentioned that you don't think that it's going to change very much. That is, when we're in the position we are in the marketplace that we're—that we're sitting in kind of a no-win situation in terms of athletics. That is, the NCAA is still going to be a cartel that serves the needs of the BCS schools, and we're not a BCS school.

Allen: Well, that's what I

Peters: So, if—if that's a long-term problem, and if constrained funding from the State is a long-term problem, then I—I think you also think it's not going to change significantly in the future, right? Doesn't something have to give? I mean—I mean, maybe the answer is that we move to Division III and—and do we—do we need to do something to get on a track to do that?

Allen: Well, let me first say let's explore—and I say this will--will happen because you have to get student buy-in. You have to have Board of Regents approval. But, first of all, how much can you take out of General University Funds and put on to—to fees? And we have some of that capacity already taken. We paid for the roof of the dome and things which again wasn't part of the business model back then when the dome was built. So I'd like to explore that first, but I think the scenario for mid-majors probably is going to be challenged at some time.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator **Roth**, Senator **Gallagher**, and Senator **DeBerg** next, and then we'll continue the list (?). Senator **Roth**.

Roth: I only want to offer some perspective. You'd mentioned the figure of \$1.5 million being not paltry, and I just wanted to insert over the last 6 years the Physics Department based on our work with the B.S., which is slated to be cut, has brought in \$4 million in external funding.

Allen: And I appreciate that, yeah. I

Roth: I know. I know.

Allen: And—and the work you’ve been doing is very fine, good—good, high-quality work. Christine **Twait** gave me more numbers last night ‘cause I knew you’d be here.

Roth: Ok. Thank you.

Funderburk: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Yes. I’m glad **Scott** asked that question. **Scott Peters**. I’m wondering if that—the Division that we have right now is sustainable? Do you see State funding for the University ever coming back, or do you think it’s going to recede more? And, if it does, I don’t think this Division—I’m suspecting that this Division isn’t going to make it—isn’t going to be—isn’t going to be sustainable. So, I’m w—I’m wondering what you think about that and what that would have to do with the Big Picture as well?

Allen: Well, the—my projection on State funding. I hate to do that during a legislative session. (light laughter around)

Gallagher: Well, as a trend though. As a trend

Allen: As a trend?

Gallagher: it clearly, all over the country

Allen: Well, we—we know what the trend’s been for the last 10 years.

Gallagher: Do you—do you see that ending? At all?

Allen: I hope that our political leadership and our taxpayers, quite honestly, get a greater understanding of the importance of education—higher education, in particular, but all education—to something which they want as economic development. We need to have it part of the reasons. But for—for many of the State officials, they like to tie it into economic development. And I still argue that the best way we help economic development is populate the State with educated students from

UNI. We do that. In fact, we don't know how this session's going to come out—this session. It will get to the ball retournment (?), but we use the argument that 75, 76% of our students graduate and stay in the State of Iowa. We don't tell them to stay, but, in fact, we hope they will. They can go anywhere they can. And so to me that gives the State a good payback on money they would invest in our educational programs, if they--they are staying in the State to work.

So I think—what I'm getting at is we probably have to make more effective arguments that—that we are helping not only the students to succeed, because they could be successful anywhere, but helping the State because of where they go. In terms of predicting what the State will do, it kind of depends on what—what the economy is going to be like over the next 10 years. It's going to be dependent upon the national resolution on the debt is going to be, because that would have, I think, imprac—impacts on money available for higher education in the State. And also kind of depends upon what we think about higher education, particularly public higher education.

Gallagher: I—I think that I don't see this as much as money available in the economy so much as a political issue. And—and I would hate to bet—I would hate to bet that we could sustain this model, and—and then find out we can't. I'd rather plan ahead. I'm—I'm—I kind of look at Truman State and what they did, and it's pretty amazing that they—they were able to carve out this position for themselves. And it's—it—it's a pretty marvelous situation. And I wonder if we wouldn't want to look at something like that?

Allen: Well, I think we would have to—and I don't mind doing that. Get a group together to look at the Truman State model to see why that worked so well. What did they have to get the Legislature to do to make that happen? Could we get that done here? Could we get the Board of Regents to approve for selectivity, which they did down in Truman State?

Gallagher: Right. Exactly.

Allen: It's a model which, obviously, has worked very well for Truman State. We'd probably reduce the University in half. Are we prepared to do that?

DeBerg: Well, our athletes would be gone. (light laughter and voices commenting variously)

Gallagher: Yeah, I know it's

Allen: Yeah, the athletes, but the academics—I think, what I—what I—I—I—I don't see how else you could do that. I'm not saying we shouldn't do it. I'm just saying that would be one of the—the impacts, I think. We'd not have a 13,000 population. I—I—again, we—we could sort through this, and maybe I'll come up with a different conclusion, but based on what I saw from a distance from Truman State, that's what happened. And—and not saying they aren't stronger and they aren't better, but they are much smaller.

Gallagher: Right, but what would happen if we were forced to that anyway at some point? And the idea of distinguishing ourselves as something different. Everybody's putting programs online. Everybody's doing it—this race to the bottom. And why don't we do something really novel? And think ahead? And figure out a way to distinguish ourselves to be a pretty special place?

Allen: Yeah. And—and to me it—it would be a—a good thing to look at, and—and I think the—the issue is what are the parameters they had to change to—to get it done? And can we do that? And I'm not—because I don't know. They honestly did some things with selectivity there.

Gallagher: Thank you.

Funderburk: Ok, Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Terlip**, Senator **Kirmani**, and Senator **East**.

DeBerg: Well, so I heard one of your main defense of the _____ of our athletic spending being that we would lose 400 students?

Allen: No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying we could lose 4 or 500.

DeBerg: Well, I'm just saying, I—I'm not really good at math, but I multiplied \$6000, which is kind of a ballpark figure for in-state tuition times 400. We could give 400 honor students full-rides for \$2.4 mil, which is like a quarter of our Athletics' budget. I mean, the idea that we're spending this much money to maintain enrollment seems to me to be an untenable argument. I would rather use this much money, if we are going to use it to recruit students, to recruit like honor students or, you know, students that we want to fill certain programs. So I don't—I—I don't buy the "we would be sunk if we lost 400 student athletes in enrollment." I just think that's not a good argument.

