

## UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

10/25/10 (3:29 p.m. to 4:42 p.m.)

Summary of the main points of the meeting is presented first, followed by the full transcription of the minutes

### Summary of main points

1. Courtesy announcements from Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** and Chair **Wurtz** (no press being present and Provost **Gibson** declining comment until her consultative session)
2. Minutes ready for approval for 10/11/10 and approved with one correction
3. The following items were docketed from the calendar:

959 (Corrected by the Chair from 958) Request for approval of recommendation by the University Calendar Committee for 2012-2018 from Registrar **Patton** (**Funderburk / Terlip**)

960 (Corrected by the Chair from 959) Request to receive the LAC Annual Report for 2009-2010 from Committee Chair **DeBerg** (**Terlip / Bruess**)

960 Request for approval of recommendation by the Committee on Admission, Readmission and Retention (CARR) from Registrar **Patton** pulled from the Calendar until further information is received

#### 4. Docketed items

955 Emeritus Status Request for Kathleen A. **Kerr**, School of HPELS, effective August 2010 (**DeBerg / Terlip**) Passed by unanimous consent.

956 Emeritus Status Request for Janey L. **Montgomery**, Department of Teaching, effective June 30, 2010 (**DeBerg / Terlip**) Passed by unanimous consent.

957 Consultative session with Provost **Gibson** regarding the budget for Academic Affairs (**Terlip / Marshall** [for **Neuhaus**])

958 Request to receive Annual Report from the Committee on Committees, dated August 2010, for 2010-2011 (**East / Marshall** [for **Neuhaus**]). Passed

Adjournment

---

**TRANSCRIPTION OF THE FULL MINUTES OF THE**

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

**10/25/10**

**1687**

ATTENDANCE

**Present:** Megan Balong, Karen Breitbach, Gregory Bruess, Betty DeBerg, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Deborah Gallagher, Gloria Gibson, Doug Hotek, James Jurgenson, Michael Lacari, Julie Lowell, Chris Neuhaus, Michael Roth, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Jesse Swan, Laura Terlip, Katherine Van Wormer, Susan Wurtz

**Absent:** Forrest Dolgener, Marilyn Shaw

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Wurtz** called the meeting to order at 3:29 p.m.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

No press were in attendance.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GIBSON**

Provost **Gibson** declined comments until her consultative session today.

## COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JURGENSON

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** stated that because he was not here last meeting he would like to personally welcome the new Administrative Assistant, Sherry Nuss, who was in his department for many years and whom he has known for a long time.

## COMMENTS FROM CHAIR SUSAN WURTZ

No particular comments offered at this time.

## BUSINESS

### MINUTES

The Chair noted that Administrative Assistant Nuss has the past minutes transcribed but that not all have been distributed yet. After a consultation with Parliamentarian **Swan, Wurtz** called for corrections to the 10/11/10 minutes that have been sent to senators. She recognized **DeBerg** who corrected the council name under Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing to Inter-Collegiate Athletics Advisory Council. The Chair called for final corrections. Hearing none, the minutes for 10/11/10 stand approved as distributed and corrected. They will be posted on the new Faculty Senate website soon.

## CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1060 for Docket #959 (corrected by the Chair from 958), a request to approve the recommendation of the University Calendar Committee for 2012-2018 from Registrar **Patton** (correcting the spelling of his name from the Agenda for today). **Wurtz** stated that the calendar was attached to the material for senators to look at and called for a motion to docket. **Funderburk** moved to docket in regular order. 2nd by **Terlip**. Discussion included a possible date requested, but the motion was for regular order and no one seemed to have a specific date requested. Vote called by the Chair. Passed.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1061 for Docket #960 (corrected by the Chair from 959), a request to receive the LAC Annual Report for 2009-2010 from the Committee

Chair **DeBerg**. Call for a motion. **Terlip** so moved. 2nd by **Bruess**. Discussion requested for moving in regular order. None else heard. Vote called by the Chair. Passed.

Pulling of Calendar Item #1062 from today's agenda due to not receiving follow-up material. This request will receive a new Calendar Item # and Docket # when all materials are received.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

**Wurtz** noted the time at 3:35 and the first docketed item #957 was to occur at 3:45. **Swan** suggested moving ahead with other docketed items until the appointed time arrived.

