

Regular Meeting  
**UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**11/12/12 (3:32 p.m. – 5:19 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. #1724**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Press present included Emily **Christensen** from the *Waterloo Courier* and Blake **Findley** from the *Northern lowan*.

Provost **Gibson** offered one comment regarding the 2012-2013 Capacity Building Grant Competition, reminding everyone that this is one-time money and encouraging faculty to apply for the grants.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reiterated the announcement about the visit to campus of Benjamin **Ginsburg** on November 29<sup>th</sup> and offered posters for anyone present to take and post in their areas.

Chair **Peters** announced that Gayle **Pohl**, a member of the UCC, will join the Ad hoc Committee on Curricular Review Process. An updated list of the membership of that Committee is found as Addendum 1 to these Minutes. This new list will also correct the history attributed Ira **Simet**, who once served as Chair of the Faculty rather than Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Chair **Peters** also announced the resignation of John **Burtis** from the Senate Budget Committee, and a snap election added Joe **Gorton** to fill that seat.

Chair **Peters** then polled Senators about the possibility of having a retreat on January 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> to discuss informally some topics to be considered next semester. Senators are to email him with their availability.

Fourth, Chair **Peters** brought up the possibility of some New Business later in the Agenda for docketing an as yet unpublished item regarding some language on shared governance that United Faculty wishes to insert into the Master Agreement [see Addendum 2].

Lastly, Chair **Peters** made a statement about his hopes for today's discussion with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen** regarding funding for Athletics and the gathering of information on the benefits and costs of the program.

## 2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for October 22, 2012, were considered approved after noting that no additions or corrections had been received prior to the meeting nor offered now.

## 3. Docketed from the Calendar

### **1167 1063** LAC Curriculum Recommendations

\*\*Motion that we return the resolution to the petitioner with the request that she first consult in a collegial manner and not yet by way of the curriculum process the relevant faculties in the departments, schools, and colleges and then return to the senate with a complete report including with all relevant minutes of meetings (**Swan/Edginton**).

\*\*Motions amended the motion to only include consulting with College Senates prior to coming to the Faculty Senate. Secunder agreed.

\*\*Motion to call the question(**Swan/DeBerg**). Passed.

\*\*Amended motion failed.

\*\*Motion to docket in regular order (**Heston/Dolgener**). Passed.

### **1168 1064** EPC Recommendations regarding changes to Electronic Device Policy

\*\*Motion to docket at the head of the docket on November 26<sup>th</sup> (**Terlip/Bruess**). Passed.

**1169 1065** Resolution to Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual Requirements

**\*\*Motion to docket in regular order (Terlip/Swan). Passed.**

#### 4. New Business

**1170 1066** Language on Shared Governance to be included in the Master Agreement

**\*\*Motion to docket immediately following 1168/1064 on November 26<sup>th</sup> (Terlip/Swan). Passed.**

#### 5. Consideration of Docketed Items

**1164 1060** Consultative session with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen** (docketed at the head of the docket for Nov. 12, 2012) (**Edginton/Dolgener**)

**\*\*Completed.**

**1163 1059** Report from Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process, regular order (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

**\*\*Not considered yet.**

#### 5. Adjournment

Time: 5:19 p.m.

Next meeting:

11/26/12

Oak Room, Maucker Union, 3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 56 pages, including 2 Addenda.

Regular Meeting  
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
November, 12, 2012  
Mtg. 1724**

**PRESENT:** Melinda **Boyd**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

**Absent:** Karen **Breitbach**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Kim **MacLin**, Gary **Shontz**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters:** (3:32 p.m.) Let's go ahead and come to order. We've got a lot of stuff to do today.

**COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

**Peters:** All right, let's see here. Call for press identification. I see Emily **Christensen** from the *Courier* and Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan*. Any other members of the press? Ok.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

**Peters:** Provost Gibson, comments?

**Gibson:** I just have one short announcement, and you've probably—already know about this, but I will repeat it, and that is the call has gone

out for the 2012-13 Capacity Building Grant Competition. And you can find the information on OSP website ( <http://www.uni.edu/osp/capacity-building-grant-competition> ). We have scholarship grants, small-scale grants, and large-scale grants. And we also had faculty who were interested in really larger-capacity grant-building work, and we are going to have a meeting with those faculty, probably about 25-30 faculty, to hear your ideas. So, the survey worked very well. I want to thank all the faculty for their input. The last thing I'd like to say about the Grant Building Capacity work is the funding is provided from one-time money, and so these are dollars that were allocated either from the President as one-time money or salary savings that we have in the Provost's Office. So I want to encourage all faculty to look at the website and to hopefully apply for the grants.

**Peters:** Thank you.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK**

**Peters:** Chair Funderburk, do you have any comments for us today?

**Funderburk:** Only that hopefully everybody saw the email I sent out earlier about our guest coming in on November 29<sup>th</sup>, Benjamin Ginsberg, the author of *The Fall of the Faculty*. Joe **Gorton**, who is kind of the lead person organizing this, sent posters along. If anybody would like to take posters, you can post them in your place. Please help yourself at the end of the meeting today. That's all.

**Peters:** Well, thank you.

#### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS**

**Peters:** I have several items to discuss today in "comments," some things I might need some feedback from you on. I'll be as brief as I can, but as Senators know, I have been spamming them with emails for the last several

days as we try to get caught up on—try to get caught up from the whirlwind of the past few weeks.

First, an announcement. After some coordination issues, I was able to find a member of the UCC [University Curriculum Committee] to serve on that Ad hoc Committee that's looking at the Curriculum Review Process. Gayle **Pohl**, who is a member of the UCC and is also currently the Chair of the Graduate Faculty, has now joined that Committee. If there's no objection, I'll just attach an updated copy of the Committee membership to these Minutes [see Addendum 1]. That update will include a correction—will reflect a correction. The earlier list said that Ira **Simet** had been Chair of the Senate at some point. He never was—never served in that particular role, but he was Chair of the Faculty. So I'll make that correction on the updated list.

Second, John **Burtis** has resigned his seat from the Senate Budget Committee. I thank him very much for his willingness to give it a try in the first place, especially since as it turned out the person who nominated him had not asked him first [light laughter all around], and I neglected to double check to make sure he was willing to be nominated before I forwarded his name to the Senate. He gave it a good try but decided it was not for him. I've conferred with Vice-Chair **Smith** and Secretary **Edginton**, and we felt like it made most sense to just offer the job to the next person, the person who received the next highest number of votes in that election. But there was a tie [laughter around] between Russ **Campbell** and Joe **Gorton**. Now Professor **Burtis** is from CHAS. Professor **Campbell** is also from CHAS. My inclination is to simply offer him the job. Are there any strong feelings about that? Professor **Swan**, Senator **Swan**?

**Swan:** Can we just conduct a quick vote right now between those two candidates.

**Peters:** That would be fine with me. Do we have ballots?

**Nuss:** Yes.

**Peters:** Could we distribute those and conduct a quick vote? While Sherry [Nuss, transcriptionist] is getting those ballots, I'll go on to make a couple other quick announcements.

Please be sure to get back to me about whether you'd be available for a Senate Retreat on Wednesday, January 9<sup>th</sup> or Thursday, January 10<sup>th</sup>. This would be a working Retreat where we would tackle a couple particular issues that are going to need our attention in the Spring, where we'd be trying to come up with draft proposals that would, of course, then come to the full Senate for debate and action.

**Strauss:** Is this Retreat open to the public?

**Peters:** Well, that's a good question. I think it's entirely possible we could—if we have enough Senators willing to participate that it's doable, I would certainly have no objection to opening up to other members of the University community to come and give us their viewpoint on things and participate. That would be—that would be absolutely fine with me. So we could—we could talk about that, too. I don't know if anyone else has any thoughts on that? [a few low voices and light laughter and voices asking, "Right now? Thoughts on that?"] Yeah, right now thoughts on others being invited. Yeah, Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, I'm always in favor of the Senate doing everything in public. So, I would very much like the—our retreats not even to be closed sessions. So that's my own personal thought.

**Peters:** Ok. Other thoughts?

**Strauss:** Well, in having a Retreat during the off time and also suggesting it should be public is contradictory, after they are all gone.

**Peters:** Well, unfortunately—well, I mean, the 10<sup>th</sup> is a day that everybody is supposed to be on campus. We are all required to be on campus the Thursday and Friday before classes start. So, I mean, the 9<sup>th</sup> would officially be, you know, the day before we're required to be on campus, but the 10<sup>th</sup>

**Strauss:** So one day is when the faculty are required to be here and one day is not?

**Peters:** That would be correct, yeah. Yep. Other thoughts?

Male voice: [now that ballots are passed out] What are we voting for now? [laughter]

**Peters:** Ok, so we'll go back to the quick vote on the Senate Budget Committee. It is between Professor **Campbell**, who is from Mathematics, and Joe **Gorton** from Sociology. [voices joking quietly and light laughter; ballots passed to front.]

**Edginton:** We will return shortly. [**Smith** and **Edginton** leave to count the votes.]

**Peters:** Thank you.

**Funderburk:** Would it be appropriate to review for some people what—some of the key differences about when we're in a retreat or not, particularly with the comment about Senate business since there would be no official Senate business that could be taken in a retreat.

**Peters:** Right, so it would be—it would be worth noting, as Chair **Funderburk** indicated, that we can only conduct business—take votes, make decisions—at actual open meetings. In fact, even if we were to have an executive session at a regular meeting, we can't make any decisions during that executive session. So the purpose of the retreat is not to supplant other business. It's just to get some work done, having working sessions, and then bring it to the Senate for more input. Like I say, I think it could be useful to have people who aren't on the Senate come to that, if they want to. The one thing that I think for sure we would tackle at such a retreat would be to come up with—to try to come up with some criteria for allocation of resources within Academic Affairs. Another thing we could possibly talk about would be “What would we like to take to the new president in terms of what we want budget consultation to look like under a new president? What kind of regular budget consultation do we want?”



And set some processes or something that we would want in place. Those would be a couple things that come to mind that we don't—it would be hard to craft a proposal in a large session. If we could get in a retreat—break down into some working groups—we could make a little bit more progress. So that was the idea behind it. Any other thoughts on the retreat? Yes, Senator **Hakes**.

**Hakes:** Do you want a response from us whether we are going to come or not or only if we are going to be able to make it?