Secondly, the—the Noel-Levitz Report that you all paid big bucks for always gets forgotten. That was just several years ago, and the Noel-Levitz firm did careful research on our prospective students, and on a long list of 14 things that they're looking for in a university, Athletics came out dead last. Our students do not come here for Athletics. They come here for academic reasons: a well-qualified faculty, quality academic programs. So I—I don't see any real connection between our Intercollegiate Athletics Department, based on their research and based on what else we could do with that money in terms of getting students. I don't see any tenable arguments there. I—I'm always surprised that I hear you make them. I mean, let's spend \$5 million and get 800 honor students. That's still only, not even half the Athletics budget. So, I—I don't—I don't get that thinking.

Allen: In the literature, we'll go both ways on that, the impacts of—because we looked at that literature for—at some length when we did the resolution and worked with the Board of Regents. There's two arguments, and I—I didn't find the literature being convincing either way on enrollment, although I—my own gut feeling is that we would lose quite a bit.

DeBerg: Noel-Levitz doesn't indicate that.

Allen: Yeah, and—and—but Noel-Levitz said, “Why did you pick this? Or why did you become aware of it?” That's the second kind of question that wasn't asked. And the—the other piece of it is “how much is it?” when you use fund raising for the academic programs. And that's probably even more than half in the research I've seen. I have personal experience that—that—when I was at Iowa State, I think an \$8 million gift because of what happened on the basketball court went to academics (?). Was that maybe just pure luck or (?)—or it is a—a—another argument. But again, the—the literature is split on it, so

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I'm—and perhaps you've done these studies, but we seem to discuss Athletics as all Division I or all Division III and find that—I mean, we have to do lots of different sports in Division I. Has anybody looked at a strategic plan for Athletics or done some model where “let's be really, really good at basketball.” I mean, keep that, so we can still draw people, but it would be—and I'm picking that one; it might be something else—I mean, am I just unaware of the commitment? I know there's schools that really—like Georgetown doesn't play football as far as I know, but they're known for basketball, and they have a reputation that still draws students. Have we looked at any sort of way to link strategic planning for Athletics so that they're within budget?

Allen: Yes, well, first of all, there are constraints on what you can do and be Division I. You have to have 15 sports, and you have to have so many men's sports and so many women's sports. I think the fundamental question, and Michael **Gartner**, who is a Regent, asked this, and we had a study done, and—was “Do you do away with football?” Because that is something which is, in our case, FCS, which is Football Championship Series (sic, Subdivision), and it is—doesn't get any BCS money. It doesn't—and—and the way our—our structure is, we'd—we'd save some money but not a lot. But—but because of being loose of their filled (?) contracts and things like that. But if you look at most of private colleges in our—in our

conference, they do—they don't have football. And I think—but once you get beyond that—see I think, I—this is what I think the NCAA should do is— is should allow more flexibility in the number of sports that you have to have, because—and—and you've got some schools do and—and nothing we want to is fear (?)—is that they really do invest in 2 sports. They have 15, but they invest in 2 sports, and they, like Georgetown in basketball, you mentioned, and that's what gives the CBS primetime, and

Terlip: Exactly. That's what I mean.

Allen: That's how—and then I—I think they do

Terlip: Have we looked at whether that would work here?

Allen: Well, given--given the constraints, I do think we need to be a bit more strategic inside that, so—so we can say, "Ok, what are the 2 or 3 sports?" Can we get any past that? (?)

Terlip: Academics has to do program

Allen: Well, actually we've done that—we've done that here with volleyball, when you think about it.

Terlip: No, I

Allen: But—but—but—but I—I—you—we need to go a step further than—there are constraints. You have to have so many sports, so

Terlip: But it seems like we have some room there where Athletics might be able to take a little less of the pie and still have a reputation that would draw students here.

Funderburk: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yes. First, I—I think that UNI students are not very fond of UNI Athletics. That then--that's my impression. Many of them go down to—to

watch the Hawkeye and Cyclone games. If you look at the t-shirts of the students, we have more Hawkeye and Cyclone t-shirts here than UNI Panther t-shirts. So the students are not as supportive of the Athletics as one would expect. So that—that's the first observation I have. Then secondly, what I was thinking was that--that the budget situation will always be bad. There's no way we are going to get flooded by money. That—that's not going to happen. So what we need is more donations. And I—I don't know how well the UNI Foundation is performing. My impression is that they are under-performing. We have to be much more aggressive in getting external money, and also I think our first priority should be to have more students here. And in that context

Allen: More? More?

Kirmani: More students at UNI. Now, one way of doing that would be to do aggressive recruiting at international level. I don't think UNI has done that. I don't know how good they are at it—at those kinds of things. Perhaps outsourcing the thing would be better. So out-of-the-state students and international students, I think they have to be a very large part of plan, how to do that. It's not going to be easy, but it is doable. I was talking to a colleague at University of Iowa last week, and the—in his program, he has 160 pre-_____ students of whom 90 are foreign borns. They are undergraduate. They are freshmans, 70 from China and 20 from Malaysia. I was telling him that I would be happy if I get 10% of that. So I—I don't think _____
I think that recruiting international students would help us a lot, but it means a lot of work and lot of excellent planning, and that—that we really have not done.

Allen: Can I respond to—to that? The last part.

Kirmani: Yes.

Allen: The Provost actually thought we were underperforming also in international students and made some adjustments in terms of how we do things, in terms of International Office. And then we have some different

arrangements now in China and in another place. And so I think your point is probably on target. I believe, though, that we will never be like Iowa State or Iowa, but we don't have to be. We could be somewhere between where we are and where they are, and I think having—what do we have now? 413? [voice agreeing] There are some schools like us that probably have 1000, and so, to me, that's a benchmark that we could use. The one in Minnesota comes to mind, if we want to name them. So I think you are exactly right on.

The Foundation I think is—is—it is always an issue: Are they raising enough money? Are they raising money for 5 reasons? Based on some data, it looks like they are about where they should be based on other peer groups, but—but I think thank goodness the stock market's back up over 12,000, and—and that helps a lot. But I think in both cases there is a change that in--in fundraising, too, that people not only want to be more conservative because the uncertainty level is higher, but they want to be a bit more restrictive, which is ok, but they kind of drill down and say they want this program and that program. But—but—but improvements can be made in both areas. There's no doubt about it.

Funderburk: Senator East.