### DOCKET 955, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST FOR KERR

**Wurtz** then moved to consideration of Docket Item #955, the Emeritus Status Request for Kathleen A. **Kerr**, School of HPELS, effective August 2010, sponsored by **DeBerg** who was given the floor as first speaker on the merits. **DeBerg** declined, stating that when she made the motion she had not understood that this would be the procedure. As any senator may offer discussion on the merits, **VanWormer** was recognized who stated that Dr. **Kerr** made a wonderful contribution to the UNI campus in terms of International Dancing. She has brought troupes from Russia and Sweden. What she did at UNI was marvelous, noted **VanWormer**. **Wurtz** accepted that as an endorsement of the merits of this request and then recognized **Terlip** who noted Dr. **Kerr**'s great concern for health and safety issues on campus, saying that she worked very hard on many faculty committees to improve health and safety issues. **Terlip** would like to see **Kerr** acknowledged for all her work there. **Wurtz** asked the Senate to consider the motion passed by unanimous consent, and, if no objection was heard, that the Senate endorse the request for emeritus status for Kathleen A. **Kerr**. None heard. Passed by unanimous consent.

### DOCKET 956, EMERITUS STATUS REQUEST FOR MONTGOMERY

Time allowed for consideration of Docket Item #956, the Emeritus Status Request for Janey L. **Montgomery**, Department of Teaching, sponsored by **DeBerg** with second by **Terlip**. **Wurtz** called for discussion on the merits of this application. **Gallagher** stated that **Montgomery** was a major force in the organizing and supervision of

student teachers in the College of Education. **Wurtz** called for the motion to be passed by unanimous consent. None heard. Passed.

### DOCKET 957, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH PROVOST **GIBSON**

As the time approached 3:45 and because no one objected, the body moved to Docket #957, a consultative session with Provost **Gibson** on budget issues. **Wurtz** gave the floor to **Gibson**, but first to **Neuhaus** who wished to clarify that consultative session does not mean executive session. Parliamentarian **Swan** agreed, saying minutes will continue to be taken. Discussion will be handled more loosely. The guest can handle the discussion if she wants, or the Chair can handle the discussion, but no business can be conducted during a consultative session.

Provost **Gibson** thanked the Chair and all present. She came today to the Senate in regards to the UNI Fiscal Year 2011 budget deficit. She reminded the body that last year the University had a deficit. Part of that deficit was taken care of by one-time funding. President **Allen** has now asked each of the units to reduce their budgets to take care of the one-time bridge provided in the past. She announced that the overall deficit is \$1,225,274 for FY11, this year. **East** sought to clarify the time frame as academic year 2010-2011. **Gibson** replied that that is correct, the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011. **DeBerg** clarified that the number was \$1.2 million (\$1,225,274). **Gibson** agreed and continued that **Allen** decided that the cut would be apportioned to a unit's percentage of the total budget. Academic Affairs' percentage of the total budget is 72.7%. The President gave Academic Affairs a break and set the cut at 71.4%, which equals a cut of \$875,000 for Academic Affairs. She noted that every little bit helps,

**Gibson** continued that her memo to **Allen** is due on Friday as to how she will pay \$875,000. She began the process months ago, because she knew she would have to find deficit dollars. First, she met with the Academic Affairs Council where she asked members to look over their budgets to see if there were large items that they might be willing to cut. She did not want to institute across-the-board cuts. She reported very good discussions. **Gibson** stated that she also looked at the Provost's Office budget to see if there were places that that office could cut. She then met with another small group of faculty, 7 members. This was early on, and she did ask that they keep that meeting confidential. She also met a month or so ago with the chairs of the College Faculty Senates, where she did not ask that that meeting be kept confidential, but she did encourage care with sharing information because at that point things were still very much up in the air. In addition, she discussed the

potential plan with the Council of Department Heads. So she has had 4 meetings and now brings to the Senate the results of those meetings where everyone pretty much agreed with the proposed cuts, because they do not directly impact academic departments.

Provost **Gibson** continued explaining that of the \$875,000 deficit, off the top of that there is a reduction of \$98,574, a permanent reduction from Iowa Public Radio. Academic Affairs benefits from that cut, so the actual cut is \$776,426.