**Peters:** If I could know either way, just via email, that would be helpful. Thank you. Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Just as a reminder, I guess, I don't know if anybody else is involved, but the Committee on Readmission and Retention typically meets the Thursday before classes. Now, they are thinking about moving it, but if they would have it, I don't know if the members would have a conflict, so I would have to decide.

**Peters:** Ok, thank you. That might.

**Terlip:** We're looking at meeting earlier though, to give students a better shot at enrolling in classes, so hopefully that will happen.

**Peters:** Thank you. Anything else? What were the results of our snap election?

**Smith:** Joe **Gorton**.

**Peters:** Joe **Gorton**, ok. I will get in touch with him. All right. The 4<sup>th</sup> thing that I want to discuss briefly is something I just emailed you about this morning, and it was emailed to you basically as soon as I could email about it. On Friday, United Faculty did put forward its initial proposal for the Master Agreement, and it includes some language on shared governance [see Addendum 2]. And as you know this came about in part due to meetings that Dan **Power** had with different members of the Senate, whoever was able to attend those meetings that he had with us. And so

United Faculty is proposing adding a guarantee—or, I don't know, guarantee might not be the right word—but a provision that recognizes the role of the Senate in shared governance, and I think we should talk about whether we want to have some kind of resolution or expression of support for that within the Senate. The timeline on this—the Administration files its response, its proposal, on November 26<sup>th</sup>. My understanding is that negotiations begin relatively soon after that, and that it's—this is—I guess probably the best way to put it, this is the kind of thing that might be likely to be discussed early on in those negotiations. So, if we did want to weigh in on this issue and ask for such recognition within the Master Agreement, we would need to do it on a fairly timely manner. Yes, Senator **Strauss**.

**Strauss:** Chair, I'll—I see where 1.2 fairly fits under our consideration. I'm not sure why 2.0 is on this page, and why we're looking at it.

**Peters:** I put forward both of the proposals that they—that United Faculty characterized as sort of related to shared governance. We could certainly support one and not the other. The other

**Strauss:** Well, the second one clearly has to do with—with United Faculty's relationship with the Board. I

**Peters:** Yes. That's correct. Yep, that's correct. Now, I will note that the Board meets, I think—invites annually the senates of the other institutions to address them. It invites representatives of all non-bargaining units to address them. So, you get like the P&S Council, the senates of the other institutions, representatives from other non-bargaining units across the 3 institutions address the Board. United Faculty, and I think ASCME [?] as well, don't—aren't regularly invited to address the Board, but as a consequence of that, we are not, also not—the Senate, we are not invited to address the Board, because they consider us, if I understand correctly anyway, they consider us represented by United Faculty, and they—I guess their position is that they only talk in the context of negotiations. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** United Faculty has been turned down twice in a re—in a request for a short face-to-face with the Board, so it's not that we haven't tried to

do this. If it gets into the contract, then they would be required to do it. I think it's not healthy to only address the Board over the negotiating table. I just don't think that's good for either group.

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** And of course the Board of Regents doesn't have to have that sort of interpretation that it has. It can seek to include the shared governance structure of the University of Northern Iowa, which is, in fact, separate from the collective bargaining structure, and we should encourage the Board to include the shared governance structure from the University of Northern Iowa just as it does from the other two State Universities.

**Peters:** Other comments on this? I think our two best options—assuming that people aren't ready to really debate this and vote on it today, since you've just seen it this morning, our best options on this would probably be to either circulate it via email and have an email conversation or docket it under New Business, move to docket it for the 26<sup>th</sup> and discuss it on the 26<sup>th</sup>. Senator **Strauss**.

**Strauss:** These are permissive topics, is that correct?

**Peters:** That's correct.

**Strauss:** And so could we define for the Senate what permissive versus mandatory means?

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**, could you take that one for us?

**DeBerg:** There's a—there's a list of mandatory topics in Chapter 20 of the Iowa Code, and I won't be able to name them all, but they include compensation, overload pay, and things like that. Shared governance and addressing the Board is a permissive topic. We're allowed to talk about it if both sides agree to.

**Strauss:** Mandatory must be negotiated. Permissive is that the

**DeBerg:** Well—well, people have—both sides have to agree to talk about it.

**Strauss:** Thank you.

**DeBerg:** Mandatory ones—if one brings it up, the other can't not talk about it.

**Strauss:** So we could support it here, and it may never make it into negotiations.

**Peters:** Correct.

**Strauss:** That's the risk of it, yeah. Of course, if we don't support it, it will never make it anyway.

**Peters:** Ok. We'll move along, and if someone wants to move to docket it for the 26<sup>th</sup>, we could do that, or—or if there's support for trying to do—trying to hammer something out via email sooner. Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I move we docket it at the head of the order on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

**Peters:** Let's go ahead and wait to do that in New Business. We're not there quite—not quite there yet.

**Terlip:** Ok. Sorry.

**Peters:** Ok. And so lastly, if you'll allow me just one brief comment on the main item of business today, the Senate's view on funding for Athletics and other Auxiliary Enterprises has been expressed multiple times in the recent past. Most recently in a resolution passed on 2010—in 2010 calling for all Auxiliary Enterprises to be reduced to 3% or less of the General Education Fund by Fiscal Year '11, with the savings to be directed to maintain the academic integrity of the University. Last year's closure of academic programs and of the Lab School and the resulting loss of faculty members underscores the fiscal realities UNI faces. Our meeting today comes at a time of major change at UNI. If the Senate wishes to be a part of the

discussion with the next president of UNI about the role of Athletics, we must gather information about the current performance of the Athletics Department and its plans for the coming years. The two issues that brought us this item today that we'll proceed with in a few minutes were—had to do with the publicity surrounding football possibly moving up a Division and the increase in student fees to Athletics. And both of those issues could have long-term effect—long-term effects on levels of athletic spending and on amount of General Fund support. Senators, of course, are welcome to discuss any issue related to Athletics with Athletic Director **Dannen**, and I just wanted to say that I hope our discussion provides us with more information about the costs and benefits of Athletics and informs whatever action we might wish to take on these matters as we move forward.

## BUSINESS

### MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

**Peters:** With that, we'll approve—we'll approve Minutes. I got no corrections. Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] received no corrections to the Minutes, so if there's no objection, the Minutes of October 22, 2012, will stand approved.

### CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

#### Consideration of Calendar Item 1167 for Docket #1063, LAC Curriculum Recommendations

**Peters:** And that brings us to Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. The first calendar item for docketing—I want to make sure that everybody understands that this is a motion, as you'll see, that—it's very small type [on the projected screen]. Let me blow that up. As you'll see, the motion is that the Faculty Senate consult with the LACC [Liberal Arts Core Committee] about the recommendations that the LACC wishes to move forward with. I apologize for any confusion that the title of the petition created. I'll pay more—I'll pay closer attention to the title of

petitions in the future, but it's very—I want to make clear we are not voting to docket actual revisions to the LACC. Now, I have been made aware that Senator **Swan** wants to make a motion about this item, so I will recognize Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** Well, thank you very much, and Senator **Edginton** agreed to second this [a motion projected on the screen], which I sent this to you, so we propose this motion. This is one of the typical things the Senate's supposed to do with petitions that come to us. We don't often do this, but I would propose that we do it in this case, and I can speak to it when the floor is open. Well, I guess it is open since the motion has now been made and seconded. I can't read that far on the screen.

**Peters:** Sorry, the motion reads "For Calendar Item 1167 titled LAC Curriculum Recommendations, we move that we return the resolution to the petitioner with the request that she first consult in a collegial manner and not yet by way of the curriculum process the relevant faculties in the departments, schools, and colleges and then return to the senate with a complete report including with all relevant minutes of meetings."

**Edginton:** And I second that motion.

**Peters:** Moved by Senator **Swan** and seconded by Secretary **Edginton**. Discussion? Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** I think it should be noted that when actual proposals are made the way the system is set up for making changes to the LAC it requires exactly this kind of consultation but on specific proposals, and what the LACC was trying to do here was to just get a sense of the Senate in terms of going ahead with proposals. So, it seems to me that this is kind of duplicative and really unnecessary. It's just going to kind of slow things down. I don't really see much benefit, because I think the Colleges and the Departments et cetera are going to be, you know, overblown with consultations on actual proposals. Having an extra consultation on something like this just strikes me as just a waste of time. I don't see the benefits of this.

**Edginton:** Well, I'd like to comment.

**Peters:** Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** It seems to me in light of the desire for increased faculty involvement in the governance structure of the University that this seems to be very appropriate at this time. And I don't think that this proposal calls for discussion about specific classes or items or the content of those, but at least to go back to the relevant Departments, Schools, and Colleges as indicated there to present the general framework of where we might be going and—and get a response back to that general framework—and, again, in light of the desire for increased faculty involvement in decision-making, it seems to me that this is a very valuable step that we could take that would, you know, demonstrate to the faculty that their viewpoints are being considered and heard in a—in an organized fashion.

**Peters:** Other comments? Chair **Funderburk**?

**Funderburk:** Is there—just for clarity, is there any requirement whatsoever for the LACC to come to consult with this Body whatsoever?

**Peters:** I don't think there is. [several voices offering quiet opinions] Before—before they move it through the curriculum process, I don't—I don't think there is.

**Funderburk:** Then is there any requirement that they would need to consult within the Colleges?

**Swan:** No.

**Smith:** Only with regard to specific proposals, and this again is more of a general framework where the LACC wanted to get a sense—and wanted to let the Faculty Senate know and get a sense of how they would feel about it. When you get to specific proposals, the formal process requires you to go through all the Departments and Colleges. The LACC was trying to get something, you know, together—a sense here. But if you're sending them back to all the Departments and Colleges, you're stretching this out for lord

knows how much longer, and again I just don't see the purpose of it. This is not about consultation.

**Funderburk:** So—and that—that's been leading to what my real question was—was as there is no requirement that any of us be consulted at all, if they're trying to get a sense of the overall structure, why would it not make sense to come to the Body where all the Colleges are represented first? And then to go back to the Departments? So that's—my question is, "Where is a problem with that logic?"