East: I would like to broaden the discussion a little bit, if that's ok? I think—I—emergencies make—decisions made during a maj—emergencies don't make for good policy generally, and so I think that—that we—we need to be a little careful about what we advocate while we're cutting budgets. I don't know much about Athletics and what the Institution would be like if we changed Athletics substantially, but I suspect it would be different. And—and just like we didn't know what we were getting into when we made the decision to go up, we don't know what we'll be getting into when we make a decision to go down or away. So I—I think that—that we need to be a little bit careful in those kinds of situations.

On the other hand, we've not, I think, had a good process for making policy or coming to conclusions about how to implement policy. I've—I've heard—I've read and heard some of your statements about vision, and I—

that sounds all cool, but I've not heard of any discussions you've had with—or that have been going on about how you'd—how vision is achieved or how vision is decided upon. And it—it seems to be that—that—and we've also heard that—that—that you and—and some faculty leaders are working on how we can better improve faculty involvement in decision-making, etcetera, but I—I think that that's what we really, really, really, really need to look into and to come to some sort of conclusion about. It—it—it's very frustrating to have to—it's very encouraging, for me at least, to have to hear you say we should be—we should focus on pre-K to 12 education and—and developing teachers and better teachers. And I—I think that's a—that—that seems to be our role historically, and I think that's a very good role for us to—to try to excel at, given where we are in the State, and—but—but I don't hear of any discussions going on about that, how that's going to happen. I—I know some people in the College of Ed. I don't hear of them being involved in any—any such discussions about how might we achieve that. And—and that's frustrating to me.

It's also frustrating to me to—over the year, I've heard a number of examples of faculty here at the Senate and then other—other venues making suggestions about alternatives for saving money or rearranging, retargeting money, whatever. But it—that doesn't seem to be discussed. I don't know if it's dismissed out of hand. I do know, or I—I believe fairly strongly that if you ask administrators how to—how to cut the budget, they're not going to cut anything they're doing. It comes into their pockets. They're not going to suggest that a service that they need perhaps needs to be reconsidered. And so not having faculty input, direct faculty input and discussions, into the budgeting process seems to me to not make sense. And—and I would encourage you very much to continue the discussions with faculty leaders on how you can better involve faculty in the decision-making process that deals with vision and budgeting and how you go about recognizing accomplishing these visions. This is a university presumably even—presumably we have some moderately intelligent people here that maybe have some good ideas, but they seem not to get used. And—and—I—I look forward to hearing more about how all of these things are going to get—get better because the Administration wishes to have good faculty relations and good consultation with faculty and better decision-making.

And I don't want to dwell on the past, but I would like to encourage some very open thinking about what goes on in the future. Thank you.

Allen: **Phil**, could I—could I respond? Good, good comments. On the vision, I would hope that people participated in the planning process that took place two years ago. So, I mean that—that was led by the Provost and was a fairly large committee, so I hope that was available to people to speak.

East: Yeah, I—I—we did participate, but it's kind of like a camel, a horse formed by a committee, or manu—designed by a committee, and that's what happens when you open up a strategic-planning process to the whole faculty as the la—as a whole, and then have to decide, “Oh, we've got to make everybody happy.” There's almost—there was almost nothing I could see in that process that actually made decisions about where should we focus on at this University.

Allen: Well, I think when you put pre-K through 12 in there, the—that's one area of focus.

East: Yeah, and we put Graduate Education, and we put this, and we put this. [several voices adding to the mix] It—it was very much “throw everything in the pot” rather than let's make some strategic decisions for X amount of time and go with it and see what happens.

Allen: Ok. It—it—related to your second part of your comments about faculty participation, faculty input. I—I think I alluded to this. When I was a Provost, we had budget—a Senate Budget Committee which I met with once a month as Provost, and that was comprised—I don't know how we'd do it here, but it was comprised of a Faculty Senator or maybe a Faculty Senate-designee—I forget how they did it—from each of the 9 Colleges or whatever they had, and then I think there was a special Chairperson from the Faculty Senate that was kind of managing the process. And—and we met at least once a month. Then the other thing which—now this was—not saying we want to do this, but I'm not sure I've mentioned this, **Jeff**, but President **Geoffrey** also had a Budget Advisory Committee made up of not

only faculty but also P&S and comparable administrators. And that process, I—I chaired that one year. The President chaired it every other year. I chaired it the other—every other—every other year, and that’s when each Vice President had to come in and make their budget pitch to that committee and got feedback from that who I think was about 12 people on the committee. And then the President was sitting there listening to the same comments. And so—I mean, though—there are things we can do to address this. I—I—I agree that it’s kind of a disconnect with—though we did have faculty on the task forces 4 years ago, on cost containment and revenues, but that wasn’t budget. That was kind of identifying things under the stress of the FY 09 Budget cuts that—but we did get some good ideas because we had faculty and students who all were looking at those different issues putting forw—going forward. But the—the Budget Committee here, the Faculty Senate, it would be a good idea. I’m saying we want to take it the next step, but whatever you think is best. And the **Provost** and I haven’t talked about this in detail, but I agree. We need to improve. We need to improve.

Funderburk: Ok. We’ve got a pretty good lineup. Say—state your name loudly in front of the thing. Then I’ve got Senator **Roth**, Senator **Smith**, Senator **Edginton**, Senator **Kirmani**, and Senator **Neuhaus**.

DeBerg: I’m on the list.

Funderburk: And Senator **DeBerg**.

Andrew **Stollenwerk** [Asst. Prof., Physics]: So, I guess a separate issue of not feeling consulted about good ideas that I might have, because I consider myself to be—not to brag but—fairly intelligent. But to focus on Athletics, to give you an example, quite possible of some ideas that I have, it—it seems like we’re—I—I’ve heard people say we need Athletics because it—it helps build our—our student population up, but it brings in money. I’ve also heard people say that it—it’s draining our money and, you know, I—I feel—I’m an experimentalist, so when I hear this happening, I—I say why—why should we argue how much teeth—how many teeth are in a horse’s mouth, when we could just open it up and look inside. I—I think we

should let the students decide in this case. Personally, when I go on an airline, why should I spend more on my ticket so that someone else could have a comfort that I—I didn't want. So if—if a student wants to—to support Athletics, let them buy the ticket, instead of the student fee. That way if—if they're—the Athletic Department can sustain itself that way, because the students enjoy it that much—and I—I'm an athletic—I'm an athletic guy. I—I enjoy sports. I enjoy watching them. I enjoy beer. I enjoy Sunday and Monday night football, so—but we're a University. We're—we're here to educate. We're not a business. We're a non-profit organization for the betterment—betterment of society. Athletics is—it should be a business, because it is not part of our—our—our mission. Athletics doesn't drive global econo—economics. Technology and innovation does. We—we don't rely on some—some product such as oil. We don't make our economy because of oil. We—we thrive on in—innovation. The United States thrives on innovation, and by cutting these programs, we're destroying the backbone of our economy. If you want to save Athletics, or by “you” I mean the students, let them decide.