For the past 2 years, **Gibson** stated, UNI's Academic Affairs has not utilized the total allocation for Summer School. Last Summer, \$200,000 was left on the table. The year before that, over \$100,000 was left on the table. These are dollars that were not used but could have been used for Summer courses. Sometimes courses do not make, and she does not know just why the money was left over. But at least for the last two Summers, when she looked, there was money left on the table. So she feels that is an area that can be cut. But if \$200,000 to \$300,000 were to be cut, that is not a real cut, because that money was not used in the past anyway. So she is proposing that \$500,000 be cut from the Summer School budget. That brings the need for further cuts down to \$276,426.

When **Gibson** asked the Academic Affairs Council who would have dollars that they could cut from their budget, Continuing Education volunteered to cut their budget. As senators know, Continuing Education has more of an entrepreneurial model, she noted, and they felt that they could sustain a cut and be able to find dollars to replace the cut. Therefore, Continuing Education will be cut by \$250,000. That brings the deficit down to \$26,426.

**Gibson** noted that the Faculty Senate has an allocation for a speaker's series which has not been used in several years, except for a little here and a little there, so she feels this non-utilized money can be cut, which she is doing by \$5,000. This brings the deficit down to \$21,426, which will be absorbed by the Provost's Office, probably in their supplies and also in an allocation for HLC which will be unneeded after this year.

Those are the proposed cuts, the first part of her discussion, and **Gibson** emphasized again that these are permanent cuts. She summarized: Summer School \$500,000; Continuing Education \$250,000, Provost's Office \$21,426, and Faculty Senate \$5,000--all permanent cuts. She asked if senators had any questions.

**Smith** asked about the larger items, Summer School and Continuing Ed, wondering what were the practical implications of this, what will they not be doing in the future that they did do in the past as a result of these cuts? What is the bottom line? **Gibson** replied that Summer School is also to some extent an entrepreneurial model. And part of the money was not utilized anyway. The Administration is also in the process of looking at new models for Summer School, and that will be a discussion for some point in the future. This coming Summer will be fine, she noted, because the 2nd part of her presentation includes discussion of some one-time money to carry everyone over. However, long-term, the model for Summer School must be looked at. **Smith** clarified that then perhaps a Summer School course could not be offered unless it had enrollment sufficient to justify the course. **Gibson** called that a possible model and stated that there are other models also. She is hesitant to say it would be this or that, because they are in the process of looking at many possible models. **East** questioned whether this would mean that department heads would no longer be required to teach a course in the Summer? He explained that in the past department heads have been required to teach a course in the Summer so that they would be full-time. They were paid half-time as an administrator, and teaching would make them full-time in the Summer. He has heard of at least a few cases where department heads have taught one or two or three or five students, and so the highest paid faculty members are paid to do almost nothing. He is assuming that that no longer will be required or expected or even allowed? **Gibson** said that she could not answer that question right now. **East** asked her to note this information and his opinion that it is a hugely inefficient use of money on this campus. **Gibson** said that she would definitely look into that.

Provost **Gibson** continued with her response to **Smith** regarding Continuing Ed. and repeated that Continuing Ed. has an entrepreneurial model and that the Interim Dean has assured her that he will not have any issues coming up for those dollars. She will be providing him with some bridge dollars; so it is not as if his money is gone instantaneously. It is gone, but she has some one-time dollars to help bridge that until he can come up with a model to take care of those dollars. He is very confident that this will not be a problem. **Smith** noted that it sounds like in the past in both cases, with Summer School and Continuing Ed., a lot of money was spent in support of course offerings that really did not pay for themselves in terms of student enrollments, and he asked if that was true. **Gibson** replied that that was true in some cases. **DeBerg** offered that many did pay for themselves, and **Gibson** agreed. **Smith** wondered if those that have paid for themselves in the past and would in the future would still be offered? **Gibson** agreed but said that that is not her decision. That is the decision of the department head, working with the dean and the faculty. She does hope that all can agree that courses that are not meeting some

