

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**10/24/11 (3:16 p.m. - 4:16 p.m.)**  
**Mtg. 1701**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** absent.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** had no comments.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that the Bylaws Committee has met with the Committee on Committees, and the two have agreed on 99.9% of issues covered. There will be a new set of Bylaws, and they are working on the Constitution. The Bylaws Committee hopes to bring recommendations on these to a meeting yet this semester.

Chair **Funderburk** offered one comment on his misspeaking regarding the Faculty Roster at the last meeting. Professor **Hays** is listed as a voting member.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for 10/10/11 were approved (**male/Smith**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

No items appeared for docketing.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- 1093 991 Report on the Current UNI NCAA Certification Self Study, Docketed out of order for October 24, 2011, 3:45 p.m. (**Neuhaus/Roth**). Report completed.
- 1094 992 Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy from the Educational Policies Committee(sic Commission), regular order (**Terlip/Marshall** —alternate for **Neuhaus**). Motion to accept the revised recommendations (**DeBerg/East**). Passed.
- 1095 993 Emeritus Faculty Request for Jack Wilkinson, Mathematics, effective July 1, 2011, regular order (**Kirmani/East**). Motion to endorse request (**East/Bruess**). Passed

## 5. New Business

Karen **Mitchell** has agreed to serve as interim at-large representative on the University Curriculum Committee until an election can be held to select a Senator for that position.

## 6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:16 p.m. (**DeBerg/Bruess**). Passed.

Next meeting:

November 14, 2011

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:15 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
October 24, 2011  
Mtg. 1701**

**PRESENT:** Robert **Boody** (alternate for Deborah **Gallagher**), Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, James **Jurgenson**, Michael **Licari**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (alternate for Chris **Edginton**), Michael **Roth**, Jerry **Smith**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Katherine **Van Wormer**, Susan **Wurtz**

**Absent:** Gloria **Gibson**, Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m., noting a quorum was in attendance.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION**

Chair **Funderburk**: Call for press identification. Lots of folks here, but I don't think they are press folks.

**COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

Chair **Funderburk**: Provost **Gibson** is unable to join us today as is Assistant Provost **Arthur**.

**COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON**

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson** joined the group a bit later and had no comments.

## **REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH**

Chair **Funderburk**: Vice-chair **Breitbach**.

**Breitbach**: I am very happy to report that the By-Laws Committee has met with the Co-chairs of the Committee on Committees, and it was an extremely productive meeting, and we are happy to agree on 99.9%--**Jesse?** (who assented)--on everything we discussed. And so we hope to have a new set of Bylaws. We are even looking at the Constitution as we meet and some recommendations, perhaps somewhat updated recommendations for the Committee on Committee Report from a year and a half ago. We hope to bring that back to you as kind of a joint recommendation, and I don't know if we'll get here in November, but we might get this done before winter break. That is my politically correctly referring to it as "winter break." And that's all I have for today.

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

Chair **Funderburk**: I have little to offer today except one correction for the Faculty Roster, which was that—we talked about Professor **Hays** was getting listed in Political Science, and I misspoke at the meeting saying that he would not have voting rights like the others, but I then said he could have voting rights like all the other administrators in a given College. I noticed that in the Minutes and remembered saying it. I know I misspoke. It is listed with him as voting rights. I have nothing else to bring forward today, so that's a good thing. So we can move right into the Agenda.

BUSINESS

## **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Chair **Funderburk**: We have Minutes of October 10. Motion to approve? (Male voice said "Move.") Move to approve. Second?

Senator **Smith**: Second.

**Funderburk**: Second from Senator **Smith**. All in favor, “aye”? (ayes all around.) All those opposed? (silence). Minutes are approved. As I understand, no amendments and none offered here.

### **CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING**

None.

### **CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS**

**Funderburk**: Our Agenda Item #991 is slated for 3:45, so we will go with a couple of these items out of order. First, I think we will likely have time to get the Educational Policies issue in for the Electronic Device Policy. Do you want to start there?

DOCKET #992 ELECTRONIC DEVICES IN THE CLASSROOM POLICY FROM THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE (sic COMMISSION)

Chair **Funderburk**: Do you have your documents before you? Do I hear a motion on Electronic Devices in the Classroom Policy?

**DeBerg**: I move to adopt them.

**Funderburk**: Senator **DeBerg** moves to adopt.

**East**: Second.

**Funderburk**: Second by Senator **East**. The floor is open for any discussion or comment. Do you have any comments or just

**Breitbach**: Please, join us at the table (to **Rhineberger-Dunn** who moved to join the Senators). Is it **Dunn-?**

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Gayle **Rhineberger-Dunn**.

**Breitbach:** Oh, gees. I always get that

**Funderburk:** We were just discussing the 2 parts.

**Breitbach:** I know there are two parts. I just every other time flip them.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** That's all right.