Allen: This gets back to your [indicating Kirmani]point I think. The students are more interested in Iowa and Iowa State and will say, “Well, we don't want sports.” And so I--we can't—we do, of course, have people who pay for things here that are not in their area. In other words, we cross-subsidize half, three-fourths of the Departments here with funds from other Departments in some sense, because the cost structures are different. But, you're not saying, “Make everything a cost center, just Athletics.” I was just wanting to

Stollenwerk: Well, the things that aren't the—the goal of the University. We're—if it's not about education, then

Allen: Then would Gallagher-Bluedorn be the same thing?

Stollenwerk: Absolutely, if it can't support itself.

Allen: And so if we do that test, if we don't have any of those, then that'd be fine?

Stollenwerk: Well, I—I don't think that we would not have any of those. For example, I—I played a lot of imermen—intermural sport—well, I'll—I'll give an example. The—the Bucks' game. The Waterloo Bucks. I—I used to live in Boston. I went to Red Sox games, and—and it was a lot of fun.

Allen: That's where the beer is, too.

Stollenwerk: And—what's that?

Allen: That's where the beer is. [light laughter around]

Stollenwerk: And—and the Bucks' game, I—it—it's a small—the—the people kept dropping the ball when they should have caught it. But I had a really good time there, and I—I plan on going more often. So I—I don't think it will cut out Athletics, even if the worst case scenario, which I don't think will happen. We will continue to have theater without the big performance. We can go outside. We can continue to have athletic events. It just won't be in a big dome with expensive big screen TV's, and—and people will enjoy that. I—I will enjoy it personally. I haven't been to a game yet because I—I have to pay and the students don't, so I--I feel it's unfair, so I refuse to go, but if—if it's a little bit more equal, I—I think I might be more inclined to do so.

Allen: In fairness to the students, they do pay the fee.

Stollenwerk: They do pay the fee, but what about the students who didn't come here because of Athletics.

Allen: Right. Right.

DeBerg: It's over \$100 for Athletics and

Allen: Is what you're saying is that's

Stollenwerk: Is it \$400?

DeBerg: They would--they pay about \$112 for Athletics.

Stollenwerk: Yeah, I mean, why should this person pay \$112 so this person could go to the athletic games? It's paying money for something that has nothing to do with Athletics. And—and it will still thri—thrive. As—as a community we will continue to thrive without big money to these things. We can still enjoy theater without an insanely nice Bluedorn, but to cut academic programs before, I believe, before these other non-mission-oriented programs is—is wrong.

Allen: Could I follow-up? Did—are you saying just test the students _____?

Stollenwerk: If they want it, let them pay. I mean, that's just

Allen: So that would go for all the auxiliaries now?

Stollenwerk: It's just, you know, if—if—we're—we're—we're debating when we should let the customers decide.

Allen: Yeah.

Stollenwerk: And—and I don't feel as though we've let them decide. I also feel that if—if said we cut academics or what should we do otherwise, I think we—I'm just one person. I imagine other people have a lot of good ideas, and—and—and no offense, but I—I can ima—I cannot imagine that one person could have the—the intellectual creativity of—of 460-some-odd individuals.

Allen: I've never claimed to have it either.

Funderburk: Ok, so we've got Senator **Roth** and Senator **Smith**, and then we're over to this side of the room again. And we are getting close on time.

Roth: We're on international—I'm sorry.

Funderburk: I was just letting everybody know we're at the 20 'til, it looks like.

Roth: We were on international recruiting earlier, and I just wanted to speak to the Physics Department. We actually are and were made attempts to use their international recruiting folks. Very recently, we actively recruited a brilliant, young, female scientist into our ranks. She is one of our two brilliant junior faculty members, and she's from China. And there are—would be—maybe won't be two students interested in the Bachelor of Science degree from China, and there are formal partnerships being forged with Chinese university—universities, institutions, and families. And they are interested specifically in the Bachelor of Science Degree, and—and so we—we were on the verge of this. So—so our international recruitment efforts through this faculty member were in place. And we—and—and now they're ready to really drop us and not even look in the rearview mirror. If the B.S. is--is gone, then they're done.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I want to get back to the issue that Phil [**East**] kind of builded up, and it has to do really with the program cuts. Now, on the particular substance of the cuts, I quite frankly am largely in agreement with—with what was done. It was mentioned that we should let students decide what sports they want to support, but if you follow that logic, students already decide what programs they want to enroll in. And this University, given the budget situation, can't afford to offer programs that don't attract enough students. That could be high-quality programs. It can be great programs, but if it doesn't attract students, then you can't afford to offer it at some point. So I'm not concerned with the substance of what was proposed.

I am concerned with the process. Normally, it seems to me that people who complain about the process do so because they don't like the outcome, but they don't have a good argument against it, and so they bitch about the process. But in the case at hand, I think you can make a very good argument that the process was seriously deficient.

I raised the issue a couple of weeks ago when we were meeting with the Academic Deans and the Associate Provosts. I said that in the implementation of change in organizations, there are two extreme poles: one which is very participative; another which is very top-down and authoritarian. And in this case it seemed that we got the pretty much in the top-down authoritarian approach on a matter, the curriculum, that has historically been of intimate concern and direct involvement of faculty. And now I don't think that you and the **Provost** are, you know, insensitive to these issues. I certainly think they are intelligent people. You're well-motivated. But it's hard for me to understand why you didn't adopt a more participative approach, particularly given the work that was done 4 years ago and all sorts of other things. I'm assuming you had a good reason. I'd like to know what it is. Why did you do the very quick, ram-it-through, top-down approach to program changes that you actually gotten done.