type of enrollment minimum should not be offered. She is all for faculty having opportunities to teach in the Summer, but it becomes an issue when you have a higher paid faculty member and only 3 students in the class. **DeBerg** offered that one of the really irrational aspects to her of the Summer School budgeting was that the money budgeted for it was disconnected from the money raised by it. It was not a stand-on-its-own, income in / expenses out, budget. She has never understood what seemed quite irrational to her. **Gibson** agreed and added that there can be exceptions, that there always should be some room for exceptions. **DeBerg** agreed and continued by saying that in terms of department head Summer teaching, that was one of the ways that the University attempted to recoup some tuition money from paying department heads full-time for two Summer months. At least they made income, rather than just paying them full-time for two Summer months without any Summer School tuition. She continued that she feels one of the discussions needs to be Summer salary for department heads. Two full months salary? Two months half-salary? There are options for department heads' Summer income. She saw the Summer School requirement as a way to at least get some money back from paying department heads two months. **East** contributed that it might be thought of as a mechanism where department heads are paid half-time for administration only and not required to teach, then the University would recoup 50% of that money. **DeBerg** agreed and suggested that Personnel be asked for an administrative needs analysis of running a department in the Summer, to find out what kind of work is required of department heads in the Summer. **Gibson** noted that she could meet with the Council of Department Heads as well to see what their thoughts are. **Terlip** added that perhaps coordination among colleges could occur with people in the same college covering follow-up on Student Request Forms and such.

**Gibson** then asked if conceptually all this made sense. Some nodded, so she continued with the second part of her presentation. She has some one-time money, she stated, that actually will need to be spent by June 30. She re-emphasized that the cuts are permanent and gone, but also some one-time money exists for Academic Affairs, referred to as "bridge dollars" in the amount of \$715,000. She asked the groups that she met with for recommendations for how these dollars would be spent. President **Allen** would like a portion of the dollars to go back to help back-fill the cuts. For example, if \$500,000 is cut from Summer School, then perhaps for this one year she could give Summer School back \$100,000 or \$200,000. The danger there is that if too much is given back, and it is not used, it is gone. It is lost. So she will have to decide carefully, and she encourages suggestions as to how much might go in that pot. For Continuing Ed., **Gibson** has said the same thing. She will back-fill for some of those cut dollars. She may or may not recoup the



\$21,000 for her office. The Senate may or may not get its \$5,000 back. But the bigger cuts she does feel need back-filled on a one-time basis.

**DeBerg** expressed confusion about the overall picture. Are the permanent cuts outlined for next fiscal year? **Gibson** replied that, no, they are for the current fiscal year. And she must let **Allen** know on Friday how she will make those cuts for this year because of the previous year when there was a budget cut. She does not have those numbers with her. **East** wanted to clarify that she was referring to cutting money the University is currently spending this Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. Yes, replied **Gibson**. **East** continued that Academic Affairs must cut \$875,000 from this Fall's budget and next Spring's budget. **DeBerg** interjected that it meant before June 30th, and **Gibson** agreed and restated that the President wants a memo on Friday stating where the money will come from. That money will be drawn from the current accounts. **East** wondered if the Summer School being cut is from last year, 2010, that has already been spent or not spent. **Gibson** restated that she is cutting from Summer 2011. So **East** summarized, then from Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Summer 2011, and **Gibson** agreed, saying it meant up until June 30. **East** asked then if money is allocated by June 30, then it can be spent, and **Gibson** agreed. **East** expressed thanks for clearing that up. And **Gibson** asked if anyone else had any other questions.

**Gibson** next asked for any suggestions for how the additional one-time dollars might be spent. Adjunct needs were at the top of most of the lists she has already received. This could be for Spring 2011 and also for Summer 2011 classes. Professional development for faculty was suggested, and one group talked about professional development for faculty as it pertains to the cornerstone courses that will be offered Fall 2011. She added that a Library representative spoke passionately at one group about the Library needing some funds that could benefit all faculty. There may be some equipment needs, but personally **Gibson** stated that she is not as supportive of these dollars going for equipment because generally year-end dollars go for equipment requests. So her preferences so far would be for adjuncts, faculty professional development which could be in a number of areas--online, IT, webcourse development, those types of development areas--and the Library.