**Funderburk:** Gayle is the Chair of the EPC committee, our Educational Policy Committee (sic) that reviewed this and brought it back to us now for the 3<sup>rd</sup> visit. (Some light joking and light laughter around.)

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Maybe, we'll just quickly then give the history. This policy with one exception was approved by the Faculty Senate, I think in '07. And then it sort of just disappeared in thin air, and so last year when EPC was working on some other issues, we asked about it. Now we hunted it down from one of the former EPC chairs, and we reviewed it. We didn't see any reason to change anything, with the exception of the first bulleted item. We added that "the use of personal electronic devices to engage in any activity that violates UNI policies and procedures." That is really the only substantive change. But I do know there has since been a few suggestions regarding the policy.

**Funderburk:** Any comments from the Senators? Nothing? Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, I have a tiny editorial correction on the 4<sup>th</sup> dotted point. It is "expressed" ed permission, not "express permission."

**Funderburk:** Other comments? (searched for document to read from) I meet regularly with the NISG leadership, and I met with Spencer **Walrath**, the current president, who offered a few comments over the weekend about the Electronic Device Policy. So I'll just read what he sent me to say. He agrees that professors should have the authority to restrict or prohibit

use in a classroom. He says, “I think that the most important part of that 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (which should be highlighted, underscored, and in bold) is that professors must communicate their policy on electronic devices (in all caps) in their syllabus. This is important so that students can very clearly understand their policy, and there is no chance of verbal confusion.” His third point, “You may want to consider adding a line under the Prohibitive Activities section that addresses gaming. I don’t think that is covered under any of the areas, and most smart phones I’ve had, iPods, and computers have various games, Angry Birds, etc. on them.” And his last suggestion was, “I don’t know enough about technology to be certain, but it may be worth something to include MP3 or any music playing devices as a specifically mentioned device to include under the jurisdiction of this policy. It may technically count as computer hardware, but better safe than sorry. It’s been my observation that students will sit through an entire lecture staring at the screen or listening to their music.” Senator **Wurtz**.

**Wurtz:** I’m going to play devil’s advocate on this one and argue that this is the technology of our time and that while this policy does say that a professor has a right to prohibit it and therefore a professor has the right to say “Go for it,” I am bothered by what seems to be demonizing the technology and saying, “Don’t use it. Don’t use it. Don’t use it.” That we should be talking about learning to use it in effective ways and to some degree, if the student wants to zone out to MP3, that’s the student’s choice. I don’t like legislating behavior.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Well, I have a comment. Since we—I think that policy is in its best form for what is needed in order to protect the rights of students and faculty. There are—I have students come into my classroom with earphones on that you can clearly hear every single word of the song. And the other students are looking at them like they’ve lost their mind because they don’t want to hear it. And so if—this is not just about faculty, it’s also about protecting a learning environment, and you can hear, even if they are turned down low, other students can hear that. We are packed. I don’t know about your classrooms, but they are sitting on top of each other and packed to the gills, that this is really for the students as well as the

faculty. I'm not--and I would agree with you that encouraging the learning of it is important but perhaps this isn't the right venue for that discussion.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Breitbach**

**Breitbach:** This policy in no way restricts the productive use of such devices in the classroom. I always tell my students that you've got the best stopwatch in the world on your smart phone. You also have a calculator, one of the best calculators on your smart phone. There's no reason to carry two or three devices when you've got them all in one. And so they should be using them for those purposes. So I don't see this policy as prohibiting productive use of those policies—uh, or those devices, but rather, as she said, getting the instructor the right to write into his or her syllabus policies that prevent those devices from disrupting class.

**Funderburk:** Other comments? I'm seeing none, so I'm guessing that we are ready to move to voting. All those in favor of approving the policy as presented, well, with this one amendment of the

**DeBerg:** “expressed”

**Funderburk:** expressed typing. All in favor? (ayes all around; some confusion as to whether there was a request to vote right then, laughter)

Senator **Terlip:** I have a question. Now where does this policy go?

**Funderburk:** Let's finish the vote. All those opposed? None. All other abstentions? One abstention. Since there is one correction to be made, I think I have an electronic doc. Do I have the right doc, do you know?

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I don't know, but I'll send it to you by email.

**Funderburk:** If I have it, I will be walking it over to the Provost's Office tomorrow and posting that I did such. (something whispered) That's a good question. Senator **East**.



**East:** Just following up on that question, I was wondering—so this becomes Faculty Senate policy, right? Or is that different on this?

**Funderburk:** This now proceeds through the policy process—I don't know how much you may want to comment on this—this will then be routed to another, at least one other committee before it works its way all the way up through the system.

**East:** To become University policy. Ok.

**Funderburk:** To become University policy and published, and we are working with the Provost's Office to track this better this time with the intent that this one gets fixed this year at least. Third time's the charm. Senator **East**.