Allen: I think maybe the **Provost** has spoken to that before, but in terms of—part of the issue was that in this particular case we were following the Union Master Agreement because of the potential end result might be to lay-off some tenured faculty. And I think we were advised, correct me if I'm wrong, advised by counsel that we did meet and confer first about sharing more broadly because there is

Gibson: I mean, that is exactly the reason why. I mean, I was at the ACE Conference last week, and I attended a panel. Penn State is going through program reduction, and their process started 18 months ago. So they're—they are taking 18 months to go through a process. I mean, and this speaks to what you're—what you're saying. And at the end of that session, I raised my hand, and I said, "You know, that's wonderful that you had the luxury of 18 months to go through this process." And part of it was that they did start with a very small committee, and then they expanded out. They expanded out. They expanded out. Unfortunately, I did—I don't—I didn't have 18 months.

Smith: You had years!

Female voice: Yes.

Gibson: Years?

Smith: Years! I mean, 4 years of when you started here, we had the Academic Program Assessment Task Force that said, “Here are programs that don’t have the students that should be cut.” Before that, even when President **Koob** was here, there was recognition, “We’ve got budget cuts coming down the road. We’ve got to look at our programs and tighten our belts.” It wasn’t done. Why not?

Gibson: Well, as you know, the APA was also a very contentious process with s—with some of the—with some of the faculty

Smith: And you don’t think this is more contentious?

Gibson: Oh, it is! Oh, oh, it is. I’m not—I’m not

Smith: And—and now faculty have every right to complain that they weren’t involved.

Gibson: I’m not—no—I’m not saying that—that it’s—it’s not. It was. At that time, we did cut some programs based on

DeBerg: A lot of them.

Gibson: based on your recommendations. We cut—we cut

Smith: Right. You cut them—right we cut deadwood, the stuff that had no students in and no faculty, but what about the serious cuts that you’re proposing now.

Gibson: Ok. Ok. Would—would you let me finish?

Smith: I’m sorry.

Gibson: Ok. We received the report. We cut programs. To move forward with the deficits that I was experiencing, I said to Faculty Senate many times that program—additional programs would need to be cut. I also said that 70% of my budget is based on salaries. I never made a blanket statement about lay-offs, because I cannot go there, but I had hoped that Faculty Senate would understand when I say, and when I gave a presentation that showed programs with few students with hardly any students graduating, that those programs would be an issue. Now, we have a Union. This discussion is not about the Union. But we have a Union, and we are advised how we are to proceed. I also said at Faculty Senate that the first step in program reduction was meeting with the Faculty Union to discuss the definition of program. I said that over and over and over again. So that was the first step.

Smith: Can I respond now?

Gibson: Mm huh [nodding].

Smith: You—you know, I'm sympathetic, but it seems to me that you've let the issue with the Union kind of override the issue between the faculty and the curriculum, because the faculty have responsibility for the curriculum, and that's what we're upset about. And it seems to me that on terms of the curriculum stuff, we basically got no input until the end.

Gibson: Well, let me put the question to you.

Smith: Well, just a minute, I want—I want—now it's my turn.

Gibson: Why—why didn't the facul—why didn't the faculty, as the Faculty Senate, deal with those issues 5, 10, 15 years ago? Why didn't the Faculty take that responsibility?

Smith: Yeah, and—and I think if maybe the Administration had said, "Here are the recommendations of the Task Force. What should we do with this?"

Female voice: “Here’s how much you have to cut.”

Smith: “Should we go ahead? We’re going to need to make cuts, let’s do it.” But that never happened. I met with you, and Phyllis [**Baker**] met with you, and you basically said, “Yeah, the Task Force did its thing, and now you and the Deans are going to take care of it.” Well, years later you took care of it, but you kind of dropped it on us like a sledgehammer. And we just didn’t—there was no substantive faculty involvement after that. And that, I think, is—I mean, I’m very—as I’ve said, I’m very sympathetic to the actual cuts that were made. I don’t have a huge problem with it, but the process could have been much more involving of faculty.

Gibson: I—and I would agree with that.

DeBerg: I—I want to defend the Union in this.

Funderburk: Let--let me have just a second. I’m going to point out, we have 10 minutes on our regular meeting. President **Allen** has another thing he has to get to in a few minutes, so this is important discussion. We’re also having discussion about how we get some more of this going for future groups. I’m not going to be the end, but point that out.

DeBerg: I—I—I just want to say the Union Leadership sat around all Fall wondering when in the world we were going to get a call from Administration to start talking about this, because I—I have a couple of other people in the Union kept hearing their **Provost** talking about “program cuts, we need to meet with the Union,” and they did not call a meeting with us until the 10th of February. That’s when they got this going. So I don’t want anyone to think that this got rushed and jammed the way it did because the Union is any way to bl—anywhere to blame. So, I—that makes me really angry. The Administration could have started these conversations a year ago with the Union.

Allen: With **Jeff**’s permission, could I just say a few words, and then I have to leave, but—good—good conversation. I’ll see some points that we’ll take back. And I think the question now is--is how do we move forward in a

way that does engage faculty better, not only in the budget process but in the planning process. If the planning hadn't taken place, we can fine-tune it. We talked about a retreat. That's another process, but I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I'll—I'll come back when you want me to come back.

[various voices offer "Thank you"]

Funderburk: Thank you. I don't know if this would conclude the portion of what we had scheduled for this auxiliary. I don't know if the **Provost** is interested in entertaining questions further at this, or if we want to move on to any New Business.

Gibson: I—I—I would like to know where is the Budget—Faculty Senate Budget Committee? Where—where—where is that? Who are those people?

Peters: We're actually revamping it right now to try to get a more

Funderburk: Ok. I—I—I'm going to, I mean, I've held my water on this for a long time. The University Senate Faculty Budget Committee refused to attend the meeting that I pa—that I scheduled their presentation on this Fall. So, the idea of complaints that the Senate didn't deal with their report, the problem was nobody from that Committee would attend the meeting when it was brought up. And we couldn't figure out what the report was asking us to do. So therefore it was tabled again. Which is why currently I've requested the Bylaws Committee to restructure those committees so there's a problem with that.

Gibson: I—I—I have no—I ha—I will meet with the Budget Committee. The **President**, I'm sure, will meet with the Budget Committee. I've never been clear on where is the Faculty Senate Budget Committee or several other committees that should be functioning.

DeBerg: You had a Curriculum Committee, but you don't meet with them about program closures.

Gibson: What?

DeBerg: You had a Curriculum Committee all these years, and they don't get asked about program closures, so, you know. So what if you don't have a Budget Committee.

Gibson: Well, I'm talking about moving forward, Senator **DeBerg**. If we

DeBerg: Well, I hope I am, too.