At this point, **Gibson** noted two points for discussion: 1) Senators' ideas about proportion; and 2) Senators' ideas about other areas for her to consider funding. **Terlip** brought up what may be an equipment point, but noted that this is a curriculum year where a number of faculty are proposing courses or majors that may require equipment as a part of that. Could this be tied to curriculum while there is

money, she wondered? **Gibson** replied in the affirmative and asked if **Terlip** was thinking about programs that would come through her own college, saying that she suspects one of the programs will have some equipment needs. **Terlip** suggested not waiting until the year-end funds, and **Gibson** agreed, saying she certainly would consider this. **East** noted that surely fairly soon this would be found out because curriculum proposals need to be made this Fall yet, and part of the proposal is money needed, so faculty would need to know about potential funding by December 1 or whenever those curriculum proposals are due. So that decision cannot be made late next Spring. The deans will need to make these decisions, he assumed, yet this Fall or very early in the Spring. **Gibson** agreed, because this bridge money has to be spent or lost. **East** presumed that the deans will no longer approve something just saying that the money will be found somehow. **Terlip** added that when building for the future, if there is money now, then it could be put in place.

**VanWormer** brought up travel reimbursement, noting that in the past faculty were reimbursed very generously, even for international travel, and now it is just a very small part of the overall cost to go and present a paper. She would like to see academic travel considered and more fully supported.

**DeBerg** stated her strong support for developing a group of faculty members trained to teach the Cornerstone course. Many have spent a lot of time on the First-Year Experience, which she feels has been exemplary work. She thinks a really great first-year course is important for UNI, and she also thinks that faculty will not be willing to teach it unless they believe that they are adequately prepared to teach, for instance, writing and public speaking and perhaps other areas. She would like faculty paid for a week of training on the Cornerstone course, perhaps running workshops every week in May, having at least 4, and inviting faculty from all over the University who might at some time be interested in teaching this course. They would not be committed for the upcoming year even, but, while there is money, training faculty can be done now. She proposes reimbursing faculty who teach the training sessions and paying trainees for their time in the Summer to sit for a week. This way faculty from across the University would be up and running on this course and prepared to teach it when it moves beyond the pilot into a full-fledged program. So she is very much in favor of supporting the First-Year Experience in that way.

**Gibson** called on **Smith** saying she could see the wheels turning. He replied that he felt mixed about asking this question, because it strays a bit perhaps beyond the agenda here. He acknowledged his comfort with what she has talked about, with the cuts she has proposed and with how to deal with the one-time money. But he is still bothered in a bigger picture sense about the many new things talked about in the

Strategic Plan, things such as new programs and investing here and there. He knows that no one here today believes that the State of Iowa has new funds to just give to UNI, so how will these new activities be funded? It seems the funding will need to come internally, and it seems that perhaps all the extra funds of years past are being used up. What plans has she considered for funding some of the new initiatives that will make this University a much better place? One that stands out for him is the Liberal Arts Core. How will the LAC be made a really standout program so that UNI can really be a leading public undergraduate institution rather than just saying we already are? **Gibson** agreed, saying that President **Allen** realizes that UNI cannot have a Strategic Plan without having dollars attached. The Strategic Plan has not yet been implemented. It was approved in September, and she is in the process of implementing that plan. So there will be some strategic dollars attached to the plan. However, when thinking about Goal #1, excellence for undergraduate students tied to the Liberal Arts Core, then investing in the cornerstone course and preparing faculty for teaching that course, she feels, is in direct alignment with the Strategic Plan. So when there are dollars available, they must be used to help support the Plan. She does not see a disconnect there. **Smith** replied that he did not either but that he wondered if she had ideas about where those dollars would all come from. **Gibson** replied that those dollars will come from different places. Will there be enough? No, she acknowledged, but everyone will just keep working at it. For now, looking strategically at the dollars available and how they can align with the Strategic Plan is important. She can even see faculty travel as aligned with the Strategic Plan. Her challenge right now is to take \$700,000 and figure out how to divide in among, say, 5 areas effectively. She thinks that small portions given out will have less impact than perhaps taking \$200,000 and devoting that to the Cornerstone course and preparing faculty to teach that course. She would rather use a larger portion of money to make a greater impact than just nickels and dimes here and there.