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** The Liberal Arts Core Committee is the University-wide Body where all the Colleges are represented already. The College Senates now are going to be much better than we around this table to address the issues that are specific to their College. The Departmental or School faculties are best prepared to act in a consultative way about the ideas being proposed and developed, and perhaps indeed most likely enhance them so that when the Liberal Arts Core Committee is ready to go through the curricular process it will have a proposal that everyone already agrees with, that we're not going to be using the technical process to have to stop things or to change things. It's a collegial way of arriving at the change in the Liberal Arts Core that everyone already wants. This Body, secondly, has an awful lot on its plate already. It's getting more. An informal consultation that we could easily get in the form of a report, a detailed report, that then we could consider—indeed we would, and then we would ask for consultation if we need it or suggest for other kinds of consultation seems a better use of our time, the faculty and the Liberal Arts Core Committee's time as well. And so that's why we've proposed to send this this and encourage them—this impulse to consult seems good, and now we encourage that impulse at the faculties who are going to know and be able to help mold the best kind of proposal. And so that's why we think this is the best action for us to take at this time.

**Peters:** Senator **Kidd** and then Vice-Chair **Smith**.



**Kidd:** Just a thought. If they don't have to come here anyway, and because it would be a bunch of work to come here and it would involve so much for them to come, then they might just say, "Well, to heck with that." I think we need to be consider here and know that they might not want to consult us.

**Peters:** Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** Yeah, all the consultation that Senator **Swan** is talking about is going to happen once specific proposals are put through. That's all provided for. You go to the Departments. You go to the Colleges. You get their input, and you potentially revise proposals based on that. The idea that we're going to end up with something that everybody agrees with is absurd. There won't be anything like that. There won't be any changes that everybody agrees on. But there will be widespread consultation as there has been for the past 2 or 3 years. But what will happen in this case, if this is just an—this is just an advisory, informative kind of thing to get a sense of the Senate, I would recommend to the LACC, and I suspect they won't need my recommendation, that they just bag it. If they have to go through all this stuff to just talk to the Senate about this, who'd want to do that? I can't imagine a rational person who'd want to do that. I don't think they'll want to do it. As Senator **Kidd** said, why bother if that's the case? So, you know, this is an attempt by the LACC to kind of get the Senate—to get it involved, to get a sense of where things—we don't want to have to go through this, which we're going to have to go through anyway when we get to specific proposals. So, I just—it's—it strikes me as very unnecessary, inappropriate, and counterproductive, because it's going to eliminate the kind of front-end advice that the LAC is looking for.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**, do you still have....?

**Terlip:** I just had a question. Have the College Senates been addressed at all about this?

**Swan:** No.

**Terlip:** Are they coming straight to the Faculty Senate?

**Smith:** I don't—they have—they've been involved in various ways with things. I know Deedee **Heistad** has been talking with the Colleges, committees of the Colleges that deal with the LAC from the Colleges on setting goals for the different components of the LAC. I don't know if they've gone directly through the Senates of the Colleges. But there've been various involvements over the past several years. So, again, I'm surprised if there's much here that would be all that surprising, but, again, when you make specific proposals, the way the—the way the structure, the procedure's been laid out, it all has to go through every affected Department in every College with every proposal that's made.

**Terlip:** Well, I guess what I would hope we would avoid is a situation where they come to the Senate, they get our feedback, and then a Department feels like they have to offer a course as a result of that. I mean, I think it should come from the ground up. That would be the only concern I had.

**Smith:** Well, the thing is—so you're suggesting that we wouldn't want to propose that the—that the faculty as a whole might not say, "Gee, wouldn't it be good if our program had a course that it doesn't have currently unless that was coming from a Department? We couldn't collectively make that kind of recommendation?"

**Terlip:** I think we—I'm saying that—that I think maybe the College Senates could speak to what the Colleges and the Departments need more directly than we could, because we don't represent every Department here. That's my point. [many voices at once]

**Smith:** \_\_\_\_\_, but I think it occurs during the process.

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**, do you still have a comment?

**Swan:** So the answer, of course, is "No." There's so many people that I represent in CHAS, so they have no idea about any of this, and so talking to them, directly that if—if supposedly some consultations have gone on before, no one has a sense of that. So you go to a Senate meeting and then

you would have documentation of this. Secondly, and this is what I wanted to say again, we receive reports all of the time. That's a normal, good thing, that this is a report. We would be docketing it to receive it. If we felt the need for consultation, then we would ask for consultation, and if it were—and when I read through this, I could not see what was the consultation to be about except to discuss, if we wanted to, any part of the document, which is kind of a report. And so we can sort of just receive the report, not take time in a formal consultation process. Take—let that time for the Liberal Arts Core Committee be taken up in College Senates, where they would have things to say because it would be in more contact, direct contact, with the expert faculty. So I don't think we should use the time. Of course, we want reports. We require reports annually. This seems like it could be a good report, but I think the report itself could be even better if the relevant faculties were overtly involved, and so that's why we recommend involving overt—overtly involve the relevant faculties, include that in your report, submit it to us as a report, and we may consult with it if we need to then. It will be a more meaningful, substantive report with this additional collegial integration of expert views.

**Peters:** And Senator **East** and then Chair **Funderburk**.

**East:** It seems to me, as Senator **Smith** has suggested, that we've been—the LACC and various committees associated with it have been working on revisions for a long time, and lots of people on campus have had time to interact and make recommendations with it and provide comments, and there have been—there have been votes about what should be included in it, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I—I'm—I don't think it's fruitful to go back to Departments at this time and think that—that when you're trying to develop an overall picture of the LACC, you know what Departments and Colleges tend to provide are details, and that's not what we're interested in at this point in time. Details come with curriculum proposals. And I can't imagine that somebody's going to impose a course on a Department that they have to teach to be in the LACC, so I don't think that—I think that this actually is the appropriate venue for a consultative session. We've consulted with a whole lot of people already this year about—about things that are a lot less important than this, and so I—I think it's a very good thing to have this consultative session at this general level, rather than at a

detailed level which is necessary for curriculum. I—I—I would encourage Departments and Colleges to send people to listen to the discussion and make comments as certainly they can. I believe this is a time-sensitive matter. If we wish to have anything done with the LACC, we need to have it done soon, and so I think that's a problem also. I would encourage us to go ahead and have the consultative session without the step going back through Departments and Colleges.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk** and then Senator **Heston**.

**Funderburk:** I think this is a case that points out if not a flaw with our organization at least a complication of faculty governance. This [the LACC] is a committee of the faculty. It doesn't—it's not a committee of the Senate. It doesn't have an organized body to go to. The fact that they're coming to us I think is good in that they're asking us for consultation, not that we're seeking it from them. And as the only representative body of the full faculty that exists, it strikes me that this is the logical place to ask the questions first. If—if there's no support for what they're talking about, done. If there is support, then it's the time to say, "We think you need to go talk to this Department about that, and give these....." But otherwise I think we're making it even more difficult for these committees of the full faculty to find a way to function effectively.

**Peters:** Senator **Heston**.

**Heston:** My question is, "Has the LAC attempted to meet with the full faculty?" I've been here a long time. I've seen some rather difficult full faculty meetings regarding the LAC in the past, but it seems to me that if they want to know what the faculty think as a whole, that that is the—that would be a good thing to do to show the whole faculty at once what this framework is that they want input on. And then the faculty could either provide input to us or input directly to that Body. I'm not opposed to them coming and us doing a consultation, but I also think that when we do a consultation, and if we were to make any kind of—do a consultation, our constituencies are not going to have necessarily access to the same information, so I would want to be sure that whatever we saw we were able to at least distribute to our faculty and get input from those faculty as

well, because I'm concerned that this Senate is just—we're individuals. We don't know the will of everybody in our College, nor should we represent always to the will of everybody in our College. But it's—we're a very small body, and we have a limited perspective, and I think that without letting all of the faculty look at this proposal, or this set of recommendations or whatever it is, we're still kind of missing the boat in terms of transparency in consultation.

**Peters:** Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** First, I agree with what Senator **Huston** [sic **Heston**] has had to say, that we should open the framework up so we have broader consultation. And what's the appropriate strategy to go about achieving that? I'm not really sure. I'm sitting here thinking that, you know, a University-wide faculty meeting might not produce the ends that we want, but on the other hand, if that—if we take into consideration Senator **Smith's** comments about being time-sensitive and helping people understand the frameworks, which I think you mentioned, maybe we could limit this proposal to suggest that the LACC go back to the College Senates, identify a timeframe for them to meet with the College Senates—that doesn't seem to be something that would be terribly difficult to achieve—so that they could get on the agenda of those Senates. Explain, you know, the framework, and then leave it to the College Senates to disperse the information amongst the Departments and Schools of—in their various areas. I think that would help tremendously in alleviating some of the concerns that people have of really not understanding where we're going with this, and at least give them the opportunity for being involved in the process or having a sense of being involved in the process.

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** Senator **Edginton** makes a very good point. I mean, this, of course, is a motion made very quickly. This came up on the Agenda et cetera. And the point of saying Schools and Departments and Colleges here was not, I am now realizing this—I mean, it's not to say, "Go to absolutely every Department on campus, every School on campus, every College." It's the relevant ones. There are specific proposals, as I'm sure we all know. It's

not general. It's specific proposals. Well, now, if there's a specific proposal that's going to affect a specific Department, then the Liberal Arts Core should visit them. This motion says, "Yeah, talk to that Department. See what it does, in fact, say. Include that as a report to us so when we consult we know what the faculty say." We're not just here saying, "Well, I heard..." We can know what the relevant faculty have to say. If there is a Department that has nothing to do with anything in this report proposed, don't go to them, and we don't need that. We do mean the relevant Colleges and Schools and Departments.

But I also, listening to the discussion, and listening to Secretary **Edginton** think, "Well, it could be fine to just say go to the College Senates and have the Colleges—meet with the College Senates." The whole reason some of us, and I was one of them, wanted—advocated for a paid Director of Liberal Arts Core was so that that person would be doing these things. When it was one of us, a faculty member doing service, we just realized, well, it's hard to have the time to go and include fac—you know, faculty as well as you can. But with a paid Director, that was one of the goals/ideals that that person would go and include. So I'm certainly willing to say, "Well, get the College Senate involvement. Include that in your report, and your consultations—consultative session with us, and that will make for a valuable consultative session, a substantive one more than we have now."