Gibson: If—if we want to move forward, that's why I asked the question. Where is the Budget Committee? Who's responsible? I'd like to know that today, if possible.

DeBerg: Fine.

Funderburk: I've got Senator **Terlip** and Senator **East**.

Terlip: One of the things actually I was going to—to suggest that everyone look at more thoroughly in the curriculum process is I bet if the Curriculum Committee were here and there's always a place where "How much is this going to cost?" And the Administrators sign off on it just as easily. So, I mean, there needs to be—everybody is responsible for letting programs grow and all of those kinds of things.

Gibson: Yes, I agree. I agree.

Terlip: So, I mean, I think we need to use that existing process better and put some teeth in that. I mean, I think it has to be budgeted.

East: I—I somewhat resent your asking where's the Budget Committee? I'm sorry. We had the—whatever Senate committees we have, have no authority to talk with anybody other than the Senate, so for—for an Administrator to—to sit here and say, "Where is your Committee? Why

haven't they...." essentially saying, "Why haven't they been meeting with us?" is

Gibson: All I'm saying is I would like to meet with that Committee.

East: Ok, then don't say, "Where is your Budget Committee?" Say, "Let's make plans for—for incorporating faculty input into the budgeting process," and not just a **Provost** meeting with a Budget Committee.

Female voice: It's everyone else's fault.

East: This needs to be the entire University process, not just a Faculty Senate Budget Committee meeting with the **Provost**.

Gibson: You have to start somewhere. We have to start somewhere.

East: Right. And let's—let's think about where we're going to start, rather than starting with some sort of history that maybe doesn't make any sense.

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**, then Senator **Van Wormer**.

Peters: Just to answer the **Provost's** question, we have a proposal that, depending upon how we end up structuring our docket over the next few meetings, may be voted on next week that would revamp the Budget Committee. The current—the proposal as it stands is to have a committee that's comprised of a representative from each College, chosen by each College Senate, and someone appointed by the Faculty Senate. They are charged with meeting with the **President** or his designees on a regular basis and—and our hopes would be to get that up and running as soon as possible so that we can have more routine communication in—in that way.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**, and I'm guessing that was Senator **Swan**.

Van Wormer: I'm not as concerned with the curriculum than I am the layoffs, and that really bothers me. There are so many courses on this

campus. We have so many well-qualified people. Maybe they're in Departments where they don't have the enrollment, but they can teach Cornerstone. We were told earlier that faculty here can, from whatever Department you are, you can teach Cornerstone. We've got a number of courses in LAC, and I just wanted to say that I'm just very concerned about that. I don't want to see anybody get laid off.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**. Chair **Jurgenson** and then Senator **Roth**.

Swan: Ok, thank you, and I want to thank Professor **Allen** for coming and beginning the discussions with us and then to say that all of my colleagues who have spoken to me about your proposed academic program cuts to the Board of Regents want to ask you to please delay making that recommendation this Wednesday to some future meeting so that we can continue and have what that my colleagues would feel would be more meaningful exchanges.

Secondly, several of my colleagues who have very long histories here tell me that unlike the other two Universities in Iowa, the **President** of this University has had to have a very strong role, much more so than the **Provost** even in academic programs, and—and so they want me to communicate that to you to help our **Provost** more or more apparently so that everyone knows that our **Provost** is getting the help that Office needs for academic programs on this campus. But most importantly they were hoping we would discuss more the actual—your actual proposals for academic cuts, going through what they feel is very fast, already to the Board of Regents. Waiting for another regular meeting at the Board of Regents does not seem at all unreasonable to them or to anyone, and so they want us to ask you and me to communicate to you that firm desire and request to please ask the Board to remove that for this meeting and then to continue this discussion so that we could collectively understand better the proper kinds of cuts we need to make.

Allen: Thank you.

Roth: Just a--a comment, and I—I—I think that I'm—I'll be brief. And I—I think should probably departments (?), but at the metric of 10 graduates

over a 5-year average as a metric for _____ programs, if that were used like for Physics, for example, 94% of the programs in the nation would be shutdown. So all I'm suggesting is that quota is—that metric was taken out of context and just used here, and if you look at it contextually I think Physics and I think a lot of other programs would do well. So I'm—I'm—and we're only a little bit depressed by low enrollment, I think we'd find. I just wanted to say

Terlip: I think some of the language programs are similar in terms of number of—or students graduated. Nationwide, we're actually above average. [several voices talking at once]

Roth: We graduate more than 60% of the departments in the nation, so

Funderburk: Ok, so President **Allen** has a personal commitment otherwise,, so we need to let him leave the room at this point, so thank you again very much for coming.

Allen: Thank you very much.

Funderburk: Ok, we have either 3 or 8 minutes remaining. If I can see out of my glasses, that would help.

Terlip: I would move to extend it by 15.

Funderburk: Motion to extend to 5:15, so extension by 15 minutes. Is there a second to extend?

DeBerg: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **DeBerg**. Discussion? All those in favor of extending the meeting by 15 minutes to 5:15, say "aye." (ayes heard all around) All those opposed? (a couple heard) Two in opposition. Abstentions? Motion carries. Ok. So, we're now at the point where it should have said "New Business," unless there's just someone else that

wants the floor for something else. Does anybody want to bring forward any business?

Edginton: I don't want it for something else, but I—this is my turn here.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I wanted to comment—make two comments, one on Senator **Van Wormer's**, you know, comment. I have two granddaughters that attend the Malcolm Price Lab School, and, boy, we had to deal with their broken hearts. And they're broken. And I'm very concerned about being sensitive to those people who are being directly affected by the changes that are occurring, not only the—the children and youth at the Malcolm Price Lab School, but also the faculty that are being impacted. And I'm just hoping, you know, that—that as a campus collectively we can express great sympathy for those individuals, because they're being directly impacted by the—the decisions that are going on. Very difficult.

The second comment I wanted to make is that—and I didn't get a chance to—to place this, and I don't know why the other auxiliary funds were not addressed in this reduction, the Bluedorn-Gallagher, Wellness Recreation Services. The University of Iowa runs their Wellness Recreation Services on an entrepreneurial model completely. It—you know, it's all a fee-based program. And there's no reason why we can't change the culture of the way that we run the Wellness Recreation Services Program and move it to a fee-based structure. They—they have multiple sources of revenue there. They have the—the health fee. They have now a dedicated Wellness Recreations Fee, and they're still being subsidized, and they charge fees for their services. They're still being subsidized by the General Fund. There's no reason why, you know, they can't change their management strategy to be more entrepreneurial. I mean, there's just a model right here in the State they can draw from. I wanted to make one last comment. Sport is very big in popular culture. See the movie *Invictus*, ok? And you'll understand the impact of sport, you know, on a world-wide basis. It—it—it's just not about our ability to engage in technology innovations here. You

know, we need to be responsible for popular culture of the world. It is—it is significant, very significant, economically and otherwise.

Stollenwerk: Joyfully retracted. [light laughter around]

Edginton: Ok, thank you.

DeBerg: Nothing gets retracted from these Minutes. [nervous laughter around]

Funderburk: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: In picking up on Senator **Swan**'s comments a few minutes ago, this process has happened very quickly, the process of program closures, and I do fear that we have not—that—that there might be things we're overlooking in terms of how programs that are closed affect other programs. I mean, I know of a program that was taken off the list of closures pretty much at the last minute, I think the night before the—the final list was announced, and that program was taken off the list of closures pretty much because I happened to talk to my neighbor about a neighborly matter, not about a curricular matter, and he raised an issue about how eliminating this one program might affect the Social Science Ed., All Social Science Endorsement. Now, if I hadn't of happened to talk with my neighbor that night, presumably that program would still be on the list and going forward to the Board of Regents, possibly for final approval as of Wednesday, and then the All Social Science Endorsement would be scrambling, trying to figure out how to offer the courses necessary. And are there other programs on the list where people didn't happen to talk with their neighbors about this? [voices saying "yes"] I mean, I'm—I'm pretty concerned about that.

And—and—and the other unfortunate thing about how quickly it happened is that I really think it—it short-circuited the opportunity for facul—for faculty in programs that—that—that maybe were graduating few numbers to be creative about the way that we design the programs to become a more viable program, if you will, in the future where—where numbers of

graduates is an indicator of viability. I mean, even when you think about something like languages, presumably maybe you don't have the resources to offer a—a—a foreign language major, but presumably a lot of those majors might declare minors if—if—if the major is eliminated. And you may still be able to offer a significant number of foreign upper level courses and have the minors that then become maybe more viable programs. I mean, a foreign language minor with a business major, for example, I think is a pretty good thing.

So I—I—it's just the speed with which it all happened I think short-circuited a lot of the important consultation that normally takes place over curricular matters, and so I would also support trying to delay asking the Board of Regents to approve this so we have time to be sure that--that there aren't more—more—more problems out there that we haven't thought of yet.

Gibson: If—if I could just briefly respond. I mean, as I—as I mentioned, Penn State is taking that route. Part—I mean, a—a huge part of this for me is the pressure that I have. If you think about having to reduce your budget by \$2.3 million, that's a huge amount of money. You know, I—it, you know, it was mentioned that, yes, I should have anticipated. There—there is no way that I would have anticipated that I would be given a \$2.3 million cut. Ok, maybe I wasn't realistic, but, I mean, believe me, I've learned my lesson, and so for next year, I mean, I hope we get our legislative request. I hope we do, but having the—the consistent cuts, and as you know and I've said, going forward for next year, I'm still \$800,000 in the hole. So I don't—I don't even have enough money with what I've done. I still have a deficit, so I—I did not anticipate, rightly or wrongly, that I would be in the situation that I am. \$2.3 million is a lot of money.

Funderburk: We've got Senator **Neuhaus**, Senator **Terlip**, and Senator **Edginton**, was that a motion for you at that same moment? Senator **Roth**, Senator **DeBerg**, and **Gallagher**. We'll have to see if we can get that far. Senator **Neuhaus**. [light laughter around]

Neuhaus: Well, you know, I think a number of times we've talked about unintended consequences, and one of the things I really worried about

right now is what our enrollment is going to be for next year. I mean, for better or worse, we have—we've gotten a lot of air out there, and, you know, I—I supposed in one sense I'm hoping that a lot of lowans are going to just wave that off and say, "I'm—I'm going to have my kids go where I went and Granddad went," and you know, we have a—a certain loyalty that will overcome that. But I—I can't be sure of that. You know, we're worried about what the State is going to do for us, but, hey, they—they—they won't pay that much of the bill. It's the students who we've taught. We really need to get more students in here, or else we need to get selective, and then we get selective and then half of us at the table won't be here in a couple of years, because to make it smaller means everybody gets smaller.

In the sense of working forward, I think one of the things we really need to do is—is—is maybe see what sort of damage control can be done. I know that there can be. But if there can't be, then we're going to—to repeat this cycle again next year, because if we lose a bunch of students, then that's—that's as if, you know, whether the—whether the Senate supports the--the Legislature supports us or not, this is going to be a deep blow to us here, and it—it—and it's one I guess we—we won't know until we get there, but—but I'm already a little fearful from having worked with a lot of parents on a lot of UNI Up-Close events, and just the things I'm hearing scare me. They really do.

Funderburk: Senator **Terlip**, can you add anything?

Terlip: Well, I—I would agree. I mean, I—my husband kept telling me to shut up when we were waiting in line at Applebee's and there were groups of parents with the student newspaper telling their kids the programs weren't going to be there, and I go, "Oh, yes, they will," but he was like, "Be quiet." But I mean, they were—they're looking. They're saying, you know, "Don't go there, or you're not going to find that out." My question was, and I—I should have asked this of President **Allen**, but I didn't have a chance at the foll—as a follow-up to Jesse [**Swan**]. Is there any reason why this has to be done at this meeting? Can it be put off to April? I mean, if you [to **Gibson**] can't answer that [several voices speaking]

Gibson: I—I'm not going to answer that.

Swan: That's for the **President**.

Gibson: That's

Terlip: Ok. Well,

Gibson: I mean, I will discuss it with him. I can't say that. I will discuss it with him.

Terlip: I just wondered if there was some deadline I was not aware of that mandated it be done now rather than later?

Gibson: There's no deadline that I'm aware of.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Three—just three comments. You know, I want to make a comment about the way in which the approval of the Board of Regents has been handled, because it's been telephone, and because it's been done with great speed, and there's been no chance for any dissent to be expressed, and that's problematic in my mind.

Gibson: It's not telephone.

Edginton: Pardon?

Gibson: It's—it's not a telephonic meeting.

DeBerg: The last two have been.

Edginton: This one, but the last 2 have been, and so that raises some concern that maybe all of this was orchestrated in advance and, you know, continues to fuel the idea that, you know, faculty involvement was really

minimized in some way. That has to be overcome, and that's why Senator **Swan's** comments about slowing the process down I think are really important at this point.

Second comment that I—I would make is that I was taken back at a earlier meeting we had when the comment was made that there were decisions being made because of the salaries of faculty members. That there were some decisions that were being made in terms of, you know, reducing—or eliminating programs because there were higher salaries in one program than another program. And that—that was—that was very offensive to me when that comment was made. I don't want to put it back on the table, but it was made in the executive session with the Deans, and I—I just don't think—you know, we talk about criteria for decision-making. That's not the kind of criteria that should be used. [pause] I can't think of my—the third comment I wanted to make because ["oops" heard from some jokingly and light laughter around]

Funderburk: Roth.

Roth: I have a couple of comments, one kind of pragmatic and then one philosophical. My pragmatic comment is that--I'm going to keep it as a one-point issue--there's a couple levels that we don't understand the application of the metric on, and—and one is within our own Department [Physics] I—I know the metric was like 10—10 graduates per—per year on a 5-year average. Yet the program that graduated the most and was—was really our—our fundamental backbone that feeds the other programs, that's the one that got cut as opposed to the B.A. which—which is—is—is a 3.4 to 1 ratio or something like that. So, we—we're at a little bit of a lack of understanding that metric?

I mean, there's other things, too. I don't want to bring those back—back up either right now, but the philosophical statement, you know, honestly, I'll go out on a limb here. You know, I—I think you're a good person. I think you have a good heart, and I—I can see this wears on you. And I really think that if you were to wake up in the morning and—and fight this with us and help us delay this and fight for the aca—academic programs just

really fiercely, I think that you'd find widespread support in--in our community and—and all of us stand beside you in that storm, because I really believe in my heart that's—that's the real way to protect the University, is to try to keep these things around. So I think that I—I'm just urging you respectfully to reconsider delaying the meeting and trying to—trying to maybe retain some of these programs that—that are slated to be cut. I—I think you really believe in academics and students and faculty. I know there's pressure from many angles that you get. I'd like you to reconsider, if you would.

NEW BUSINESS

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**. Senator **Gallagher**.

DeBerg: Me? I would like to move for adoption of the draft resolution for the Board of Regents that's been circulating.

Swan: Second.

Funderburk: Motion and second of the draft. [a few voices, papers shuffling]

DeBerg: I would like to go on record thanking Ken **Baughman** for his good wordsmith and the energy that he expended over Spring Break to get this draft together. Thanks to **Ken** who is not here.

Funderburk: Are you ok with.....?

Gallagher: I'm fine.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: On the substance of the draft, I don't have strong feelings either way. But on the practicality of getting the Regents to kind of, you know, delay things and kind of re—redo the process, it seems to me to ignore

fundamentals of organizations, sort of like how things work. And specifically this, I can't imagine that the Regents who have pushed the Administration of this University and the other State Universities to cut programs to deal with budget cuts, to make—to deal with things by cutting programs, that they're going to respond to faculty pressure and by doing so in essence undermine the decision made by the **President** and the **Provost**. I just can't imagine them doing that because it would—it would basically set up the situation where they might be, in essence, generating Ben **Allen's** resignation. So this strikes me as kind of a—a symbolic gesture and not all that a helpful one. And so in that regard I just—I understand the motivation. I—I agree with the ideas of stretching out the process, but I think they ought to be done internally here. I don't think we should be going to the Regents and asking them, because in essence we are going over the heads of our Administration, and they're not going to support us over the Administration. It's just not going to happen, and we shouldn't be, you know, pretending or deluding the selves—ourselves into thinking that it will.

Funderburk: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I have no—I don't think the Board of Regents—this is going to affect the Board of Regents. That's not why to do it. I don't want the Board of Regents to think, "Well, we didn't care—we didn't hear any—we didn't hear any voices against this."

Smith: They—of course they have.

DeBerg: So, I—I want—I want something formal to go to them from the Faculty Senate. I think that's really important.

Funderburk: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: At one time we had a conversation here about having this Faculty Senate meet with the Board of Regents. And—and, you know, in light of your comments, Senator **Smith**, maybe the alternative strategy would, as the University of Iowa Faculty Senate has done as--as I

understand—the alternative strategy would be for us to ask for a meeting with the Board of Regents.

Funderburk: I'll get Senator **Terlip**, Senator **Swan**, but by my clock, it is 5:14, so we've exhausted our time

DeBerg: Someone call the question.

Funderburk: unless we are calling the question or extending further.

Gibson: Could I just interject that the Board Meeting is here at UNI?

Terlip: My comment would then be perhaps a friendly amendment to the motion, because, you know—but asking for additional time, I mean, if we asked for a meeting with them in April and asked them to act on it then, I think that could stand a better chance than this nebulous initial _____ but maybe I would be incorrect.

DeBerg: Well, I won't accept it as a friendly amendment because we don't have time to discuss it.

Funderburk: Yep. And we're at—that was 5:14. This is 5:15. Do we have a motion to extend, or are we calling the question?

DeBerg: I'd like to call the question.

Funderburk: Ok. I'll assume that was a motion to call the question and a second over here. So the motion to call the question was Senator **DeBerg**; second was Senator **Kirmani**, for you Sherry [on the audiotape] whenever you come back; it can't be soon enough [light laughter]. All those in favor of the motion to call the question say "aye." [ayes heard all around] All those opposed? [nos heard] A hand count. I'm pretty sure I know. All those in favor of calling the question, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven is my count. All those opposed to calling the question, three, four. Ok, so the question is called. The motion is asked.

Terlip: I would like it noted that I find it somewhat ironic that a motion asking for more time is [laughter]—the Senate refuses to grant us time, but, so [more laughter]

Funderburk: So noted. There is a lot of irony going on lately. [laughter] All those in favor of the statement drafted by Professor **Baughman** please say “aye.” [ayes heard around] All those opposed? [a couple heard] And abstentions? [none heard] I think that was clearly

(?)**DeBerg:** You got one.

Funderburk: I think that’s a clear pass unless somebody’s going to call.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: How about our favorite motion?

Edginton: Move for adjournment. [5:16 p.m.]

Funderburk: Thank you very much, Senator **Edginton**. Second from everybody. All in favor, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] All those opposed, stay in the room.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

March 26, 2012
Location
3:30 p.m.