**Soneson** voiced a small concern with taking money from Continuing Ed, because of the implications of doing that for funding adjuncts for the LAC. Right now, especially with regard to certain courses, such as Writing and Oral Comm., the LAC is an unfunded mandate. There are about 40 sections of Oral Comm and 40 sections of Writing each semester, and if he understands things correctly, the Dean of CHAFA has always gone to the Provost with hat in hand each semester, and that often the money has come from Cont. Ed. because that unit would make money. If that money has now dried up, then the question becomes: "Where will money come from for funding adjuncts?" **Gibson** replied that a lot of the money is not going to dry up. Again, looking at the Strategic Plan, it says that UNI will increase its online and distance education offerings. That will bring in money. And the Interim Dean has a

plan for working with academic deans. She is not as concerned about Continuing Ed. because they already have an entrepreneurial model, and they have been asked to increase those offerings. The "they" is not only the Provost. It is also the Board of Regents, because in the Board of Regents' Strategic Plan they are asking all three universities to become more entrepreneurial with outreach. They call it "access." In other words, the Board of Regents wants to make sure that there is greater access to educational opportunities across the State. One way to do that is online/distance education. **Soneson** asked if Continuing Ed.'s net income will increase, which will then be used to pay adjuncts? **Gibson** replied that that is the plan; however, another plan under discussion is to revise the LAC. She does not know what new model they are exploring, but they are exploring new models as well. She does think it will be okay. She really is not concerned about Continuing Ed. They will be able to make those dollars, and she is hoping they will make additional dollars to talk about. **Soneson** clarified that his concern is not about Continuing Ed. itself. He is concerned about the LAC adjuncts. **Gibson** agreed, saying that all of the deans get dollars from Continuing Ed., and she does foresee all of those dollars continuing. She also understands that the new model may be a little different from what the University is doing now.

**Gallagher** stated that retention is an important issue, and **Gibson** agreed absolutely. **Gallagher** wondered aloud what kind of commitment exists and how that fits into the Strategic Plan and has it been stated directly and what kind of message will everyone see about this? (?) **Gibson** replied that investing in the cornerstone course will help immensely with retention. **Gallagher** noted that she firmly believes that and that the writing issue is important. So that needs to be included. **Gibson** stated her agreement and relayed the good idea she heard at one of her meetings to devote some dollars to professional development for faculty specifically for the Cornerstone, First-Year-Experience course. She had actually been thinking more about professional development for faculty for online and for technology use in the classroom, as some faculty still do not use any technology in the classroom. She thinks it is a great idea to infuse dollars there. **Gallagher** agreed but also wanted to add that there may be some efforts needed along the line of retention beyond that Cornerstone issue. **Gibson** will ask, reminding the group that the money has to be spent by June 30 and noting that there is a Retention Council which **Lacari** chairs. She encouraged him to share with her any ideas from that council that might be helpful.

**DeBerg** noted a point of some despair for her is that as other Divisions are cut also, they will pass along those cuts to academic departments in the form of charge backs. For example, Physical Plant, IT, even the Registrar's Office stopped printing

the Schedule of Classes, and now departments print it on printers using good, white paper. Students print it out using good white paper. As units at the University think that they are saving themselves money, the academic departments get stuck with almost all those things as passed along, indirectly or directly. Therefore, Academic Affairs will see some percent of the cuts that other Divisions take. She knows that academic departments are worried about this as they should be, and she hopes that the Provost is an advocate in the President's Cabinet on this issue of charge backs. Academic departments cannot afford the cuts from other Divisions as well. Academic departments provide income, through tuition, then they get sniped at. **Gibson** agreed with the issue and stated that she met with the Council of Department Heads a month or so ago, and this was one of the topics, if not the main topic, on the agenda. She had asked all of the Academic Affairs Council to bring her examples of some of the present charge backs. **DeBerg** interjected that Food Service is way up, that departments can no longer afford to use Food Service. **Gibson** also noted that there is no water at Faculty Senate meetings because they charge to bring water into this room. **DeBerg** continued that charge backs are another cost to departments that is simply a reality. **Gibson** reported that the Cabinet has had that conversation and that she will continue to have that conversation in the Cabinet because she understands that it is a very serious issue. For example, when the issue of snow removal arises (at above market cost which is entirely unacceptable, interjected **DeBerg**), **Gibson** says that is very serious.