We could also ask to expedite that. Even if we were to docket this right now, it's likely not to be—you know, we're not going to get to it this semester. It probably will be early in the Spring. We could still dock—you know, say, "We'd like to handle this very early in the Spring. Consult with the Senates as quickly as possible." But I do think for our own business, and our own progress and the progress of the Liberal Arts Core, that integrating into the report and the discussion the reactions of the faculty as consulted through at least the Senates would be very good.

**Peters:** Are there any further comments? Vice-Chair **Smith.**

**Smith:** Yeah, just to the point if you stick with the Senates it is more manageable. If you go to relevant Departments, there are some proposals in there where every Department on this campus is relevant. You're talking

about potentially having writing intensive majors. You're talking about having courses that are geared towards teaching developing thinking skills. Potentially every Department on campus is pertinent there. So, if you're going to that, you're broadcasting to everybody, and it makes it very difficult. I think the—if you limit it to College Senates, perhaps this is manageable. Again, speaking as, you know, the Senate's rep. on the LACC, I know their intent here was to try to get things moving, because we want to get stuff into the curriculum process, and over the course of years we've had lots of consultation with all sorts of faculty. Everybody in this College has had plenty of oppor—any of this campus has had plenty of opportunity to weigh in on this stuff. So we're—there's—we'd like to get this moving quicker, and there will be consultation down the road on specific proposals no matter what.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I was going to say I haven't read it. I don't know what the proposals are, but I do think that at a certain point that, if you're trying to get input, the kind of the thing that might be helpful is it might be, "Ok, on this issue we need to have a full faculty meeting." Suggesting those things. To suggest that any Department on this campus is not affected by the LAC is absurd. It affects every single one of us. And in the case of some of them, like the Elementary Ed. majors, it is their entire major essentially other than the teacher methods courses. So, I do think that having a broad picture is important and a broad discussion before you start getting into some of the details where turf issues start getting involved. So, if you're going to have a broad overarching discussion, we don't have a regular body set up to do that. If this body came together and said, "The full faculty needs to have this discussion," we would probably have better attendance than just trying to call a faculty meeting. Because then I'm afraid the only people you would get would be someone with a bone to pick.

**Peters:** Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** You're the political scientist here [to **Peters**], but I believe someone said that politics is the art of compromise, and I think I heard

Senator **Smith** offering a compromise to the motion that was on the table [laughing].

**Smith:** Well, I wouldn't go that far. [laughing all around]

**Edginton:** That we suggest that the LACC meet with the College Senates and we do it in a timely fashion so that it doesn't impede on the process. I think it can be carried out very quickly. And if they—and if they met with the College faculties, explain the framework—I'm not necessarily talking about the details—I think that would—that would satisfy the needs that we have for that consultation to take place, although I really like Senator **Huston's**—I know I got it wrong [light laughter around]—**Heston's** comments about a full faculty meeting.

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, I—I would support that LAC first discuss the thing with the Senates. I was on this LACC-RSC. I don't know what it is called. I was on that Committee for 2 years, never really understood what that Committee was doing. I was extremely disappointed. That was the worst Committee I've been on at UNI.

**DeBerg:** And that's saying something. [loud laughter around]

**Kirmani:** Because—because it had very poor leadership. They wasted an enormous amount of time. I think it's time they discuss it with the Senates and then come to us.

**Peters:** Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** One concern I would have, some of the Senates are pretty big. You know, you look at CHAS and you look at—well, even the College of Ed. That—that represents a lot of different people. It's possible for me to believe that we could take these to those Senates and discover there are irreconcilable differences, even though we'd like to go for compromise. So I'm not sure what's the next step. We take it to those Senates, and those Senates say, "No, we don't like this." Then what? Do we get to—do we get



to invite them back and then we hear that, no, they didn't like that. I guess I'm wondering why we couldn't still have them here and at some point during that discussion we could say, "We really want you to go to the faculty Senates of each College." Why not try it in reverse? I think I'd like to at least hear this. We certainly could invite all interested parties. This document will be up on the web for a good chunk of time, and if it isn't until January or February that we get at this, that should give a lot of people on campus a lot of time to sort of think about this a little bit, maybe even a little less—maybe a little more thought going into that that way. But I—I'm not convinced that sending these to the Senates will—well, it will get more people involved, but I'm—I'm just worried about the "we might get stuck" problem that could happen. I don't know. Maybe that won't happen.

**Terlip:** We could get stuck here, too. [laughter]

**Peters:** I heard a motion.

**Swan:** The person has to have the floor. You have to give the person the floor.

**Peters:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** Thank you. The point of it is to get the—and the two things—is to include the discussion from the College Senates in the consultative session of this body. And I'm saying that the faculty talked to me—they don't always come to talk to me about anything on the Senate Agenda; they did so about this. There's interest in talking about this at the College level, at least. And so I wanted to do that. So secondly I'd say, "Well, I'm certainly willing to change the motion," if the person who seconded it, to send it to the College Senates and include—they're not going to say, "No," but just the LACC is going to include their reactions and comments to elaborate and enhance and inform our consultative session with them. And so I hear that—my second—the person seconding the motion agrees to the modification to that effect, that we send this—ask that this go back to the Senates and return in haste to this body with the information learned from the Senates, so I change the motion to that, and call the question.

**Peters:** Oh, ok. So the question has been called. Do I hear a second?

**DeBerg:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **DeBerg**. The question in front of us is to return the resolution to the petitioner with the request that she first

**East:** The motion in front of us is to end debate.

**Peters:** I'm sorry. What?

**East:** To call the question to end debate. [many voices saying to vote on this first before on the amended motion] You have to vote on that before you vote on the question.

**Peters:** Thank you. All in favor of calling the question, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] The question in front of us then is to return the resolution to the petitioner that she first consult in a collegial manner and not yet by way of the curriculum process with the relevant college senates and then return to the University Faculty Senate with a complete report, including with all relevant minutes of meetings. All in favor, please say, "Aye." [some ayes heard] Opposed? [ayes heard] I think I'm going to need a show of hands on this one, please. All in favor, please raise your hand, and if Vice-Chair **Smith** could count with me here in a double count.

**Smith:** You want me to count? [some laughter]

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**, can you help me? [counting] I see 5 ayes. No, please raise your hand. [counting] Twelve, the motion fails. Is there any other motion with regard to this item, Calendar Item 1167?

**Heston:** Move to docket? Would that

**Peters:** In regular order?

**Heston:** In regular order.

**Peters:** Is there a second for that motion?

**Dolgener:** Second.

**Peters:** Second by Senator **Dolgener**. Can I assume we don't need any further discussion? All in favor of docketing Calendar Item 1167 in regular order, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [some "no's" heard] The motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1168 for Docket #1064, EPC  
Recommendations regarding changes to Electronic Device Policy

**Peters:** Calendar Item 1168, EPC Recommendations regarding changes to Electronic Device Policy. This is the reason I sent around the amended Agenda. This is something that the President asked us to do by the end of the semester, and so I wanted to try to make sure we could fit it in during our last meeting of the semester, so for that reason I'd recommend a motion to docket this at the head of the docket on November 26<sup>th</sup>.

**Terlip:** I'll move.

**Peters:** Thank you, Senator **Terlip**. Second? Seconded by—I saw Senator **Bruess's** hand first. Any discussion? All in favor of docketing this at the head of—Item #1168 at the head of the docket on November 26<sup>th</sup>, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No?" [none heard]

Consideration of Calendar Item 1169 for Docket #1065, Resolution to  
Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual  
Requirements

**Peters:** Finally, Calendar Item 1169, a Resolution to Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual Requirements. There is no particular urgency to this item. I put out the amended Agenda with regard

to the Electronic Devise Policy. This had been filed in the meantime, and I figured, what the heck, I'll put that on there, too, for docketing. If people feel there hasn't been enough time to look at it, we could just leave it on the Calendar for another 2 weeks. Otherwise, I would think that a motion to docket it in regular order would be appropriate.

**East:** I move to docket in regular order.

**Peters:** Senator **East** moves to docket in regular order.

**DeBerg:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **DeBerg**. Is there any discussion about this? All in favor of docketing Calendar Item 1169 in regular order, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] All opposed, "No?" [none heard] The motion carries.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**Peters:** Ok, now is there any new business? Do we want to move to docket the shared governance language? Does anyone?

**Terlip:** I move that we docket that at the head of the order.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**, we'll frame that as a motion to—for the purposes of our discussion, let's say a motion to support both items. During our discussion then we can decide whether to support one or the other. So, we'll—the motion is to docket in regular order a motion to support both the items that United Faculty has put forward in the Master Agreement regarding shared governance that have been circulated before you and that we talked about earlier.

**Terlip:** I asked that it be at the head of the—I want to do it at the next meeting.

**Peters:** Immediately—let’s say immediately following the EPC item that we just docketed at the head of the order.

**Terlip:** That will be fine.

**Peters:** Ok. Is there a second?

**Swan:** Second.

**Peters:** Seconded by Senator **Swan**. Is there any discussion about this?

**Swan:** So, I have a question.

**Peters:** Yes.

**Swan:** That means that at the next meeting we will get to this item?

**Peters:** Yes. Yes.

**Swan:** So the EPC as is is not extensive?

**Peters:** It shouldn’t be. No, it should not be extensive, should not take that long. Any discussion? All in favor, please say “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries.

## **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

DOCKET #1060, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH ATHLETIC DIRECTOR TROY **DANNEN** (docketed at the head of the docket for Nov. 12, 2012)  
**(Edginton/Dolgener)**

**Peters:** And with that we get to Consideration of Docketed Items. Professor **Jepsen** provided us with the report of the Faculty Athletic Rep. I want to thank you for that report. In the interest of time, can we just start and ask Senators are there any specific questions you had about that report? I see Professor [Frank] **Thompson**.

**Thompson:** I've got a couple of questions. There are actually 6. In February 2010, the University contracted an outside consulting firm Alden & Associates. My first question is: "How much did they pay for this particular consulting report?" and #2, "What were the sources of funds that were used to pay for the report?" That's question #2. Do you want me to get through with all

**Peters:** Professor **Thompson**, do you mind? I was—it—I was asking first just to start our discussion if there were any particular questions about the Faculty Athletic Report [FAR] itself, just any questions at all about that in terms of for clarification purposes about the Faculty Athletic Report itself [ <http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/far2011-12annualreport.pdf> ]. And then we'll—and then we'll start with Associate Prof—with Athletic Director **Dannen** in particular. If you [Professor **Thompson**]  
—if you don't mind hanging out for just a minute. We'll recognize you early on, I promise. Ok. Any? Yeah, Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** I have one specific just to—to clear up that—that I was trying to get to the bottom of earlier. It's on page 30, and it's—needless to say, it relates to Athletic Bands. And it was a comment about "in the past, the Athletic Department funded \$5,000 in scholarships for the volleyball pep band (which no longer exists)". That seems to be implying you don't provide the \$5,000 anymore, but wasn't the request to convert the volleyball pep band into the women's basketball band? So the funding is still going, I'm assuming.