**East:** So we would hear back if they didn't approve it?

**Funderburk:** Very good question. (light laughter)

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** I'd like to know that, too.

**Funderburk:** From the last 3 we have been working on, that answer would be, "No," but I guess technically they didn't "not approve" them. They just did not act upon them. But we can't tell if they had them or not. Ok? Thank you very much. Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** I'm just going to thank the Committee and **Gayle**, in particular, for working on that. It's been a long, tortuous journey, but thanks a lot for your work.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Not nearly as tortuous as what's to come. (laughter)

**Funderburk:** This is still the low-hanging fruit for that Committee.

**Rhineberger-Dunn:** Oh, it's so low, it's touching the ground. (more laughter)

**Funderburk:** Ok, we still have a few more minutes before our other guests, so I would suggest that we go ahead and do the docketed item #993.

#993 EMERITUS FACULTY REQUEST FOR JACK **WILKINSON**, MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2011

**Funderburk:** Docket Item #993, Emeritus Faculty Request for Jack Wilkinson from Mathematics. Could we have a motion?

**East:** Move to approve.

**Bruess:** Second

**Funderburk:** Approve by Senator **East**. And second by Senator **Bruess**. Discussion? Comment? I think Senator **Kirmani** was the one originally, but he is not here today. Any comments?

**East:** Are we speaking for or against?

**Funderburk:** Indeed. (light laughter)

**East:** An early encounter I had with Jack **Wilkinson** he was talking to legislators and trying to get money or support or something, and he suggested that while the scientists and social scientists talk about the complexity of their work, how important that was, he said something about "I work on understanding learning of my students and that seems at least as complex and important as plants or planets or whatever." And so **Jack** is a good man. He's done lots of good work for UNI.

**Funderburk:** Other comments? (silence) All those in favor of recommending emeritus status, please say "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none) Abstentions? (none) Motion passes.

## NEW BUSINESS

**Funderburk:** We still have 15 minutes. We have under New Business appointment of a Senator to serve interim position at large for the University Curriculum Committee. I had asked last time that you do some soul searching to see if you might be the ideal person to do this. Do we have anybody from the floor willing to step forward, before I tell you whether or not there's anyone else? I don't see any people leaping at the opportunity. Luckily, on the other hand, Karen **Mitchell** did—I won't call it "leaped"—but she was kind enough, as a former chair of the Committee, to say that she would serve until we can get an election mounted to find a person. She also made it very clear that she's not willing to continue on that Committee past that point, so she will not be a candidate for the position. So, still keep in mind who we might want to encourage to run for election for the 3-year term on the Curriculum Committee. All those in favor of giving **Karen** the nod to fill in that spot, please say "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Are there any abstentions? (none heard) Very good then. Chair **Jurgenson**, thanks for joining us. (3:31 p.m.)

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson:** Sorry I'm late.

**Funderburk:** I wasn't sure you would make it today. Do you have any comments today? I think we have a few minutes, I'm sure. (joking among Senators about the time left before the scheduled guests due in 14 minutes)

**Jurgenson:** Are we waiting for someone to show up?

**Funderburk:** We have—yes, 3:45 is our presentation report. Not meaning to force your hand on that. There was one other

**DeBerg:** I have a question.

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

**DeBerg:** Did you reschedule the visit with the Museum Director?

**Funderburk:** Yes, and actually I thought

**DeBerg:** Did you announce that last time? I missed it.

**Funderburk:** No, no. I copied you on an e-mail in the meantime, but it is—we docketed it on our next meeting, which is November the 14<sup>th</sup>, for our next Senate meeting.

**DeBerg:** I just want to encourage—this is a chance for us to get to the bottom of all the rumors about the Museum that are circulating. So, I think this is a really good opportunity for the faculty. I've encouraged Director **Grosboll** to bring some of her Faculty Advisory Board members with her on that day.

**Funderburk:** Also, as part of, since we have a few minutes, as part of our visit, President **Walrath** brought forth a proposal that he would like to see if the faculty would be interested in working with the students on a response to the suggested tuition increase for next year. And he was seeking perhaps a faculty member that was in particular interested in working with him for some sort of a joint statement on this. I recommended a couple of names. I don't know that anyone was contacted, but I will just throw that out there. If anybody has a particular interest or, I suppose, if someone really wants the Senate to make a statement officially, then we will need some sort of petition or something started. But I've sent a note to a few people to consider it, and if you are interested, you can send me a note or send one to **Spencer**. I'm sure he'd be happy to hear about it. Ok. Anything else from the floor? That's why I am doing my best—I'm looking to see if they say they aren't coming (looking at his laptop). That's why I've had it up here, just in case. I did confirm with the Senator that they would be here at 3:45, so I think that if we have nothing else to do, we'll go in recess.