**Wurtz** pointed out that **Funderburk** wished to speak. **Gibson** apologized for missing seeing his hand. **Funderburk** said that his comment actually tied in with **DeBerg's** line of comments. He wants someone to examine the exclusive contracts where office supplies must come from a particular supplier who might charge double the price a local store would. **DeBerg** added that the department does not get the kick back. Central Administration does. She feels that if the department would receive the kick back for spending the money, it would be fine, but the departments spend the money and Tom **Schellhardt** gets the kick back. She asked if any of the money even came to the Provost's Office? **Gibson** replied, no, but that some of this is mandated by the State. Not all of it, but some of it. **DeBerg** called it corrupt. **Gibson** reiterated that some of it is mandated by the State and added that some of it is mandated by the Board of Regents, so the University cannot sometimes decline participation. **DeBerg** asked if Office Max is mandated? **Gibson** said she believed so. **DeBerg** asked, Pepsi? **Gibson** replied that that is a contract and other voices agreed. UNI gets kick backs from that, but not individuals who drink Pepsi. **Soneson** noted that his department cannot buy any soda other than Pepsi products for parties or for get-togethers. **Gibson** stated that she knows it is no consolation,

but every campus goes through this. **DeBerg** replied that hundreds of wrongs do not make a right, and **Gibson** agreed but noted that it is an ongoing matter everywhere.

**Roth** talked about an issue such as snow removal, depending on who charges for that, but he wanted to talk about the many fundamental inefficiencies in the slowness of maintenance in the Physical Plant. He is not talking about waiting just a little while or an office that's too cold. He strongly feels this needs to be looked at. **Gibson** said she knew this and fully agreed.

**East** brought the conversation back to professional development and allocating money for adjunct faculty. He expressed a hope and an assumption that the result is more than just throwing some money at it. He has participated in faculty development here at UNI. Some of it has been good; some of it less good. Some departments seem to just live on adjunct faculty without making strategic use of their faculty, whereas other departments strive to live without adjuncts and do not get rewarded for their good use of faculty. He applauds the decision not to make across-the-board cuts. He hopes the Administration will also be as strategic in thinking and planful in decisions about how to actually spend money. He knows of departments who historically have a large adjunct faculty budget, whereas other departments have a very low adjunct faculty budget. Both have gotten used to this, and, in the former, regular faculty are teaching small classes because the large classes are taught by adjuncts. He encourages decisions about quality in this issue, with the Provost asking deans and department heads to attempt to make good decisions for the use of limited money. And when the Provost is allocating money for professional development for the Cornerstone course, then **East** hopes that she will ensure that it is quality professional development and not just funding anyone who shows an interest in the idea of developing faculty. **Gibson** agreed 100%. As for the issue of accountability for professional development, last year the Senate may recall, she said, that money existed for faculty to develop online courses. Faculty were required to teach that course either Spring 2010 or during the current academic year. So it was not a matter of an individual using funds to learn something new and then not doing anything with it. So the courses were scheduled along with the development. She agrees that a level of accountability is necessary. As far as the issue of adjuncts, she stated that she has trust or confidence in department heads and deans to make good decisions. **East** suggested that a college with 10 department heads may have a history of adjuncts, but that just as across-board-cuts are not reasonable, so too across-the-board apportionment is not reasonable either. **Gibson** questioned **Lacari** as to whether Administration looks at the enrollments to determine feasibility of adjunct requests. She remembers that as the case. **Lacari** noted that those requests for adjuncts are handled per semester, so there are

opportunities there to not give so much. They have looked at this down to the course level. **Gibson** wanted to be sure she understood what **East** was saying. Did he suggest that some departments request adjuncts they do not really need? **East** said, yes, or who could get by without them, yes, he believed so. There are other departments who strive to do without adjuncts because they believe faculty teach better, so those faculty have larger class sizes. They do not request adjuncts or request fewer. The squeaky wheel gets the grease. If each request is honored with half across the board rather than asking why the requests vary, then it may just be based on history, which varies in departments.

**DeBerg** noted that the Liberal Arts Core Committee has begun to talk about some creative incentives for individuals and/or departments to have tenured or tenure-track faculty teach LAC courses. She would like the committee to discuss something like that. **Gibson** stated that that is also in the Strategic Plan, to increase the number of faculty who teach LAC courses. **DeBerg** agreed that the numbers right now are despicable.