**Jepsen:** I believe that is correct. The funding, however, for the pep bands that would encompass the current band that plays at the women's volleyball is included in the current costs that are provided ahead of that. Does that answer your question?

**Funderburk:** It does. That's why I was asking, because the understanding that I had when in conversation with the band's director yesterday (?), he was assuming that he was getting the 8 [\$8,000] plus the 5 [\$5,000], since they're still doing the same work, so that that would mean that it is actually 13 [\$13,000] going to bands still.

**Jepsen:** Ok, and I can clarify that with Professor **Valentine**.

**Dannen:** That is—is accurate. When we made the shift this year to do bands during all of the pre-season basketball versus doing them—the volleyball, that’s—it just transferred into the \_\_\_\_\_ of basketball.

**Funderburk:** Right. That was what. And then the other on the same thing was—which is actually celebrating something, is my understanding is that the graduate assistantship that went away that had been for the Graduate College, Athletics then picked up paying for that, so that’s year two that you’re funding now, which since there it talks about 3 there but that’s—there never were more than two. It’s just a matter of the source of funding.

**Jepsen:** Correct. That’s correct.

**Peters:** Any other questions about the FAR report?

**Swan:** Over here.

**Peters:** Yes, Senator **Cooley**?

**Cooley:** I have a question that relates to page 4. In the first long paragraph: “The Equity and Diversity Committee administers diversity grants” and it has plural “to support professional development of females and minorities. The grants were not used this year.” I was just intrigued by that; you know, there was money available, and it was opted to not be used.

**Jepsen:** And because of that in the Fall meetings that we just had a couple of weeks ago, that Committee has decided to expand the definition of what types of activities would qualify for those grants in an effort to have them be used so we don’t have those unused resources. So I would anticipate that in future years the broader categories that will now be able to be eligible to be funded will result in using those grants.

**Cooley:** Can you tell us what types of activities have been funded by those grants?

**Jepsen:** Often they are leadership conferences.

**Peters:** Other questions about the FAR report? Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** I was just curious, and maybe you could do this in future reports—it relates to the stuff on academic impact of Athletics. How many student athletes are represented in the majors that you describe?

**Jepsen:** I don't have that information offhand, but I will definitely make a note to include that in a future report, and I can supplement this report, if that would be helpful.

**Terlip:** I think that would be helpful.

**Jepsen:** Absolutely.

**Peters:** Other questions on the FAR report? Ok, now I did ask AD **Dannen** to—if—if you could start out with about a 5-minute explanation of the Student Fee Proposal, because that's something that Senators have not had that much time to review, the most recent copy of that. And then Professor **Thompson**, we will—I'll recognize you first after that. So, if you could just lead us through the Student Fee Proposal?

**Dannen:** Sure. A couple things. One, I appreciate the invitation. I've been here every year that I've been Athletic Director, other than last year. I know you were busy last year. But I appreciate the chance to come and talk to you. And also want to thank Lisa [**Jepsen**]. The report that you got today is something that probably you should have had a long time ago. It's in great detail, and it's something no other FAR in our league is doing, certainly to the extent that Lisa did, and I appreciate that report. We'll be using that on our website as well, for the—for the public to have access to it so they can better understand from—from the Faculty Reps standpoint in the Department.



Since I arrived here, I've always talked about 3—3 funding models that exist for Athletics like ours. One is an institutional fundraising—or institutional support model, where the primary source of funds is General Funds, as we call them here. One is a self-sustaining model where as—as an example, Iowa State University has gone from \$11 to \$21 million dollars in television revenue in the past 2 years, which allows—basically allows their Department to be self-sustaining/self-sufficient. That's a source of funds that a school like Northern Iowa will never receive, and so while it exists, it doesn't exist for us. The third source of funding for schools like us is—is a—is a—is funding that is primarily student-fee-based.

Around the country there are several states—and I—I think Delaware right off the top of my head, but I know there are others—that have state laws prohibiting student fees being used for Athletics. In those states, Delaware as an example, puts about \$25 million a year in institutional funds into their Athletic Department. In—in some schools, and I look at—through our list of peers, there are a couple of academic peers that are also conference peers: Illinois State and Indiana State. Both of those institutions are heavily funded by student fees, very little in the \$1 million range or so by General Fund.

I would—I would tell you that 15 years ago Northern Iowa should have started down this track. We did not. I've attempted to start down this track since I came, because long-term sustainability relies, I believe, on going toward a student fee model. I've said many times, "The future of Athletics at UNI are in the hands of the students," because at one point in time they will be asked to decide whether their fees should go toward support of Athletics.

In the Spring, I met with the Student Services Fee Committee, or at least the Executive Committee of that group, and I proposed to them a model that would freeze the institutional support Athletics receives, which is the total of Student Fees and General Fund money in Fiscal '12. That's institutional-supported program. It would freeze that amount of money—basically I took it out to 2020, but I would argue in perpetuity. But 2020 is how the model goes. Over the course of the next 8 years, then, there

would be a transfer in the source of funds internally. We would move from General Education to student fees. That plan was complicated by the fact that Athletics had a \$500,000 cut in the Spring.

The model that I presented was on Fiscal '12 levels, not at Fiscal '13, '14, or '15 levels, but it was at Fiscal '12 levels. The model also considered that the total amount of institutional support would be frozen for the next 8 years. So, while I understand and one of the issues of contention with some is the fact that it appears that Athletics is—is backfilling the cut, whereas the proposal was, “If I’m going to freeze institutional support, which is 47% of the Budget, for the next 8 years, including salaries, including tuition, including room/board/fees and everything else, that the proposal was based on Fiscal '12.”

The plan and—and I forwarded that. I think you probably have a copy of it or—or Chairman **Peters** may have gotten you copies.

**Peters:** Yeah, there’s paper copies floating around, and there’s a copy up on the screen [projected] right behind you.

**Dannen:** Ok. Ok. That plan was taken to the Student Services Fee Committee. I did meet with them this Fall, clarified the intent of the plan. Student Services Fee Committee sent it forward. The plan—and keep one thing in mind with student fees is that even though this is a model through 2020, student fees are approved annually. So, the Student Fee Committee, under different leadership, may say, “I don’t want that \$25 increase this year.” Even if they say they may want that increase, the next president may say, “I’m not willing to carry that increase forward.” And even if that president carries it forward, the next Board of Regents may say, “We’re not willing to sign off on that.” So all three of those things have to be in place on an annual basis.

I would assume that there would be somewhat thorough annual reporting from Athletics expected by the Student Services Fee Committee. Historically, since I’ve been here, the Student Services Fee Committee has demanded that—that the funds that are transferred to Athletics do not fund salaries and do not fund scholarships. And so one of the things that

will be important as we go forward is to make sure those two requests are continued—continue to be honored. For the most part I would tell you between health insurance, medical coverage, other medical coverage—as an example, we self-insure first, I think \$300,000, and we’ve had well in excess of \$300,000 in surgeries this year, and we’ve always used that \$300,000. Travel, when students from the University are representing the institution externally, that’s—that’s the—what those funds are directed toward. However, as is true with every budget, it’s hard to follow this \$1 all the way through. My point is, here’s the amount of money we’re expending here to show that it doesn’t exceed the amount of money that—that the student fees bring.

So that—that’s the proposal. That’s the intent of the proposal. It does get us more in line with how Athletics are funded by our peers. I looked at our academic peers in the—in the past few weeks as well. It’s all over the board. It’s all over the board. Some are very heavily institutional-supported. Some are—are almost entirely student fee-supported. At UNI, I think we are next to last in our peer group, in our conference, or maybe 3<sup>rd</sup> to the—the bottom in student fees. When I say UNI should have done this \$15 years ago, that was the—the movement in Athletics funding at this level 15 years ago. And we did not do it.

**Peters:** Thank you. Professor **Thompson**.

**Thompson:** I said I have 5 questions I want to ask. The first question is: In February 2010 you’ve commissioned the Alden & Associates to do this outside report

[http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/football\\_feasibility\\_study.pdf](http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/football_feasibility_study.pdf) . How—how much was paid for the report?

**Dannen:** \$25,000

**Thompson:** \$25,000. And where did those funds come from?

**Dannen:** Athletic Department resources.

**Thompson:** In the Athletic Department.

**Dannen:** Not General—non-General Fund sources.

**Thompson:** You also made a presentation to the Faculty Senate in which this report had already been done. Why was there no mention of this report or any of the report to the Faculty Senate, if we spent \$25,000 for the report?

**Dannen:** The report was presented to the Board of Regents in April of 2010.

**Thompson:** Ok.

**Dannen:** At that time, and I'm—I'm not—I'm giving you the best recollection of that time—the President pre—presented a report and presented a recommendation to the Board of Regents at that same time. It's really not in my purview to—to take anything as a part of that report that was going to the Board of Regents and present it anywhere in front of the President.

**Thompson:** You—you understand though that at the time that this report was done, the University through their academic programming infused some \$4.5 million into the program and was a stakeholder. My question is: why weren't the stakeholders, the students and the faculty, informed of this report as it was made available to the Athletic Department?

**Dannen:** Again, the President had the report as a part of his presentation at the Board of Regents. It really wasn't my decision or in my purview to unilaterally decide "I'm going to present this report anywhere ahead of the President's report with the Board of Regents." At the time it was presented to the Board of Regents, it was public on the UNI Athletics website. It was also in the *Des Moines Register*, as it was a document—public document that was given to the Board of Regents.

**Thompson:** But there—there was no publicity given to it like there was here this Fall at this finding of the report.

**Peters:** If you'll allow me—there were press reports at the time. I can still find them on the *Courier's* website. And, indeed, the—the copy of the—the report that I—I put on the website for the Senators to read, I downloaded from the *Des Moines Register*.

**Thompson:** Well, I—I think if people'd looked at this report back in 2010, they would have seen a couple of things. One thing that I find interesting is that all of the scenarios that were run by Alden as a sponsored consultant by the Athletic Department indicates that there will be ongoing, substantial losses in the Athletic Department Budget. Now, my question is: part of those losses are related to a—a line item which says “Departmental-related other expenses.” Can you tell me what “Departmental-related other expenses” are, because they—they—they represent anywhere from \$8 million to \$10 million a year in each of these scenarios?

**Dannen:** Well, I—I can't tell the Senate what those—what they are.

**Thompson:** Well, the reason why that's relevant is that in a business school when we teach about evaluation of projects, the one thing that we talk about is an item called “sunk cost.” Now if this amount represents “sunk cost,” (?) that is, the cost to maintain the Athletic facilities, the cost to maintain the building, that's a “sunk cost” and when you're evaluating the difference on a business decision basis, you're not looking at “sunk costs,” you're looking at how to save on costs going into the future. Now the reason why that's particularly relevant is that if you look at the two scenarios that Alden & Associates were driven to kind of discard, namely the one involving the elimination of football in general or the one involving to moving down a level, those particular costs are relevant, because once they get eliminated as “sunk cost,” then you wind up with them being the least costly alternative. So, you know, a particularly relevant issue here is where—whether they are embedded in “sunk costs” into this particular operation.

My other question is: they talk about the peer institutions. And when we talk about a business decision, we—we talk about the difference in the business school between a business decision and the way that it is financed. What we say is that a business decision, the merits of a business

decision are separate from the merits of the financing. In other words, I can give a person \$1 million. They can go out, and they can wind up making a poor decision. That decision is a poor business decision. The fact that I gave them \$1 million doesn't make it a good business decision.

Now the reason why that's relevant in the question that I have here is—is have you taken into consideration that, yes, the students will be paying more under this proposal, but the fact of the matter is is that when you compare Illinois State to us, for example, it's an apples to oranges comparison? Illinois State has 22,000 students. We have 11,000—897 students less having eliminated the liberal arts and some of the programs out of the College of Education. We have less students. So when you talk about student fees, spreading student fees over 22,000 is an entirely different matter than spreading it over 11,000. And so, the—the issue that I would raise here is the fact that the students are putting money into it doesn't make for this being a good business decision. The question of whether it's a good business decision rests on whether or not we can get control of this particular budget. So, did you take into consideration the differences in the size of the institutions—the peer institutions—when you created this proposal? The fact that there are 11,000 students here, there are 22,000 students at Illinois State?

**Dannen:** We assessed per head not total. Out at Illinois State and Southern Illinois, which were the two institutions in our league who are heavily student-fee-based, as a—on a per-head basis—they are in the \$446 to \$480 range. They don't necessarily do it as an annual fee. At Illinois State it's a per credit hour fee that—but it is per head so the per head in max on this will get to about \$300 over the course of the 8 years, so it would still sig—be significantly less on a per head basis.

**Thompson:** And the—the last question, again, relates to each of these scenarios that show that the institution is planning on anywhere from as much as a \$10 million loss, if we go up a Division, to if we remain the status quo of anywhere from \$4.5 to \$5.5 million. And my question is: does then the Athletic Department feel that it can't live without a—a set budget, that in fact these ongoing costs will continue and—I guess, in, you know, sort of an ancillary to that, is this particular report talks about institutions—peer

institutions—that have no football program or have gone down a Division. So you look at Drake. Drake University played Colorado. They—they were in a higher Division. They went down a Division. You talk about Butler. You talk about Creighton. Creighton doesn't have a football program at all, so within that particular context, how is the viability and the cost to where—did you compare the viability and the cost and how much they were actually taking out as opposed to raising revenues in those institutions, those peer institutions, as opposed to ours where those institutions have a liberal arts program. They have a full/complete liberal arts program, and we don't currently.

**Dannen:** I think the crux of the study that Alden did in 2010 was to assess at the time non-scholarship football, which was the—the solution of the day, if you'll remember. And non-scholarship football is played by 19 schools at the Division I level—18 are privates; one's a public. David **Miles**, who was Chairman of the Board of Regents at the time—David **Miles** sat on the Drake Board of Trustees when Drake University went from a 1AA, UNI-looking program to a non-scholarship. So the crux of the study was to assess whether that fits a liberal arts public comprehensive institution sitting in Cedar Falls, Iowa.

They also looked at the move up. I have never advocated the move up. I made comments this Fall, however, that I believe Northern Iowa needs to at least explore that, and here's why. The study I would tell you is already obsolete, because there are two unique circumstances that have happened in the football world. One of them happened today. Today the playoff was determined—at the—at the Division—the FBS level, the Iowa/Iowa State level, the playoff was determined. It is going to return \$475 million to those schools who are eligible for the playoff. In the level above UNI, not the level at Iowa, but I'm talking a level that includes Ohio University, Central Michigan, who are also academic peers—that playoff will return, to be split among those schools, 20% of \$475 million. That's going to amount somewhere between \$1-\$2 million a year.

The other factor that came into play that was not anticipated at the time the study was done is the ability of an institution to play football in a league, only play football in that league. There is no way that it would ever

by economically viable for Northern Iowa to join a conference other than the school—the conference that it’s in. However, if you take football and do it indeben—independently, the viability may be different. And that’s why I believe that we should explore it. I have yet to commit anyplace to saying this is my recommendation to the University leadership that we should go for it. Frankly, I don’t know what the long-term goal for student recruitment is here, from an out of the—out of state area. If we are better served by getting exposure into certain areas, because of our Athletics programs, then maybe we need to look at those areas. That’s not my decision, but that may—we may be an asset in that. So the idea of exploring, that’s as far as it’s gone. Frankly, I know I—I believe my—right now, in my heart of hearts, I believe in my brain it’s going to be a moot point, because I said that all these schools are going to get \$1.5 to \$2 million. The University of Iowa, Iowa State are going to be somewhere in the \$4-\$5 million range. For us to try to play with schools like Iowa and Iowa State financially right now, we get by with it competitively. We couldn’t do it week-in and week-out. We get by with it. But at those schools above us, the Central Michigan’s and all, they’re trying to do it every day. They’re trying to do it on a budget that’s about \$18-\$20 million versus Ohio State that’s \$140 and Texas that’s \$160 and Iowa who’s going to be pushing over \$90. Those schools are getting further and further away from Iowa. We’re getting closer and closer to them. I think in the long-term we will be playing at that same level, but I do not know that that’s going to mean we’re moving or doing anything differently than we’re doing it today. That’s my guess right now.

**Peters:** Senator **Strauss** was trying to get the floor a minute ago. Do you still have something or....?

**Strauss:** Yes, I have a question.

**Peters:** And then Senator **DeBerg** after that.

**Strauss:** Ok. Mr. **Dannen**, did I hear you say this correctly that we have \$300,000 a year in surgeries? Is that an accurate number?

**Dannen:** Uh huh.



**Strauss:** And do you have a sense of what the sport breakdown is? Which sports generate the most surgeries?

**Dannen:** I can tell you two years ago women's soccer. We had more knees in women's soccer than we had in any other sport.

**Strauss:** So, football does not dominate?

**Dannen:** Well, I—I couldn't tell where—what it's at right now. I just know that we had—this year we've had a bad year in football. Two years ago we had an inordinately bad year in women's soccer.

**Strauss:** So, if we were to look at—if we were to look at a 10-year period, would—would, say, football dominate the injury list?

**Dannen:** I would say from a surgical standpoint, yes.

**Strauss:** And

**Dannen:** But I wouldn't say it's more than 50%.

**Strauss:** So \$100 or so roughly--\$150, 000 a year in surgeries for football is possible?

**Dannen:** No more than that, yeah.

**Strauss:** Thanks.

**Peters:** Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, I have two questions. One is based on my attendance at a Board of Regents meeting earlier this year, and a Board member asked President **Allen** how in the world your Department can live with \$125,000 reduction, and Ben **Allen** said, "We're playing Wisconsin in football." So, could you comment on that statement? And the second thing is it seems to me that the best argument that I've heard for Athletics at UNI comes

from the community who wants people in motels and in restaurants and whatnot. Has the University ever talked with the county or the city about a restaurant and hotel tax to support UNI Athletics so that the people who benefit from it financially—our students don't benefit from it financially—so that the people who actually benefit from it financially pay for it?

**Dannen:** Right now Ken **Brown**.

**DeBerg:** I'm sorry?

**Dannen:** Ken **Brown** in the Department of Economics is actually leading an impact study, and what I hope to do with that study—and President **Allen** and I have spoken about getting a—and I'll use another example, Southern Illinois, who has a local option 1% tax, 25% of that tax goes to Athletics. And where there has not been an economic impact study done in at least a decade, and so to have that ammunition to go out and attack that I think is step 1. I—I believe—and I talk about the students—the community has to step forward as well.

**DeBerg:** Right.

**Dannen:** Now, I will tell you in some respects they do. Of the non-big time football playing schools, UNI ranks 4<sup>th</sup> in the country in the amount of money that's raised for its Athletics Department from donations. So the—the community does in one respect, but the impact in—and I'll just say from the high school football playoffs, they'd go away if—if Athletics isn't here, because we're not going to maintain facilities solely for that. It would be a huge economic loss to the community.

The Wisconsin—when we agreed in 2010 to the funding plan which was taking us down to 2.4% in overall institutional General Fund, Athletics would have no more than that, we indicated that we would play—as a way to generate additional revenue—we would play two money games. The University of Iowa, we've already been scheduled. It's a \$500,000 guarantee to go down there. Wisconsin paid us \$475,000 to go up there. And Wisconsin also—we were supposed to play Southern Utah this year, go out there to return a game. Wisconsin paid \$175,000 to them so we didn't

have to go. So it was a huge net boon for us. What I'm hoping is that that money stays in the Budget for a couple, three years, that we have a surplus—we don't roll all of our foundation fundraising over this year because that's a stateside surplus for us and that down the line we will have to continue to do this. One of the other things I want to bring up about the FBS. The Wisconsin and Iowa guarantees, if we are an FBS or that next level up, are double. Double what they are right now. So Iowa would be paying us \$1 million and Wisconsin close to \$1 million.

**Peters:** Senator **Strauss**.

**Strauss:** I want to go back to the rate of injuries as a result of our sports and athletic entertainment here on campus. You said \$300,000 in surgeries. Where are the costs for non-surgical injuries like concussion, sprains, contusions? How do we

**Dannen:** Every—every student's required to carry personal insurance through their families, and typically most of those—most of those plans cover. Deductibles is where we have some expense. We also, as an example with students who have knee, we receive funds from the NCAA that's a part of our Budget of the—of the \$12.1 or whatever the number is this year—that allows us to pay for insurance premiums for those students who may have a knee, and we—we have insurance through the University of Iowa for those students.

**Strauss:** I just want to—I'm wrestling with this. Do we record annually the—the quantity of injuries that occur in our athletic programs?

**Dannen:** Yes.

**Strauss:** And where are those data found?

**Dannen:** Well, I—Athletic Training and Sports Medicine is a part of the School of HPELS, not a part of the Athletics Department. I have concussion data because that was just in the newspaper, and I wasn't sure if anything would come—any questions would come—because concussions are the—

the injury of the day, nationally, and everybody wants to talk about how do we eliminate concussions. But

**Strauss:** I mean, you don't say that lightly when you say "injury of the day."

**Dannen:** No. No. No. Not at all. I'm just saying—I'm saying that because that's what's getting all

**Strauss:** We're all learning about it now.

**Dannen:** That's what's getting all the attention today, and it—the issue of the day. You know, ACL injuries have—have received a lot of attention, particularly in female athletes in the past few years. So I don't have specific data, but that data is available, and Athletic Training and Sports Medicine keeps—keeps that.

**Peters:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Yeah, we've all been hearing a lot about tuition set-asides going away. And I think earlier you said student government has stipulated that money can't be used for athletic scholarships, so if tuition set-asides go away, how are you going to fund athletic scholarships in the future?

**Dannen:** Good question. That—it's my number one issue, because I have no idea what's going to happen with tuition set-aside, because it—it's going to hinge on what happens in the Legislature. And I don't know if what happened in this last session (? Another's coughing covered words) if that's going to change what the Regent's thinking was. Of the \$4.1 million that Athletics received, \$1.2 was set-aside. And so—and the other \$2.9 is the—is true \_\_\_\_\_ (AEF, DEF??), tuition, fees, money that's returned. The \$1.2 is set-aside. In a perfect scenario, best-case scenario, where the \$1.2 goes away but tuition also goes down 18%, the—the net impact to Athletics is -\$600,000. Now, what I don't know—there's still going to be, if the Legislature approves, there's still going to be basically a set-aside account, tuition set-aside. I don't know how it's going to be used. I have not been involved in any of the discussions of how it's going to be used. I understand there may be some merit-based. I understand there may be some need-

based within that. But that's—that's way outside of my bailiwick right now. What I'm worried about is the net \$600,000 and where I'm coming up with it. I've got 5 asks from donors out there, trying to build money for that eventuality right now.

**Peters:** I have Senator **DeBerg** and then Professors **Thompson**.

**DeBerg:** I would like to say now, and I would say to the student government president, too, I—I personally think it's immoral to ask UNI students to pay more for Athletics, whether it's through tuition, the General Fund or in student fees. Our average indebtedness is way above the national average, so I'm appalled that one would think that this is a good idea for our students, but secondly I think the only really legitimate way for students to fund Athletics is from ticket sales. I mean, let the students who want to go go and pay to go, and the students who aren't interested, and there's a lot more than we think, the students who aren't really interested don't have to pay, or have to pay just a tiny little bit. But I—what if—why don't you charge more for tickets? Why don't you commit to ticket sales to fund your program to a greater extent, and that way you don't have the problem of heavily indebted students who don't care about Athletics having to pay more and more fees to fund it. I—I think that's an imm—that's immoral to ask our students to do that. They have other fees to spend their money on.

**Peters:** We are—we have only about a minute left in our scheduled time. Our docketing discussion earlier was rather lengthy. Would there be support for extending our time 15 minutes or so, assuming our guests can stay an extra 15 minutes? Would there be support for that? [heads nodding] If I hear no objection, we'll consider our time extended. [none heard] Ok, so I've got Professor **Thompson** and then I saw a whole bunch of hands, if you guys want to raise your hands again real quick.

**Thompson:** I've got a—I've got a kind of follow-up to what Dr. **Jepsen** (?) had to say, if you look at projection c which is rejection of moving to the FBS status, it includes \$2 million of other income. So, in fact, this projection does include all the benefits received by going to FBS. Nevertheless, at the end at the bottom here we have net deficit position beginning at \$5.8

million in the first year and in the very last year it turns out to \$10.4 million. That would appear to indicate that if we go to that particular option, the students will be asked to pay more money. Now, if they're going to be asked to pay more money, that also increases their costs in tuition and room and board and with the General Education Fee, their total cost goes up.

My good colleague from Economics left, but there's such a thing as elasticity and inelasticity of demand. And I would posit that as we increase the cost of education at this institution we are merely inviting more and more students not—no longer to attend this institution because it's too expensive. In addition, if students are going to be paying more and more, they may wind up going for the first two years at a community college, in which case we get even less revenue. So, my question to you is: isn't the option in which we go down to a lower level much more viable in terms of the cost to students and the cost to this institution?

**Dannen:** Again, that's a question I'm—I'm assessing right now. And as I indicated previously, the environment is different than when the study was—was conducted. And it's worth exploring to see what the most viable option is to the long-term benefit to the University. And I certainly haven't made any recommendations or any decisions in my own mind. But to be afraid to just try to assess what the long—best, long-term interests are is the failure. And so that's what I'm trying to assess.

**Peters:** Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** Two comments I want to make with regard to the immorality comment that Dr./Senator **DeBerg** made, we have a mandatory \$35, I think, a year fee that goes into Wellness Recreation Services, and not all the students use the Wellness Recreation Services program, so if we're going to talk about immorality, you know, in terms of fees, we need to—you know, talk about it across the board. The other comment that I wanted to make, Professor **Thompson**, is that I—I really don't want us to go back to a situation like we were 40 years ago where coaches were hired here to also teach in the academic programs of the School of HPELS. If we go into a model like Division II or a Division III model, if we hired a coach whose

background was in mathematics, I assume that the Department of Mathematics would accept this individual to teach in their academic program as we were forced to do, you know, in years gone by. We were forced to bring people in into those coaching positions, and they taught in our academic program. As they moved their program to Division I athletically, we wanted to move our program to Division I academically, and I think we have. We've—we've pretty much replaced all of those individuals that brought—were brought in here as teacher-coaches. So, you know, there are other consequences that really have to be concerned. I—I doubt very seriously if someone had a degree in English if the English Department here on campus—I don't think it's called that any longer—but [voices joking and laughter]—if that program would be open to the idea that if we hire a coach, they're going to be a faculty member in the English Department or in Business or any other area. We've progressed beyond that as an institution.

**Thompson:** But as a follow-up, you've got the problem of a Creighton and Butler both which have great basketball programs, and, in fact, a former coach here is now coaching over there, and they don't have that problem. They—they moved on, too. They don't have them teaching in the classroom, but they still have a program that lives within a budget.

**Edginton:** Well, Creighton doesn't have the football program, so

**Thompson:** Should have.

**Edginton:** Butler does, though, I believe.

**Thompson:** Yeah, it does, at the same level as \_\_\_\_\_.

**Peters:** Chair **Funderburk**.

**Funderburk:** And the comment I did want to celebrate the one thing that Jordan [**Bancroft-Smithe**], the student government were really good about asking the students' opinion on this this time. The student response rate was pretty much as miserable as when you ask the faculty to respond to something [light laughter around], but they were at least given the

opportunity in a couple of nice things in the paper, and they're working on continuing to ask. So, I would have found it immoral if they were not asked, but they were asked, and the majority of respondents were supportive of this at this point—of the students.

**Peters:** Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** I just wanted, you know, to make a comment relative to the immorality of the Wellness Recreation Fee [laughter around]. I'm very supportive of that fee. [more laughter] I think that all students should be encouraged to, you know, use the Wellness Recreation Center, and we should not eliminate Personal Wellness from the LAC program. [more laughter]

**Peters:** Senator **Kidd**.

**Kidd:** Just a question. A lot of schools have tuition waivers or not tuition waivers in full but out-of-state waivers. I don't know if that's just money juggled, but it's to me a decent model, so has that been considered at all?

**Dannen:** I'm---I'm begging for it. It's not an institutional decision. It's a Regents'-wide decision.

**Kidd:** Oh, ok.

**Dannen:** To my understanding, tuition waivers would do two things for us. It would immediately cut about \$1.1 in need for General Fund support, and secondly the number of minority students we recruit would double, because it's harder to recruit minority students in the State of Iowa, and—and we're—we're restricted in how much we can go outside the State by the level of scholarship funding. The—how—how far down it is—I think a couple of the issues, I think is how far down would tuition waivers permeate beyond Athletics, and secondly Iowa, the University of Iowa would have zero interest in it because it would be money out of coffers, and Iowa State would probably have about as much interest in it. So, yeah, it—I think it's an uphill fight but that is—that's really my first priority in trying to reduce the General Fund, and I haven't had much success.



**Kidd:** I want to continue. Just a question, so if I went out of state, do they have tuition waivers for academic programs, again like when I was in graduate school? [various voices giving opinions]

**Peters:** Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** Then what is the average attendance at UNI for ballgames?

**Dannen:** This year it's about 13.2, 13.3.

**Peters:** That would be another hurdle, would it not, for going up a Division?

**Dannen:** It's actually not. The attend—there—there's a requirement that you have to average 15,000 over a 2-year span. In the—I call the mid-American MAC conference, which is the Ohio/Central Michigan league, they only have 3 schools that average that number. The remaining schools, their Media Rite (?) partner purchases tickets. [light laughter around], and it's essentially a net zero transaction. And so, you know, I—we—we don't need 13,000. We'd need to be closer to 16 from—to make the financial model work in moving up, but the being below 15 would not necessarily be a liability for us in making the move.

**Peters:** Questions? Secretary **Edginton**.

**Edginton:** Yeah, one—one other comment, you know, I—I really think, Professor **Thompson**, you have to go back 40 years and look at the decision points that occurred, you know, as we moved from Division II to Division I and then not really fully comprehending what the costs were going to be as we moved along. When that dome was built, I don't think anyone considered what the costs were going to be of fully running a program at that level, just the same as when we built the Bluedorn-Gallagher. You know, we really had an economic model in place that really has not come to full fruition. Now, how we get out of this morass, you know, from an economic standpoint is another question. But I—I think that, you know, my feeling is the Athletic Department is trying to move in a different direction.

Whether it's moral or immoral to assess the students a fee or to ask the students to pay a fee, that is, you know, up to each individual's consciousness in here. But I think they are moving in the right direction to, you know, address the issues that they've been—been asked to do. I mean, they've been asked to reduce the percentage of the General Fund. They're working on it. They're moving forward. It's—do they have a perfect model in place? No, but I think we should be somewhat complimentary of the fact that Athletic Director **Dannen** has taken the right step and moved some in the right direction. I think the issue of moving to Division I football is something obviously that has to be considered because it does have financial implications, and if it's possible, given the playoff structure, that additional monies can be acquired, you know, that would support that, you know---and you know, with fingers crossed. Maybe that's something that ought to be considered.

**Thompson:** Well, since you brought it up, I actually looked back in the past. I went back to all of the past audited financial statements, and what I discovered was that when we built the dome we actually were breaking even or making some money. It wasn't until the football that expanded that we started to see deficits, and they've continued to expand as we've continued to expand football. Now, if history is going to teach us anything, it's that \_\_\_\_\_ we've made some long-term decisions that are like an albatross around the neck of the University, resulting in less money going to academic programming. Going up a Division is not going to help that according to their own report. It will merely increase the amount of deficit to \$10 million, some 5—some 2 times what it is right now, and I don't think the academic program side of the field or the students can handle that type of loss.

**Edginton:** Well, I—I think that may very well be the case, but remember that as you go back and do those—that financial analysis that a great portion of the budget of intercollegiate of athletics was buried in the School of HPELS, was buried in the School of HPELS. Head—head track coach. Head volleyball coach. You know, Iradge **Ahrabi-Farb** made a very decent salary. He was paid always by the School of HPELS. So, you know—you know, that's why there is a differentiation there. That's why they were able

to save money, because it was all got buried down in our academic programs which really wasn't fair to us. It didn't allow us to accomplish our objectives either.

**Peters:** We've got just a few minutes left, and I've got 3 people who've already indicated that they want to speak. Senator **Terlip**?

**Terlip:** Yeah, as we continue to look at this, I would like to know, because I think it can only be philosophically we can make this argument, why we should have football? There are a lot of schools that focus on basketball, which is less expensive. So as an Athletic Director, philosophically why do you want to keep the football program? Economically it hasn't made a whole lot of sense in any of these models. So why—why should we have football?

**Dannen:** Well, I would tell you that a school like UNI economically I can show you net losses in 16 of 17 programs, depending on how you attribute, you know, different

**Terlip:** I think we can go to Division I basketball and supplant some of that money.

**Dannen:** The, you know, it's—you look around the country and the number of schools adding football, and they're doing it from an enrollment standpoint. The reason—the reason people add today, and I'm not saying the reason we—this has nothing to do with us right now, but the reason people add today is enrollment. You gotta have football to drive enrollment at a public institution. It's not so big of a deal at a non-public. But the publics that are adding football, it's all about enrollment. And I wouldn't even hazard a guess, because I'd be wrong, as would any of us, if football didn't exist here, what would happen to the enrollment of the institution? I don't know. It—you could tell me it would go up 5,000, and I would have no way to disprove you. I could tell you it would go down 5,000, and you couldn't disprove me. But—but football is an enrollment mechanism. I would tell you football—if—if we were able to attribute every donor dollar that is donated generally and that is not sport-specific, I

would wager a guess that 75-80 cents of every dollar is because of football. And so if football goes away, the \$3 million

**Terlip:** Have you done any studies to look at that, though, because there are programs successful out there where they do basketball?

**Dannen:** Well, I would tell you I looked back 2 years ago, and I couldn't find but one school in the last decade who had dropped football at the Division I level, and that was in New Orleans. And that was related to hurricane that the University of New Orleans eliminated football and took athletics as a whole to Division II. Nobody else has dropped it. So there's no model for me to go out and look at and say, "Well, why did you do it? And here's what the impact was." It's purely speculative. I will also tell you this here, at the end of the day, because we've played Wisconsin and Iowa, on the balance sheet football will show a net profit. We will be—us and North Dakota State will be the only 2 schools in our league that show a net profit for football.

**Peters:** And we have 2 people in the queue, and that—that will probably run out our time. Vice-Chair **Smith**.

**Smith:** I—I happen to think that Athletics has way too big a footprint in higher education, and if it were simply up to me, I would really scale things back, but I am sympathetic to Mr. **Dannen's** comments here. It's hard to imagine what the impact of dropping football would be here, and given the enrollment problems we've got in this University, I think it would be very difficult to—for a President of this University to unilaterally drop football because of the potential downside effects on enrollment. So, I certainly encourage Troy and—and people running the Athletic Department to do as good a job as they can making it, you know, financially responsible. Schedule games with Wisconsin. Do what you can. As far as decisions moving up or down, my feeling is, you know, there's not enough evidence or information to decide which is right at this point. I think you stay with the status quo. And for me, from the faculty standpoint, I think what we have to do is make this place so attractive to students on an academic basis that we can fill up these seats academically for students who want to be here to get a great education, and when we do that, then we can go to the

Administration and the Athletic Department and say, “Hey, maybe we can do without some of this stuff now. We think we’re strong enough academically to do it.” That’s what I think we as a faculty should be committed to.

**Peters:** And Senator **Kirmani**.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, well, actually I think that this end fee of \$35 is actually totally—I think it will prove to be grossly insufficient. I would like it to be more than one. Probably starting next year \_\_\_\_\_ consider a higher fee. This \$25, I don’t think that will be sufficient at all.

**Peters:** It’s \$25 each year, added each year.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, but still.

**Peters:** Yeah. So at the end of—what it will be at the end of the sequence additional?

**Dannen:** A year is \$25 a pop.

**Peters:** Eight years. Right. I couldn’t remember how many years it was. So, I mean, after 8 years, it will be an extra \$400.

**Kirmani:** Yeah, but \_\_\_\_\_ everything will become more expensive 8 years from now.

**Peters:** \$200, sorry, math, you know. It’s late in the day. It’s been a—it’s been a long day. I was home with a sick kid this morning, so I want a math pass.

**Dannen:** Senator **Peters**, if I could say one—one quick closing thought. I hope everybody in here understands that—that the—our Department wants nothing more than to not rely on General Funds. I use an analogy of an apple, that we’re a long way—we’re—we’re the outside of the skin of the apple. You see us, but we’re a long way away from the core. But it’s our job to protect the core. I also know that we have to have institutional

support at this level for Athletics to work. At Truman State's level, at Mankato State's level, or at the University of Ohio's level—or Ohio University's level. You have to have institutional support, and so we're trying to find a way to fund it so it's least objectionable and most beneficial to the institution. We're generating a lot more money now donor-wise than we have had in the past. As I indicated before, we're 4<sup>th</sup> in the country in the total donor dollars coming into our program. I don't know what the upside is. I would have to tell you the upside is probably limited in how much higher you can climb, but we continue to grow every year. But it is in our interests to make sure your interests are met as well, and I appreciate the chance to be here, and anytime I can, I will.

**Peters:** Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT (5:19 p.m.)

**Peters:** And with that I'm assuming that there would be no objection to adjourning, so I think we'll just consider ourselves adjourned. Thank you very much everybody. We'll see you in 2 weeks. Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Transcriptionist  
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 11/26/2012

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Follows are 2 addenda to these Minutes.

Updated Membership List for the  
Ad hoc Committee on Curricular Review Process

**Ad hoc committee on curriculum review**

*Membership:*

- **Barbara Cutter**, Associate Professor, History & Interim Director of Women's & Gender Studies. Professor Cutter was heavily involved in revising the Curriculum Handbook in 2008, when she was an administrative fellow.
- **Todd Evans**, Associate Professor, Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services. Professor Evans is the current chair of HPELS Curriculum Committee and a past chair of the College of Education Curriculum Committee .
- **Gayle Pohl**, Associate Professor, Communications Studies. Professor Pohl is Chair of the Graduate Faculty and a member of the University Curriculum Committee.
- **Ira Simet**, Associate Professor, Chemistry. Professor Simet is chair of the Committee on Academic Program Reviews, and is a past chair of the Faculty and also chaired the Graduate Council and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.
- **Jerry Smith**, Professor, Management. Professor Smith is Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect of the University Faculty Senate and was co-chair of the Academic Program Assessment Task Force.
- **Laura Terlip**, Associate Professor of Communication Studies. Professor Terlip is a member of the University Faculty Senate and Graduate Council.

**Charge:**

To review our curriculum policies, curriculum handbook and standard curriculum review practices and recommend changes that will: 1) assure faculty control over the curriculum; and, 2) enable faculty bodies to actively monitor and manage curriculum and academic programs.

Ideally, the committee will have a framework of its recommendations completed and will consult with relevant faculty committees early in the Spring semester. After any necessary revisions, the full package will be ready to present to the University Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council by mid-Spring.

Proposed Language in  
United Faculty's initial proposal to the Board of Regents,  
Section 1.2 Shared Governance and  
Section 2.0 Address the Board

**Section 1.2 Shared Governance:**

The Iowa Board of Regents and United Faculty recognize the unique roles and responsibilities of the University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate. We recognize that Faculty Senate consultation in the decision-making process regarding educational policy and curriculum, standards for granting of academic degrees and academic credit, personnel decisions that can modify the faculty's professional identity, professional quality, working environment, budgets, programs, and methods of teaching is important. The parties recognize the necessity of a collegial governance system for faculty in matters of academic concern. It is mutually desirable that the collegial system of shared governance be maintained and strengthened so that faculty shall have a mechanism and procedure, independent of the collective bargaining process, for making recommendations to appropriate administrators and for resolving academic matters of concern to the faculty.

**Section 2.0 Address the Board**

United Faculty shall have the right to address a regular meeting of the Board for at least ten (10) minutes at least twice per year. Any additional requests shall be granted if three (3) days notice is given unless a majority of the Board in a public vote denies the request for specific reasons publicly stated.