**DeBerg:** Well, here they are. (Senator **Roth** and Professor **Chancey** walk in) (oohs all around at the good timing)

**Funderburk:** Or, we can start early, if we have enough of you here. Sherry, where do we want—well, I guess it's more for the mics, Rob do you want our presenters down there or is up here ok? (various voices as decisions are made for **Roth** to sit on the side and **Chancey** to sit in Provost **Gibson's** empty chair at the head table; slight delay as papers are passed; many casual voices speaking amongst themselves)

#### #991 REPORT ON THE CURRENT UNI NCAA CERTIFICATION SELF STUDY

**Funderburk:** Ok, Docket #991, Report from the Current UNI NCAA Certification Self Study, so I'll turn it over to our guest (Professor Cliff **Chancey**, Chair of the NCAA Steering Committee).

**Chancey:** Well, it's been a few years since I sat among you on this—5 or 6 years. You look as happy as when I last served. (laughter) It's been my pleasure for the last year and a half to chair the NCAA Certification Review on campus. And the document you have before you is an Executive Summary of what the Review Committee found. Let me begin by saying that if you are not familiar with the NCAA Review, it, like the HLC, occurs every 10 years. We had our last orientation visit in 2001, and it was—we had our, what is formally called Cycle 2, the way the NCAA talks about these things. And we had our Cycle 3 Peer Review Visit on September 27-29.

The NCAA Review is, uh, I don't know—I'll be frank with you. It's a bit of a bureaucratic nightmare. If you know anything about the NCAA, you usually hear the NCAA—never with us—but with some other institutions in our area, you hear them bringing sanctions against sports programs. I have to say we are not in that category, but still the NCAA guidelines are very specific.

I, first of all, have to pay tribute to the members, our colleagues on campus who did the hard work of this, and you'll see them on page 2 and 3 and 4.

In particular, I owe a deep debt of gratitude to John **Buse**, Dean of Students, to Lisa **Jepsen**, and to Leah **Gutknecht**, who did a lot of the survey and work that had to be done. And also to Jean **Berger**, the Senior Women's Administrator in the Athletic Department.

Well, this has been going on—the Review, as I said, it's a bureaucracy, but we are required to review certain areas of what we do, and how we educate students, and how we run our athletic programs. And those areas of Academic Integrity, Governance and Commitment, and Gender and Diversity Issues, and Student-Athlete Well-Being cover the full spectrum of what services we provide our student-athletes and how we report to the NCAA.

The Self Study Review got off to a slow start a little bit more than a year ago because, as you may remember, in June of last year, of 2009 (sic), the Board of Regents asked the Regents' Institutions to review whether the Regents' Institutions—whether they should continue using General Education Funds, that's State funds. There was a report made by the President's Office to the Board of Regents on September 26, 2010—I said 2009; I meant 2010—which gave the Universities what UNI could do in this regard, and you'll see that in the middle of page 2. The University said that it could reduce general support to Athletics to about 18.3% by Fiscal Year 2010 (sic, 2015), and also the goal was "A limitation in budgeted general fund support for athletics to 2.4% of what our projected budget would be in 2015. You will also see in the next statement something about how our Athletic Program funds itself. The majority of its funds do not come from the State. They come from revenues, from other revenues, outside revenues.

The Report of the Certification Committee follows these three pretty important broad areas. Beginning on page 5, you will find both the key findings and the recommendations of the Certification Steering Committee. And let me point out, the Steering Committee had faculty and staff from across the University and had also representation from students and coaching staff. NCAA requires us to have a broad representation, including off-campus people. We had Dave **Anderson** as an alumni member. We had

Dave **Braton**, publisher of the *Courier* locally, who sat on the Committee. We are very fortunate for the time that they invested in this.

On page 5, you have Key Findings in Academic Integrity, and I can tell you we are a strong academic institution, and it is no surprise that what we are for our student-athletes are no less academically successful than our students in general. There is a—the Report showed a strong degree of compliance, as we called it. It says “between the Athletics Department and other individuals and departments on campus.” In this area of Academic Integrity, I’d say there were very few concerns. I’d say the most substantive recommendations, the very first one in the middle of page 5: “Initiate a dual reporting relationship for the athletics student services staff to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.” This was to strengthen the oversight of academic services.

The hardest area for UNI in reporting to the NCAA comes under Gender and Diversity. And this is a difficulty because the NCAA requires that resources and opportunities for our student athletics by gender follow the general student population. Over the last 10 years we have moved from roughly having 54% of our students women to now we are 60% women. That has been in the last 10 years. And the NCAA requires that we give a similar fraction of our resources and opportunities to student-athletes. And this, as you can believe, is a difficult evolution over 10 years’ time. You might notice that as background to this that on the very first page over the last 10 years we have dropped 3 men’s sports. The last, February 2009, was the Varsity Baseball program.

Anyway, this is the area that we fall the most short in NCAA eyes. And the question is “What can we do to improve it over the last 10 years and particularly over the last 3 years?” Well, in sum, in trying to readjust resources from men’s sports to women’s sports we have used “roster management” which means that we take positions, supported positions from men’s sports to women’s sports. Over the last few years I think you will appreciate there is not a lot of flexibility otherwise, and that is the only thing we have been able to do. We had—even though the gender goal post

has been moving over the last 10 years, we are better—we are more representative now than we were 10 years ago.

I think one of the key findings is laid here at the bottom of page 5, the hiring of Jean **Berger** as Senior Associate Athletic Director. **Jean** is the person just below **Troy**, and **Jean** does a tremendous amount of work. The other finding was that the Gender Equity Plan that was produced in response to the first visit had not been appropriate--adequately put out.

In the middle of page 6, another finding: “Lack of on-campus facilities for women’s sports”—in essence, 30% of the women’s sports are off-campus because we lack facilities. Even though progress has been made over the last few years, just below that it says: “Currently, a 5% discrepancy exists in the recruiting dollars spent on women’s teams and female student-athletes.” And this is something that we continue to work on.

The recommendations in the Gender and Diversity area are shown on the top of page 7, and they come under—it’s a broad category. It says: “Conduct a review of administrative tasks and related job descriptions with the following goals in mind:” 1) To reduce the work load on Jean **Berger** in this case; 2) Improve gender equity; 3) To communicate what the University’s Diversity Plan. The Athletics Department follows the plans of the University, and the need is to get the information in the coaches’ hands and staff’s hands in the Athletics Department. Well, the recommendations—there are 4 bullets, and there are 4 sub-bullets. For the Certification Steering Committee and Sub-Committee’s view, these were the requirements to improve the program.

Gender and Diversity again is our most difficult area. I would point out that at UNI we’re quite different from some of our other Regents’ Institutions. You look at Iowa State, which has an Ag and Engineering school. Of course, it has the reverse of the student population we have. It has 40% women and 60% men. I can tell you that Iowa State has had no problem with gender equity. It is something that we need to do better on.



Governance and Compliance again, as with the case with Academic Integrity, the Steering Committee and Sub-Committees found that we have a good structure of compliance between the Athletics Department and broader part of Campus. I would say that I don't think it's always been this way, but certainly for the last 3 or 4 years. While Troy **Dannen** has been here, and Jean **Berger** has been here, we have done very well in trying to redress some of the problems that accumulated during the previous 10 years.

There were, of all the recommendations made, which are showing on the top of page 8, there are only two I will—well, there's one that I will point out, I think the most substantive, and that's the very first one. To "Create a 'safe haven' reporting relationship for the Director of Athletic Compliance to the University General Counsel." This was considered necessary. It's a whistle-blower mechanism. If something is not right, there should be a direct line out of the Athletics Department, and this was our recommendation, and it will be followed.

I'd also say that we had a recommendation on the Panther Wrestling Club. You may have seen some of this because I think it may have been in the newspaper. No? I think that was the case. University sports programs have greater accountability to the NCAA than other programs do. If I want to run a bake sale to support the Physics Department, and in these times that's maybe not a bad idea (laughter around), I can run a bake sale, and if I had Mike **Roth** there bake his favorite cookies to peddle them, I can do this. But a sports program can't do this. As you know, the NCAA not only wants there to be complete clarity over how funds are raised and how they are used—if you go out and run bake sales, who knows you are running this yourself? It's not clear how the money is going or what's going on. As far as I know from the investigation of some of the activities I saw, I do not think there is anything untoward, but it gave the impression, and it had the option to do that. And so the restructure, the recommendation of the Panther Wrestling Club and how it ran its operations to bring them under the oversight of those that were responsible. And, again, this would be if there was a problem in a program like this, this is partly what would come under the whistle-blower line up at the top of the recommendations.

We started out in May with 52 citations from the NCAA, which is large (speaker chuckles). There was a back and forth discussion between the Steering Committee and the NCAA Committee on Athletic Certification through July into August into September (sighs). By the time that the visit was over on September 29<sup>th</sup>, those 52 citations had been reduced to 3 (sighs again). And I'm not at liberty right now to tell you what those 3 are. I can say that we were not cited on a gender issue as such, which I'm pleased about. But there were some operational details on diversity, on other things that were provided staff that we do have to report to the NCAA on by December 16<sup>th</sup>. I say I'm not at liberty to talk about the details of that because the Peer Review Committee asked me not to, because it's not theirs to say. It's the NCAA Athletic Certification Board that is the one to say yes or no to these things. But I can say that the 3 that we were reduced to is really rather good, given where we came from.

Now, I'll stop and see if there are any questions, but I will point out that our NCAA Review is not as such a discussion of money. The NCAA pays us a compliment as an institution. They assume we know what we want to pay for. They assume we know what we want to pay for, and they leave it to us to do it. All they are concerned about is whether we educate our students well, whether we treat our staff well, whether we have good controls in place. That's what they care about. It is not an excuse to the NCAA to tell—to say, "We don't have the money to do that, else we would have done it." Ok.

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

**DeBerg:** I just have a question of information. On page 7 in the—in the bottom 3—in the middle dots under the Recommendations on page 7, what are the 3 improvement plans? What are those 3 plans? They are talked about in the 2<sup>nd</sup> recommendation and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> recommendation.

**Chancey:** Well, they cover all 3 areas, and I

**DeBerg:** Oh, ok.

**Chancey:** They cover

**DeBerg:** I thought that was just for area 2.

**Chancey:** We have a general improvement plan, and there's a gender and diversity plan—improvement plan that's referenced in here. But there is also a more general plan. The more general plan is on the website. Leah **Gutknecht** has the Gender and Diversity Improvement Plan, that area of the—if you would like to see the document, the general plan, if you go to the UNI HomePage and look for the little NCAA hyperlink at the bottom, you'll come up to all the documents and the broader plan is

**DeBerg:** And there are 3 plans.

**Chancey:** There is a plan to covers all 3 areas.

**DeBerg:** Uh huh. Oh, I get it. Ok. So it is one plan, but 3 plans.

**Chancey:** Yes

**DeBerg:** Is that that long? Is that the Self Study itself? No. Ok.

**Chancey:** No, it's separate from that. In fact, the broader plan for improvement is again on the—as a pdf file on the website.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** You had mentioned that 52 citations seemed large. You know, not having any sense of what normally happens at—that does sound like—was there any sense given as to what an institution would normally incur on this—citations are less than sanctions, I mean, you know.

**Chancey:** They are areas of concerns. They are—they are areas where they wish us to address, to show cause of what we might do. It's hard to say. That's to say I know that Jean **Berger**, and this is **Jean's** 4<sup>th</sup> NCAA employer

review, her first one here. She knows a lot of people in the area, so she made an effort to call around to other institutions just to get from them how many citations they had then. I know that some of them were 3—to start with 18. And there some were that were 40 and 50. It seems that partly it is a matter of who your liaison is. I think, for our good, we had a very scrupulous liaison who called us on a lot of things. Some things which—you know, anytime you have what turned out to be 300 pages of dense verbiage, it is easy for a Review Committee to miss some things. And they simply missed some of the things that were, you know, on page 167, 2<sup>nd</sup> column. But overall, it was more, I think, than we expected. A lot of them were under the Gender and Diversity area, which we expected.

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

**DeBerg:** I don't know, **Cliff**, if you know all of the background to this, but one of the reasons I wanted the Senate to ask the President why we have twice the percentage of students admitted under the Board of Directors' (sic) Admissions Guidelines than does Iowa and Iowa State is because of the claims that we make in Athletics. So, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> dot on page 5, "The percentage of student-athletes admitted as exceptions to admission standards has declined slightly in the past two years, and the percentage of student-athletes admitted as special exceptions is comparable to the percentage of special exceptions made for the whole student body." Well, what if we make special exemptions just to keep it even with Athletics? See my point? Do you know how carefully those things are—or if they are scrutinized in that way at all?

**Chancey:** Well, I don't know the—I know this as an outcome for it, but I'd have to go back and look at the data again in the self study document. This was directed by the Sub-Committee, then it was drafted by the Sub-Committee. If the Senate is interested, I will go back and investigate that. I have no reason to think that that's not true.

**DeBerg:** That what isn't true?

**Chancey:** That the way it is expressed here is not true.

**DeBerg:** No, I believe it. But I'm wondering

**Chancey:** You are wondering what the number is?

**DeBerg:** I mean, I'm wondering does—I'm wondering why we admit so many more, proportionally, students at lower than Board of Regents' Admissions rates? It's the same percentage athlete and non-athlete, but I'm wondering why the non-athlete one is so high? And if that's artificially high because the athlete one is high? See my point?

**Chancey:** I see your point, and I don't know. I suspect that it's not the—I don't remember the number, but I've heard the raw number of exceptions, and it's not a large number.

**DeBerg:** It's a percentage.

**Chancey:** It's a percentage, but the raw number for it was on the order of 10's, not 100's. I would guess that we—and this is my guess—I would guess that we are higher than Iowa and Iowa State because our students generally are needier. They have greater needs. They come from more economically-disadvantaged groups. Iowa and Iowa State both have students who have family backgrounds that have more money, more opportunities, than ours. I know that that is true—that we see as our mission in educating a broader part of the Iowa population.

**DeBerg:** Did anyone hear the President

**Funderburk:** I would like to insert also—can I—I had a conversation with Vice President Hogan on this exact topic following the first Presidential Breakfast, and he actually had quite a few insights, none of which had anything to do with athletics, and he offered as part of that if we ever wanted him to come here and talk on something, he would be more than happy to explain why we are at the number we are at and what the ramifications in changing that number would be.

**DeBerg:** I would very much like to know, because that affects our teaching in the classroom, whether or not we have academically-qualified students or not.

**Funderburk:** Yes.

**Chancey:** Yes, that is so true. Maybe in person he can talk with you.

**DeBerg:** Thank you.

**Funderburk:** Other comments? Should I take that as a request from the Senate that I request Vice-President Hogan to join us on that topic? Yes? I think I see that. Ok. Then I shall do that. Other comments or questions? Senator **Van Wormer**.

**Van Wormer:** Here I'm thinking the gender discrepancy here, and they have lost some really good sports for the males, if you didn't have football at all, that would solve the problem, wouldn't it? Because of the expense for football. I'm told that it's so out of proportion to other sports.

**Chancey:** Well, you know, I'm not going to be able to talk about specific sports. However, I can tell you that we have been dropping men's sports for the last years, and one thing that one of the NCAA Peer Review Team did tell me, she said that it wasn't satisfactory to keep dropping sports like that. The NCAA is interested in raising the standard for all students and making sure that women student-athletes have the same opportunities as—yeah. And I know that **Troy** and **Jean** have been very serious. And just going out and dropping one after another doesn't necessarily say you are trying to meet that higher standard.

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

**Neuhaus:** Well, this is something that I could certainly go back and research, and I think I will a little bit, but does the NCAA have certain statements or positions they've taken that take into account the kind of financial exigencies that almost all universities are laboring under. Some of

this--we understand the kind of burden you have, because it's noble to want to aspire to something, but to hold people to a standard when they are being cut off at the knees financially, that's a difficult

**Chancey:** Well, it is, and, believe me, I've looked for that document. You, with your expertise, might be able to locate it (light laughter). The NCAA rather says the opposite. They say in bold letters several times over their guidelines "**You may not use financial difficulties as an excuse for not doing what we....**" in trying to meet the goals that we set. Again, as I said at the beginning, they pay us the compliment that we as an institution should know what we are willing to pay for.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Dolgener**.

**Dolgener:** Just to clarify, so the gender equity issue is one of participation, or is it also resource?

**Chancey:** Opportunity. It's—participation—if—I don't think it's—it's my understanding it's not simply participation. It's both participation; it's resources. We are not up at 60% of our resources are going toward our women student-athletes. So participation, if we were truly fair and we had 60% of our athletes were women, but if we did not, if we did not put resources also to follow them, then we would not have met their standards.

**Dolgener:** Or if we had 60% that were female but the resources were still lopsided, that's still an issue?

**Chancey:** Yes. It would still be an issue. They underst—the NCAA, of course, understands that some sports programs cost more than others. They understand when the Peer Review Team is here, they look at—I mean, the very first page you see the Conferences that teams play in, and they understand that in some cases you have to travel further and some of the sports require play on days other than weekend. It's a challenge. So they realize these things. But, again, as you said, it is not simply participation. It

is that funding should follow generally the gender division that we have and opportunity and funding.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Terlip**.

**Terlip:** Yeah. What is the goal set by that 2015 report for gender equity? Is it going to be 60%, or is it set lower?

**Chancey:** I'm not sure what the specific number is by then. I think I can—I will say that what we are doing now is roster management, and that only goes so far. That might get us another—you know, we are about 6% out of balance right now. We might go up to 4% by roster management, but the only way that we could bring it into balance would be, in my opinion, is to add a sport, a women's varsity sport.

**Terlip:** Or could some of those funding shifts be made? For example, on scholarships and things where women aren't keeping up with men on campus?

**Chancey:** Well, in fact, when you do roster management, that's what you are doing.

**Terlip:** Ok.

**Chancey:** When you do roster management, you are taking resources on the student-athlete rosters, what you support. Also, for staff, what travel you'll support. You are taking those and migrating them to another area.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** I don't know if this is appropriate for your committee to do or not. Did you look at universities that are comparable to us, both what we believe that we are and what we are, as well as in relationship to the composition of the student body, 60% female, and see how they managed to have 60% student-athletes being female?



**Chancey:** No. I would say that that's been a general concern, and I do know the Athletics Department, for our peer institutions, it's a matter of funding and how it's done. But, no, the Steering Committee did not do that. We were under a very tight timeline to respond, and as I said, the NCAA, you know, good people that they are, they are a bureaucracy. So, no, **Jesse**, we did not do that, but that is a very reasonable thing—not for the Committee to do—but for the athletic program to do.

**Swan:** Actually, this is kind of then related to the second question I had, these recommendations are for the President of the University, is that correct as I'm interpreting this? And so that I as a faculty member who want to follow-up on these recommendations, would go to President **Allen** to see if they've been executed? Is that right?

**Chancey:** I'd say that's right. You would—you might ask Troy **Dannen**, but the ultimate responsibility on campus is with the President, so you would talk with the President about this.

**Swan:** Thank you.

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

**DeBerg:** What kind of public response will we get, either from the NCAA or from the visitors, or from both? And how and when will that be available to everyone?

**Chancey:** I would think it would be in January. We have had a response from the Peer Review Committee. Again, they highlighted those 3 areas in which we were not compliant.

**DeBerg:** Is that public?

**Chancey:** I can't say.

**DeBerg:** Well, I don't--I'm just asking.

**Chancey:** No, it's not. It's not public yet. We have to give comments on those 3 areas, but I tell you again they are operational areas at the University, as I call it. We have to respond by December 16<sup>th</sup>. The NCAA meets in January sometime, I think toward the end. They will issue a public statement.

**DeBerg:** That's just like a little press release thing, is what they'll do?

**Chancey:** It is. That's what I expect. I haven't—I can't imagine, but whatever they say will be public.

**DeBerg:** Well, then how do we know all the details of the problems they had with the last 10 year or so study, if we didn't get something—if we don't get something more fulsome from them?

**Chancey:** Well, in fact, all the problems they--all 52 problems are up on the web, and our responses to them.

**DeBerg:** Are on our website

**Chancey:** Yes. In fact, they are again off the UNI HomePage. You go down to the NCAA

**DeBerg:** Yeah, I've read it. So

**Chancey:** Well, in fact, there are a lot of documents, but what you should be looking for is not the Self Study. You should be looking under supplementary documents. The supplementary documents give every concern that they had, every response that we gave, and it

**DeBerg:** When will we have that document from this round?

**Chancey:** The one I just referred to?

**DeBerg:** From last round, it's out on the web.

**Chancey:** No, it's from this round.

**DeBerg:** Oh, it's from this round? I'm getting it. Ok. Thanks. I thought it was from the last round.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Smith**.

**Smith:** I'm looking at page 6 at some of the concerns about gender diversity. A lot of those look at management issues, that things that were supposed to be done weren't done, etc. Do you have a sense of why that happened or things didn't happen? Was it that some people drop the ball? Or it was not enough emphasis institutionally put on this? What exactly caused some of these troubles?

**Chancey:** **Jerry**, I don't know. I think it's fair to say that somebody dropped the ball. Clearly, we said things in 2001 and 2003 that we were going to do, and we didn't do them. Now I can say that in the last 3 to 4 years, we have been playing catch-up. Again, **Troy** has a hard job, and he's a good fellow, I think. And **Jean** is a remarkably hard-working person. They've been catching us up as fast as they could. But trying to do in 3 years what might have been done in 10 years, is....yeah, somebody dropped the ball.

**Funderburk:** Other comments or questions? I have one to insert if I can get it phrased in such a way that it doesn't get too complicated. With the recent change in the reporting structure, so that Athletics now reports directly to the President, rather than to the Vice President of Finance, do you see particular impacts on areas touched on in the report and on important areas cited that needed attention? Or is that, in fact, a response in part due to the Report? Or do you know?

**Chancey:** **Jeff**, I don't know. I mean, there was a desire to give—to have it reviewed at a higher level to the extent that the President is informed regularly about what happens. It gives it a higher visibility, so I think generally it's a good thing.

**Funderburk:** So, comments? Questions? Anyone? Dr. **Chancey**, thank you very much for a very informative report after a great deal of work on this. (others concurring vocally)

**Chancey:** Well, you should thank all the people listed on 2 and 3 and 4. It's a thankless job.

**Funderburk:** And also thank you for bringing it to the Senate to keep us informed as to what's going on, as Athletics topics come to us often.

**Chancey:** Well, I understand. (exits)

**Funderburk:** Well, barring other items before us....Senator **Neuhaus**.

**Neuhaus:** **Jeff**, I was gonna just ask this question. The next meeting we are bringing the Museum folks here. Have we set that for a particular time? Or is that going to commence immediately? We don't have much else on the Agenda.

**Funderburk:** Yes. My memory is 3:45. Yes, I'm getting a thumbs up (from Sherry), so that's at 3:45.

**Neuhaus:** My only thought was

**Funderburk:** We potentially have one exceedingly large item coming by then, but we'll see.

ADJOURNMENT

**Funderburk:** Now, to my favorite part of the Agenda, do we have a motion for adjournment? (silence) Or we can wait until 5:00?

**DeBerg:** I move to adjourn.

**Funderburk:** Senator **DeBerg** motioned to adjourn. Second?

**Bruess:** I'll second.

**Funderburk:** Second by Senator **Bruess**. All those in favor say "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Thank you very much. (4:16 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss  
Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:  
November 14, 2011  
Oak Room, Maucker Union  
3:15 p.m.