**Gibson** moved the conversation back to the basics, asking how the Senate is feeling about the apportionment of dollars? Do senators agree with the concept of a larger amount for areas, rather than trying to spread it out a little here and a little there? **Jurgenson** wondered what percentage of the total budget that has been provided for Continuing Education is being cut? **Gibson** replied that she did not know off the top of her head but that she could get it for him. **Jurgenson** wondered if it was half? The Provost replied, no, nowhere near half. **Jurgenson** asked if they had been given a budget at the beginning of the fiscal year, and that now \$250,000 was being taken back? **Gibson** stated that Continuing Ed. does get some general funds, but they also generate their own dollars. She is not sure what percentage the \$250,000 represents, but she does not think that the Interim Dean would have suggested it, unless he felt he could absorb that. She thinks he will be fine, because he would not have suggested it otherwise. **Jurgenson** clarified asking that the Interim Dean volunteered this amount? **Gibson** replied yes.

**DeBerg** suggested that everyone keep in mind for the future of Academic Affairs the maintaining of the phased retirement program. It has to save money every year. It comes up for renewal in 2012.

**Terlip** wondered if the Provost might look at increasing graduate student stipends as a way to enhance quality and attract more graduate students. Many of them also teach, so that would help as well in dealing with some of the adjunct issues. **Gibson** was not sure that that could be put in place for next semester or for the Summer.

**Lacari** stated that the problem there is that this is one-time money. **Terlip** was thinking more about the Strategic Plan and things to look at there.

**Neuhaus** wondered if there is any sense that the Board of Regents or the State would not only like but would allow certain units to become more entrepreneurial than they have been allowed to be in the past. He thinks there are a number of avenues, where if given a chance to actually bring in money, that a lot of things could be done. **Gibson** noted that there are different ways to be entrepreneurial, and certainly for faculty one way is external funding. She does have a small portion of money, separate from these bridge dollars, that will be going to sponsor programs, and faculty will be hearing more about that soon in order to compete for those dollars for external funding.

**Soneson** stated that he thinks the budget cuts proposed today are reasonable. One thing that strikes him is the possible effect on faculty morale, those who, for example, are used to teaching Summer School who no longer will be able to teach Summer School. At times like this he becomes concerned about all the money being funneled that is creating a fuss (?). He brought this up not to make a case at this point, but just to remind the Provost that this is something that Academic Affairs should not let go. This is not a sports institution. It is an academic institution. Sports are a sideline that are kind of fun to have, but they are by no means central to the mission. As parts of academic programs are cut, he becomes worried that others are seeing coaches salaries going up whereas faculty salaries are going down. It does not seem fair to him. **Gibson** replied that she will either put in her letter to **Allen**, or in a more general communique on her website, that regarding Summer School, faculty need not worry about their place in the large Summer School cut for two reasons. First, money has been unused and left over every year. When over \$200,000 is left on the table, that is glaring. Second, for Summer 2011 she will back-fill some of that. And she hopes that by sometime next year, there will be a new model in place so that faculty salaries for the Summer will not be disrupted. That is her hope.

**Gibson** summarized that she is hearing support for professional development for the Cornerstone course, correct? Heads nod. She has heard support for adjuncts--kind of, sort of.... Many voices acknowledge that UNI must use them. She has heard support for equipment needs that might be tied to new curriculum areas and support for travel and support for the Library. **DeBerg** offered her personal support for the Library, which she feels is really important.

**Gibson** thanked everyone and voices thanked her in return.



**Wurtz** stated that the body is rising from the consultative session and moving back to the Agenda. The remaining item is docket #958, the motion by Senator **East** and seconded by Senator **Neuhaus** that the Senate receive the Annual Report from the Committee on Committees dated August 2010 that is for the 2010-2011 year. That has been taken as the motion and the second. The floor was opened for discussion on the merits of this motion. **East** was given first chance to speak as the sponsor. He wanted to clarify that this is simply receiving a report of what is and that no actions were recommended to be taken. **Terlip** explained that this was discussed at an earlier meeting, but the Senate failed to receive it. **Wurtz** agreed that this is going back and fixing the receiving of this report. **Swan** and **East** clarified with each other and for the record that no action is required nor recommended in the report. This is simply receiving a report. **Wurtz** called for further discussion. Hearing none, vote called. Motion passed. Report received.

**Wurtz** announced adjournment by unanimous consent at 4:42 p.m.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate