

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
01/14/13 (3:30 p.m. – 4:58 p.m.)
Mtg. #1726

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

Press present included only Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan* today.

Provost **Gibson** was attended another meeting today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** offered positive and encouraging comments on the work of the Presidential Search Committee over Break and encouraged all faculty and staff to be active in the final determination of a new president for UNI. The complete text of his comments is found in the full transcript following this Summary.

Chair **Peters** noted that the Faculty Senate January 28th regular meeting may be moved to February 4th due to a possible conflict with a presidential candidate open forum. He will let everyone know when the open fora are all scheduled. **Peters** also thanked all those who were able to attend the Retreat last Thursday to get work done on this semester's Faculty Senate issues.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

No minutes were up for approval.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1171 1067 Consultative session with University Relations (Jan. 14, immediately following 1169/1065) (**Terlip/Bruess**)

1172 1068 Curriculum Changes—Women’s & Gender Studies Program (regular order) (**Kirmani/Cooley**)

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

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

**This item will be considered at the next meeting.

1169 1065 Resolution to Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual Requirements, regular order (**Terlip/Swan**)

Motion to bring to the floor for discussion (DeBerg/Strauss**). Passed.

Motion to call the question. (DeBerg**) Passed.

**Vote on resolution. Passed.

1171 1067 Consultative session with University Relations (Jan. 14, immediately following 1169/1065) (**Terlip/Bruess**)

**Discussion completed.

5. Adjournment: Time: 4:58 p.m.

Motion to adjourn (Edginton/Hakes**). Passed.

Next meeting: 02/11/13

Oak Room, Maucker Union;

3:30 p.m.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 14, 2013
Mtg. 1726**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, David **Hakes**, Becky **Hawbaker** (alternate for Melissa **Heston**) , Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**, KaLeigh **White**

Absent: Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, Melissa **Heston**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Gary **Shontz**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters:** Ok, it is 3:30, and although we have a somewhat low turnout, we do have a quorum, so I'll call this to order. [Several more Senators did arrive over the following 10 minutes.]

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Let's see. I see Blake [**Findley**] from the *Northern lowan* here, and I don't see any other press in the room. Correct? Ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson is going to be late today. She's in a meeting until about 4:00 o'clock, but I think she plans to join us after that. [She did not

arrive later, however.] Associate Provost **Licari**, you had a quick announcement for us, I think?

Licari: I do have one quick announcement. The Leepfrog Curriculum System went up and fully functional last week, so that's available now. The work flow is established, so all of the edits and things like that that faculty have been working on throughout the Fall will now—you can log in and send those changes along the way. So, if you've got questions about the system itself in terms of making sure that it's functioning in the way that you expect it to, contact Diane Wallace in the Registrar's Office or Coleen Wagner or me. The only little sensitive item about it is it seems to work best if you use the Firefox browser as opposed to some of the others. It works in the others, but it--it works best in Firefox.

Peters: Any questions for now? Ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: The Presidential Search Committee worked throughout the holiday break. Working with this committee has been a tremendous experience. It is a large committee made up of representatives from the varied constituency groups that make up the UNI community. The commitment to UNI and the excitement about the mission of this institution is palpable from every member of the group. Based on the experiences of working with this group, it is clear that at UNI we are blessed with tremendous and unwavering support from every part of our community and state.

Last weekend, the committee conducted airport interviews and selected a pool of candidates to invite to campus. Beginning next week, we will have a series of visits from the finalists for the position of UNI's tenth president. This change in leadership will occur at a critical time in the history of this institution. While the recent decade has presented a seemingly unrelenting series of challenges, we are currently poised with a great number of

opportunities before us. Because of the series of events beginning with the financial crisis of 2008, the complicated financial situation faced by UNI has come to be recognized. As a result, the Iowa Board of Regents, a significant portion of the legislature, and the Governor all recognize UNI's unique and important role within the State, and understand that UNI needs better financial support in order to sustain its consistent record of serving the State of Iowa.

Given this "alignment of stars," UNI has a tremendous opportunity. With the right leadership, we can solidify our finances and set forth on a path that will raise the institution to new heights.

In order to do this, we also have to find ways to heal the wounds of recent past and to restore the trust and cooperation within the institution that has long been a hallmark of UNI.

Selecting the right leader for UNI will be critical in allowing us to leverage the unique opportunities we have while quickly restoring trust within the UNI community in order that we may build a stronger and more effective institution to better serve our students and the State of Iowa.

The search process is not a one-sided effort to select who we want. Rather, it is also up to all of us to show candidates the unique strengths and charisma that make UNI the special place that we know it to be.

Our finalists are each very successful in their own right and have excellent positions with other institutions. They will be assessing the challenges and opportunities presented here. From their perspective, they will be looking at UNI to see if the community is ready to move forward following our recent history. They will be interested to gauge the willingness of the faculty, staff, and student body to engage.

To that end, I ask that everyone make a special effort to attend the public presentations by the candidates.

Strong attendance at these forums will demonstrate the desire on the part of all segments of the UNI Community to come together. Such a

demonstration of the engaged vitality of our community can go a long way toward helping the prospective next president recognize that UNI is a tremendous opportunity for them and their families.

You will receive notification of the schedules very soon, probably in the next 24 hours I suspect. Candidates will be announced a few days before they are to arrive on campus. There will be an opportunity to offer feedback after each candidate has presented to the community. While we are all busy at this time of the semester, please try to find the time to take part in this important process that will significantly impact every area of our institution over the coming years.

If there are questions, I'm sure that I or Scott [**Peters**] will answer what we can.

DeBerg: I have a question

Peters: Yeah, Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: It's not so much about the Presidential Search process; it's about your introduction in which you say that it seems clear that the Governor, the Legislature, and whatnot are on board about solidifying UNI's financial situation? What evidence do you base that statement on?

Funderburk: We've had a lot of very frank and significant discussions in the Committee, and there's been a lot of discussions that lead one to believe that we're probably better postured now than we have been for a very long time.

DeBerg: Within the Presidential Search Committee, those discussions are happening?

Funderburk: All of those groups are essentially represented there, so we have

DeBerg: How is the Governor represented there?

Funderburk: The Governor is represented in most everything here.

DeBerg: Ok.

Funderburk: The Governor has actually said on plenty of occasions that he's a very strong advocate for this, particularly since we are serving more of the citizens of Iowa than anybody else.

DeBerg: I'm not doubting you. I just would like to know your source.

Peters: I think in particular to the extra \$4 million each year that we got the first installment of last year, and then—and then the—the Board's asking for it again, and—and, yes, my take on Board politics is they wouldn't be asking for it if they didn't think the Governor was going to follow through with it. I think the Governor—I think the Governor has signed on to that \$4-million-each-year-for-3-years plan. I mean, I guess—you know, it's not like—it's not like I've heard that out of his mouth or anything, but that's just kind of my sense of the way that it—that it works. And so that—that recognition I think is particularly helpful to us.

DeBerg: Thank you.

Peters: Are there other questions on the Presidential search? It's like Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] said, sometime in the next couple of days, maybe tomorrow, the schedule will come out and then each candidate's name will be known publically for the same amount of time prior to the time they arrive on campus. Does that make sense? So, if—if the first candidate is announced on Wednesday for an interview that starts, say, Monday evening—next Monday evening with dinner with the Search Committee, then if the next candidate after that would arrive on Wednesday, then that person's name would be made publically like Friday afternoon or something like that. So then it will—everyone will—each candidate will have the same amount of time to meet so that we can all go Google on them—you know, you guys can start to learn about them, all the things that—that the members of the Search Committee know about them. Yeah, Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I apologize because I came in late, but how large was the pool? Can you all speak to that now?

Peters: Was it 37? 40? Close—somewhere around 40

Funderburk: 39 or 40ish was the total for

Peters: And we interviewed 9 at the airport.

Terlip: Thank you.

Peters: Other questions?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: So, along those lines then, one of the likely slots for the open forum for presidential candidates is [Monday] January 28th at 3:00 p.m. It's—this is—none of this is set in stone yet, because we don't know yet how candidates' schedules are going to match up with the—the sort of schedule templates that—that the Committee has created, but that seems like a likely spot for an open forum. That, of course, would be a [Faculty] Senate meeting [time]. So, I emailed last week to give you all a head's up that it was quite possible that we would have to cancel that [Faculty] Senate meeting, and if we do, I'll look to reschedule one for the very following week, February 4th I think it would be, that Monday. So please try to keep that open on your calendars, if you can.

Also, just a quick thanks to everyone who was able to make it to the Retreat last Thursday. I really appreciated people coming in and--and giving up of their time over the Break to do that. Given the—given how busy we are going to be here in the next few weeks with presidential search issues—search presentations on campus, I thought it was particularly important to get some traction made on that before the semester started. We had some good discussions about—about these key issues that are part of our year-long goals, and so the next step then is we're going to give the—the notes from those discussions to the [Faculty] Senate's Budget

Committee, which will start working on proposals to bring to us about criteria that the Provost should use for allocating resources within Academic Affairs, and about a proposal to take to a new president that indicates how faculty would like to be involved in and give advice in a—in a more routine way on budgeting and planning of the University. And then [Senator] Mitch [**Strauss**] also had—had a work group—working group going at our Retreat dealing with more regular evaluation of administrators on campus, and they had a lively discussion. We had a good discussion about it back as a whole group, and so if members of the [Faculty] Senate would like to work with—with Senator **Strauss** on coalescing those into formal proposals, certainly let him know or let me know, and I'll help coordinate that.

Any questions about anything before we move forward with our Agenda today? All right. Well, welcome back. Here we go.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Peters: No minutes for approval today. We took care of that before we left for our Break. And that brings us to two calendar items to consider for docketing.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1171 for Docket #1067, Consultative Session with University Relations (Jan. 14, immediately following 1169/1065) (**Terlip/Bruess**)

Peters: The first is Calendar Item 1171, Consultative Session with University Relations, which, of course, I've recommended that we docket today immediately following the discussion about the UR Style Manual. Can I have a motion to docket that under those conditions?

Terlip: So move.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**. And a second? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. Is there any discussion on docketing this today? Seeing none. All in favor of docketing this item today immediately following the petition on the University Relations Style Manual, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no”? [none heard] The motion passes.

Calendar Item 1172 for Docket #1068, Curriculum Changes—Women’s & Gender Studies Program (regular order) (Kirmani/Cooley)

Peters: Finally, Calendar Item 1172, these are Curriculum Changes for the Women’s and Gender Studies Program. You will all recall that this is one of the programs that was marked for restructuring in the program changes last year. As long as they are designated for restructuring, they cannot admit students, and so they need to—this needs to get done as quickly as possible. It’s been approved by both the CHAS Senate and the SBS Senate. It’s going to be heard by the Graduate Council, I believe, on the 24th of January. It would then—if we still have a meeting on the 28th, we would expect to act on it at that point. If not, we’ll wait until the following Monday. So we just need a motion to docket that in regular order.

Kirmani: So move.

Peters: Senator **Kirmani**. Is there a second?

Cooley: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Any discussion? Seeing none, we’ll go to a vote. All in favor of docketing this in regular order, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no”? [none heard] The motion carries.

NEW BUSINESS

Peters: Is there any new business to bring to the [Faculty] Senate’s attention? Then we go to our consideration of docketed items.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1059, REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE ON POLICY PROCESS,
REGULAR ORDER (**DEBERG/NEUHAUS**)

Peters: Docket #1059, the changes on the policy process is—is not ready to act on yet, so we’re hoping to be able to act on that at our next meeting.

DOCKET #1065, RESOLUTION TO EXEMPT FACULTY WORK FROM THE
UNIVERSITY RELATIONS STYLE MANUAL REQUIREMENTS, REGULAR ORDER
(**TERLIP/SWAN**)

Peters: So that brings us to Docket #1065, the Resolution to Exempt Faculty Work from the University Relations Style Manual Requirements. The wording of the motion is here [projected on large screen]—sorry, wrong one. The wording to the motion is here

[<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/resolution-exempt-faculty-work-university-relations-style->].

We can see that the resolution asks “that Faculty materials associated with their teaching, scholarship, or service work be exempted in full from the Visual Identity and Style Manual.” And that “University Relations cease all review of Faculty created materials developed for the purposes of teaching, scholarship,” or—I think that’s supposed to be ‘service’—unless “(Faculty ask for such review) and abide promptly and without question with the actual duplication orders placed by Faculty.” So I need a motion—I need a motion to bring that to the floor for discussion.

DeBerg: I so move.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**. Is there a second?

Strauss: **Strauss**.

Peters: Senator **Strauss**, thank you very much. Senator **Heston**, unfortunately, who filed the petition, could not be with us. No, wait, do I need to vote? Do we—no, we don't need a vote to bring that to the floor. Sorry. But Becky **Hawbaker** is here serving as her [Senator **Heston's**] alternate, so Senator **Hawbaker** can you please lead us off?

Hawbaker: Sure. So, Melissa [**Heston**] brought this resolution to the Senate on behalf of many frustrated faculty and secretaries in the College of Education, in particular, who have run into some difficulty when they have legitimate reasons for making photocopy requests using such things such as yellow paper or spelling out the month of September, and having it be rejected because it doesn't meet the style guide that's established by University Relations. And so her point is that that style guide was developed without input from the faculty, that there are legitimate reasons why faculty may need to copy things for their teaching, their scholarship, or their service in ways that may deviate from the style guide but may be legitimate for professional purposes. And there's—there doesn't seem to be any appeal process or—or any—any way to get around it. In our Department our secretary won't even buy the yellow paper anymore so that you could copy it yourself. I know that some faculty are paying for it out of—out of their pocket to be able to do it. So, we do recognize that there are reasons for the University to, you know, maintain some identity and branding and all of that, but—and so the University logo, I don't think anyone has any problems with, but there's things in the style guide that seem a little over—over the top, so I think that's the basic gist of it, and I don't know if others have had other frustrating incidents or not, but I have a few examples, but I know Melissa [**Heston**] had pages and pages of them, so—but

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Can I have a couple examples?

Peters: Please, go ahead.

DeBerg: I'd like a couple.

Peters: Oh, oh, you're asking for examples?

DeBerg: Yeah.

Hawbaker: So, I have a personal example, and I—I teach a Level I class Exploring Teaching. It often has 350, 400 students in it. I color-code some of the handouts on the first day, and so, you know, it's always—"There's—there's the purple handout. There's the yellow handout." Not—so it can't be yellow now because yellow is for the University of Iowa. And so, that's—that's their brand. That's not our brand. And so I—I had to switch to a different color. Now, is it—is it—is that a huge issue? No. It's just purple/yellow, that's our colors. Other faculty, though, there were other reasons for it, like they were doing the professional presentation for elementary teachers. There was an activity that involved red, yellow, green, you know, like the stop light. That was the colors, so they wanted to copy it on that, but red was not ok, because that's Iowa State. Yellow is not ok, because that's University of Iowa. Green is ok. So, and—and the—the color of the paper thing seems to be the big thing, but there's lots of other ones that get rejected because the logo isn't in the right place, or it's the wrong version of the logo, or things like that.

DeBerg: I guess, well, how would UMPR, or whatever they are called now, how—how would they even know about these materials?

Hawbaker: Well, with the closure of Print Services, print requests that are paid for out of the Department Budget go to University Relations first.

DeBerg: Oh, wow. So everything that goes from a Department to CopyWorks goes through you all [addressing the representatives from University Relations present]?

James **O'Connor**, Executive Director, University Relations: Not necessarily.

DeBerg: Well, what does and what doesn't? Ok, thank you, Becky.

Peters: Take a couple of minutes to explain the style manual and how the work flow works and everything.

O'Connor: Sure. Yeah, absolutely. First, thank you for –thank you for asking us here. We really appreciate the opportunity to clear up some misunderstandings, and Becky [**Hawbaker**] nailed it. Legitimately, there were some miscommunication on our side, and—and misunderstandings came because of that, and we want to apologize for that.

We met with the Academic Department Heads back on October 15th and had a very good discussion, and we heard in—we'd been hearing input all semester long. We introduced the new Visual Identity and Style Guide back at the beginning of the semester. It had been in place for several years, but it hadn't been updated. We were waiting to do that. We did it, and we introduced it. And we knew that this would be a—a—there would be some feedback, there would be input, because anytime you come out with a new textbook, anything, there's always changes that need to come as it evolves.

So we met with the Academic Department Heads on October 5 [sic], had a great discussion with them, heard a lot of the same input, and we instituted changes immediately following that. I apologize. We assumed that that information had been shared broadly with the faculty, and it hadn't, apparently, obviously.

We've addressed these things moving forward. I couldn't agree more. The last thing we want to do is interfere with your scholarly activity and your classroom activities and your materials in your classroom and materials used for scholarly activity. That was miscommunicated. There were some over zealousness, frankly, on some—part of some of our staff. We've corrected that since. So, we've made some changes as we expected. We wanted to give the style book this semester to get through to find out what were the major things that needed to be clarified, updated, et cetera. We've made those changes, and moving forward I don't think you're going to see those problems anymore.

Brislawn: So, specifically, we can talk about the modifications and the update. So, I don't know a lot of you, so I'm Kim **Brislawn**. I am the Associate Director in University Relations, and I work very closely with the creative and the marketing and specifically on the communication

specialists across campus and the creation of the style guide. This approved color—ok, there were two issues really when I met with different areas. I met with, like we said, the Department Heads. I met with Department of Residence. I met with Student Government, President **Allen**, Provost **Gibson**. Really wanted to get feedback so that we could make the modifications that would represent everyone's needs.

So the two areas that were a point of concern were the color combinations to avoid and then also the logo use. So, the color combinations to avoid, we modified this section, and we have pretty much copied what Iowa State does. So Iowa and Iowa State's are pretty similar. Iowa State's is a little bit more aggressive in the fact that they don't allow the use of purple at all, but we modified this to say that this is a recommendation instead of an absolute. Before, there was the tone of "you must," and now it's a recommendation of "be aware," "you should avoid," but the use of yellow paper, when we met with the Department Heads in October was something that we discussed, and it wasn't anything that we were—it was certainly not the hill we were going to die on to say, so that sounds like that was a miscommunication and not disseminated further, and I—I'll take responsibility for that, because I assumed once we'd gone there and had that discussion that that information had been communicated. So,

O'Connor: And to be really clear, when we—the Visual Identity Guide, what we're talking about is promotional materials

Brislawn: Right.

O'Connor: not faculty scholarly activity or, like you said, the syllabi, things like that that you hand out in your class. That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about promotional materials, and we want to, you know, really frame it up very tightly that way. And it—it—the miscommunication that was out there and it was—and it was true miscommunication, it—you know how things spread. And it—and it caused a lot of consternation, and we really feel bad about that. We want to apologize for that. That was not our—our intent at all.

Peters: Ok, then

Brislawn: But then—I'm sorry

Peters: I'm sorry, I have a quick question on promotional materials. Would a—would a paper being presented at a professional conference, would that be considered a promotional material, or not?

O'Connor: No. No.

Peters: Ok, I just wanted to make sure.

O'Connor: And when—and when we go to that next sec—next page [of projected information from flashdrive UR provided regarding upcoming changes to their website]

Peters: Like a poster—poster presentation or something like that?

O'Connor: Yeah, a poster presentation about your research? No.

Peters: Ok.

O'Connor: Not necessarily. But if—if you go to that next page, we have two pages that we're updating in the style guide, and you scroll half-way down there, it says "new." There you go. That—that's really the key point there.

Brislawn: So, this was the second area that through all my conversations seemed to be a sticking point, and so we've modified this language to talk specifically about "promotional material, print and electronic, paid for by the University or related to University-sponsored activities must carry the appropriate University logo or word-mark." And having said that, all approved UNI sub-brand logos meet this requirement, so a lot of the Colleges and Departments have their own logo, and underneath it says University of Northern Iowa. That certainly meets that—that bullet point. And then the asterisk that we've added is "promotional material excludes material used solely in the classroom or for scholarly activity," which covers all of the concerns that I heard when I met with the Department Heads and

Provost **Gibson** and—and the individual conversations that I’ve heard from the different faculty members or Department secretaries who have contacted us. So we’ve had a lot of really great feedback and meaningful discussions, and I’ve heard what’s been said, and we’ve talked to the College communication representatives and gotten feedback from them, and the Deans of each College as well have weighed in. So I think that these modifications address the concerns specifically related to logo use and the competitive color concerns that are currently on the table.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: I appreciate your clarification of the policy and the willingness of being flexible and agile in changing the framing of it. Part of the ongoing conversation that we’ve had on campus has to do with faculty governance and the role of the Faculty Senate in terms of oversight in the promulgation of policies, the introduction of policies, and I listened very carefully to your conversation about the groups of people that you talked to, and you missed a whole constituency that seeks to have great influence not only now but in the future in controlling the creation of policy and then the promulgation of that policy across campus. So, I guess what I would ask you to do is when you tick off those groups that you’re going to speak to in the future you must come to the Faculty Senate

Brislawn: Ok.

Edginton: and have that conversation because we—you know, we represent that view. Very important.

Brislawn: Sure. And—and I—I’ll own that, because I’ve been here a year and a half, and I didn’t—you know, I thought talking to the Department Heads and the Deans met that need, and I now know differently, so sorry.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yeah, if I should bring up the new guide that you have out there. What’s—I imagine that lives out on the internet

Brislawn: It will.

O'Connor: The Guide—the Guide does. These new pages have not been incorporated yet. We wanted to talk to you first.

Neuhaus: Oh, ok. Ok.

Brislawn: What I didn't want to do is I didn't want to introduce changes and then have some feedback from this group that made sense to modify again and then introduce yet another version. I didn't want to confuse the audiences across campus. So I haven't launched this to the campus community yet. I wanted to wait until after this meeting.

Neuhaus: But, you know, I think one of the things we'll want then is some mechanism that, you know, either you communicate with—with one of the gentlemen there [the Faculty Senate officers] and then they send that out, but just—just so that that's something that we can point to because I think—I think, you know, the idea with the Department Heads was probably a good one but maybe not all of them took the trouble to spread the word.

O'Connor: I think that's a fair statement that what—from the feedback, yeah.

Brislawn: Right. [laughter all around]

Neuhaus: I think if we have somewhere that—that we can point. I—I know I'd like to be able to point my guys in that direction, because I—you know, I think some of them have heard the—the horror story version, and I'd like to be able to say, "Hey, just give that a read and see what it says now."

O'Connor: Absolutely. And—and that's—and Chris [**Edginton**] to address your concern, we intend to do [projector screen roles up loudly on its own with various comments from startled persons present]. Our intent is to update this annually or at least go through it and see if there's updates necessary, so it's very easy then to come to the Faculty Senate and all the other groups and say, "Ok, we—we've got some changes or updates that

we're anticipating. Take a look at them. Give us some feedback." You know, et cetera. And but—that also we get phone calls every day. We work with folks every day. We get emails. We keep track of that stuff, and so as we're going through the years, we're saying, "Ok, you know, what do we have? Have we—you know, are we at a tipping point where we need to do another edition?" You know, hopefully we'll be doing it just annually, but you never know as things change.

Peters: Senator **MacLin** and then Senator **Terlip**.

MacLin: I apologize for being late, and you may have already addressed this, but when you said that you met with the Department Heads in the Fall, was that like each and every one or was that a big head

Brislawn: It was at the meeting that

O'Connor: It was their—their regular meeting of the Academic Department Heads.

Peters: Council.

MacLin: Ok. Ok, thank you.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, promotional material for service work then would still be under your style guidelines, is that correct?

Brislawn: Could you give me a little bit more definition of what you mean by "promotional material for service work"? Would that be like promotional fliers or brochures or

Terlip: Could be.

Brislawn: So, those we would still want the University logo of some kind on it. So, whether that be a sub-brand or the nameplate or the word-mark,

you would still want whatever that service were to be tied to the University, correct?

Terlip: No. That wasn't my question. It was the style guideline that we'd use, because you're using AP style guidelines, correct? And Jim [**O'Connor**] will appreciate this. I've been through many conversations with Dean **Kruckeberg** where at times

O'Connor: Who's no longer here.

Terlip: where at times in a particular discipline AP is not going to be the correct way to do things.

O'Connor: We're very willing to be flexible.

Terlip: Ok.

O'Connor: We—the standard we're held to is the AP style guide in the things that we produce. We—we have to hold ourselves to that standard. Certainly I understand what you're talking about, but, you know, the key thing is, you know, the bigger picture is when you're doing something or your students are doing something out there, we want to make sure that you're getting credit for it and that it's easily recognizable as University of Northern Iowa. That's really the bottom line.

Terlip: Well, as I was listening to things, it appeared to me that somebody got out the AP style manual in a lot of cases and were telling faculty members how to write when they were using disciplines specific to their

O'Connor: Right, and like I said that was part of—that was part of the miscommunication was we had folks who were trying to be very diligent in their job, and those nuances hadn't been explained to them well enough at that point.

Brislawn: I'd also like to address your [to another Senator] question about the copying and Copy—the relationship with CopyWorks, unless you [**Hawbaker**] had something else you wanted to add?

Hawbaker: I don't have anything else right now. [too quiet to hear for sure]

Brislawn: Ok. Ok. So just a little bit of background, so when Print Services closed, that was a very difficult decision, and at that time we did a lot of research and analysis and decided to do an RFP and partner with another copy operation, and CopyWorks won that RFP. And one of the conditions—because they are a business also trying to make money—was that they had one central location where all the orders came through. And so all the orders are submitted through University Relations. We have a process. “URprinting” as the email address that people submit orders to and 95% of the time when it’s something that comes from faculty is automatically forwarded on and printed. There have been times where we’ve asked questions. There might have been some overzealous—I—you know, I’m not the one that does it, so I can’t speak in absolutes. But I know that there have been times when we’ve responded with questions because not all the printing detail has been included. There have been a few times that just in a quick scan we’ve caught spelling errors, and people have been very appreciative of that. And there could be examples where there was an error that was made and feedback was provided that was unappreciated.

And, you know, I’ve received some of those emails and calls, and I’ve responded to them, but overall the—the process that we have in place works very well. Orders are turned around same day. We check that email hourly to make sure that things are ordered. And CopyWorks does an excellent job, high-quality work, and they turn things around same day in some cases. All of the tests and—and confidential material from faculty are coded that way, and they are sealed in a box at CopyWorks, and no student employees are involved in that—that job ticket. So, I feel like we have a pretty solid process in place. And I meet with the manager there on a regular basis.

And if there are specific concerns that you have or that Melissa [**Heston**] has that she hasn’t communicated or examples, that would be really helpful for me to go back and research, because it’s hard to talk in generalities and have me be able to fix it. You’re—you know what I’m saying?

O'Connor: One of the key features, though, that—that's a real positive that I think kind of got missed, you know, and I understand because people were unhappy, is that when you—when people send their orders through us and they go to CopyWorks through us, there's a significant discount that's attached to it.

Brislawn: Yeah.

O'Connor: If you just go directly to CopyWorks, you are not eligible for that discount, so that's—that's a real key. And—and then we see it as a real win-win.

Peters: Senator **Hawbaker**.

Hawbaker: Well, I just—I wondered if, since you're revising this, what you said earlier about these rules were really meant for promotional materials, and what does that mean, and how is that different from the teaching and research work that faculty would use? So faculty would use this as a guide but not a requirement, is that right? For teaching things or for

O'Connor: For your teaching materials, frankly I wouldn't even look at them. It's—it's not meant—it's not germane.

Hawbaker: Ok, so I'm—I'm wonder—I'm looking at the motion and saying, "Well, what would you say about this 'that Faculty materials associated with their teaching, scholarship, or service work be exempt'? Is that—how—what would you say?"

O'Connor: I'd say, "We couldn't agree with you more." And we thought we'd nailed that down back in October. So that's, you know, we were concerned, too, when we got the petition in December. It came out of left field, because we thought we'd addressed it.

Brislawn: The only question I would have about the service work is who the audience is that's receiving the material? Is that something that's going external? Is that going to prospective students? And, if so, we would want

to ensure that the correct logo is used and that the University—the University’s name was represented—it’s a missed opportunity. So, that would be my—my only feedback there, which makes sense. I think everybody would agree we’re on one team, working together.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I have a question. A couple years ago I—I had a grant, and I produced a huge report that I had copied at CopyWorks on my grant account. Now, that would be required to go through this process?

O’Connor: No.

Brislawn: So, well, to get the discount.

O’Connor: But to get the discount.

Brislawn: Yeah, so what you would do

O’Connor: If you want to get a discount, come through us, and we’ll help you out to get the discount.

DeBerg: Well, what if I—what if my report were confidential, and I wanted the discount. Can—could we send things through you labeled confidential that you all wouldn’t open?

Brislawn: Yeah. So this is what I would do

DeBerg: Really?

Brislawn: I would—we’ve had this happen where people have just stopped into our office with their copy and said, “I need to get this copied.” And we don’t flip through it, and they just explain exactly what you did. Or they’ll call us and say, “I have this, and I really don’t want it to be shared.” We just send John an email and say, “There’s going to be a job coming from Betty, and she’s not going to have an approval form. This is what it is. This is why, and please move forward and afford her the discount.” We’ve done that

on numerous occasions, and normally Janis will just give myself or Jim a heads up in case after the fact, because there's not that documentation, then we put it back into the system because why we—I track it in a database so that when I do my next RFP, I know how many copies we made so that I can accurately get and negotiate a lower rate when the contract comes due, which it's coming due soon. So, yes, absolutely we could do that.

DeBerg: Well, couldn't I just send it by email, say "Confidential," and you send it on?

Brislawn: Well, sure. Yeah.

O'Connor: Yeah.

DeBerg: Ok.

Brislawn: And explain in the email—just explain in the email what—why, you know, just so we have some context.

DeBerg: So we would have to justify all the confidential things that we sent through?

O'Connor: No.

Brislawn: No, it's just

O'Connor: No, just telling us this is a confidential document.

DeBerg: Can't we just say, "It's confidential." and leave it at that?

O'Connor: Yeah.

Brislawn: Yeah, but then you could say, "It's confidential. This is a report. It's confidential. I need 1 copy. I'd like it to be charged to this account. I'd like it delivered or picked up."

DeBerg: Well, yeah, ok.

Brislawn: But give us the context so that we know what to do with it.

DeBerg: Oh, I understand that.

Brislawn: And then we can label it, “This is a report for Betty, and she’ll be picking it up.”—or, you know, if it’s a test, you know, we don’t open any of those things. We get confidential things sent to us all the time from faculty. We just—we—we note what it is, we put the number of copies in the system, and then we pass it through.

Peters: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah. There are some occasions when in addition to UNI’s logo, there has to be a logo of some outside organization also. For example, we have a Professional Science Master’s Program recognized by the Council of Graduate Schools, and as part of that it is required that any promotional material we send out must also have the logo of the CGS.

O’Connor: Uh huh.

Kirmani: Now that would be in addition to UNI, is that ok?

O’Connor: Oh, sure. Oh, absolutely.

Brislawn: Yep.

O’Connor: Absolutely.

Brislawn: If you ever

Kirmani: That would not be in _____ though?

O’Connor: Pardon?

Kirmani: That would not be in _____?

Brislawn: Sure.

O'Connor: No, it's absolutely

Brislawn: Have you ever receive—have you ever been told “No” to that? I'm just curious so that I can go back and do

Kirmani: Well, I never have. I just pretend.

Brislawn: Ok.

DeBerg: What if their logo is red and gold.

Brislawn: Well, we've worked with that before. I mean, so there have been organizations. You can't change somebody's color identity, just like we wouldn't as well. So, you know, you do the best you can, and you—the—we're not working in absolutes. We're working—you know, I just got a poster sent through to me today from the Oscars, and the poster ended up being black and gold with a white UNI nameplate on it. Well, the Oscars are gold. What are you going to do about it? You can't change their logo or their statue color. I mean, it's just—they have their own brand as well, and we acknowledge that.

O'Connor: But what we can do, and this is something if you can feed back to your colleagues, is we've got professional designers on staff, and there are a lot of times when, you know, they look at something. To them, something's a very easy fix, and it can be, frankly, just a few minutes, and they—they come up with ways to handle these sorts of things to make things look sharp, to make them look more professional than they started out, and that's a very easy thing, and we provide that service.

DeBerg: For free?

O'Connor: Yes, for free. No charge.

Brislawn: Yeah, so design and photography services became no charge this Fall.

O'Connor: This Fall.

Brislawn: Yeah.

O'Connor: So we're here to help. We want—we want your materials to look as sharp as you are, and that's—that's really important. [light laughter and murmurings]

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Earlier I heard the remark made that there seemed to be no appeal process if there was an issue. Can you go into what somebody does do if something's being kicked out? Is there a process?

Brislawn: Yeah, so we—yeah, so I've gotten—Janis usually will bring it to my attention if somebody's upset or concerned or has inquired. And either they contact me directly or they'll shoot me an email or sometimes I've been able to contact—reach out to them and talk through it and come up with some solutions. I know Jim [**O'Connor**] is always available as well, if I'm not. So, I've had numerous conversations, and it just sounds like we didn't get connected to the right person. But we have several people who check the email, and I know that sometimes we've discover—we've discovered that sometimes there's discrepancies, like I might say, "That's fine." And somebody else might say, "Oh, my gosh, no, we have to send back a question." And so we've really been able to, through these interviews and the research I've done with different groups across campus, correct that so that we're all on the same page and singing from the same songbook and following the same parameters. So, absolutely, if you have questions, suggestions, if you're angry, please be kind, but I—I'm open to all feedback.

Peters: I have Senator **East** and then Senator **Terlip**.

East: Relative to the—the appeal process, it sounds like this is sort of an ad hoc process that if the person who gives the answer of “no” happens to pass that along to you, then there might be an appeal process. But if the person just says “no,” the faculty member doesn’t know in any appeal process. They don’t know who said “no” or why “no” was said. How is the faculty member supposed to know anything about an appeal process if the person just says “no” and doesn’t contact you?

Brislawn: That’s a good point and something that I probably need to clarify and develop further. That’s a good suggestion. I don’t have a formal process, but that doesn’t mean I can’t make one.

O’Connor: But also

East: It—it needs to be available to faculty

Brislawn: Absolutely.

East: without them having to take an initiative to say, “Oh, wonder what I do now? They just told me ‘no.’”

Brislawn: Sure.

O’Connor: I was—and we asked—we were talking today to try to anticipate questions you might have, and one of the things we came up with is that at least in recent history, the past few weeks, you know, Decem—November December, the word “no” has been used very, very sparingly. What it often is is somebody forgot—you know, I do this all the time—like filling out a form, forget to check whatever box, you know, what—is it black and white? Is it 4-color? How many quant—I mean, what was your quantity? It isn’t “no.” It’s “There’s missing information.” That’s much more common.

Brislawn: Right.

O’Connor: That’s the vast majority of the calls back—is, “Pardon me, but you forgot to check this box. Can you just tell me, you know, did you want

it folded? You know, which way? That direction?" It's not "no." It's a follow-up call.

Brislawn: And another very frequent response is that sometimes a logo's copied off the web instead of using the native file that you can download from the University Relations HomePage, and so that makes it look very granular, and it doesn't give the best appearance, and so often when we see that, we will respond and attach the correct logo and say, "We notice that the logo isn't high resolution. Please replace it with the one that's attached." And that happens 10% of the time just because people that are designing don't necessarily have the design suite available to them that we do in the professional design staff. So, very rarely would anybody ever receive—actually I can say I've never seen an email that just said "no." I've seen emails that have said, "This is my concern with this print request." And there's usually an explanation and an attachment to—to help define it. But, you're right, I do probably—I do need to formalize an appeal process and have that communicated as part of the updated style guide.

East: Well, either—either you're talking about recent history or we have faculty who are lying to us that said

Brislawn: I don't have examples.

East: they were—that things were cancelled. [multiple voices at once]

MacLin (?): I think there's a lot of people who are now self-editing, like

Hawbaker: I—I don't send in requests on yellow, because I was told "no" several times, and so I just say, "Ok."

Brislawn: You were told "no"? Just the word "no" was in the email, or was there some kind of explanation? Because I—I will research this for you.

Hawbaker: There was no explanation given, and it was early. It was early in the semester, and so things have changed, but I haven't pushed it because I'm not a pusher. [light laughter around]

Brislawn: Well, please come back, because you can save a significant amount of money by running your jobs through CopyWorks, and I think you'll find it to be a much better process.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I think that in order to help the faculty, which is what you all indicate what you would like to do, it might be nice to not only have the appeal process made public, but maybe you ought to develop some protocols with your staff. For example, I would be angry if the only thing I did was not download a file and you sent it back to me and caused a 2-week delay or something, when you could have fixed that very easily. I mean, it seems like there are some things you can triage. So maybe you ought to do a focus group with faculty to kind of figure out ways to solve problems and then protocol for appealing decisions.

O'Connor: And—and we've been doing that with the communication roundtable folks, and we've been looking at—because we've asked them and said, "Here's the—here's what we've been getting for questions and concerns." And—and absolutely we do that on a daily basis on the ones we can. The big—the big problem is quite often people are designing things in software that frankly isn't professional standard, and we don't have access to it, and so we have to—we have to give coaching back to the people in the—whoever designed it, so that—because they have to fix it, because there's no way we can fix it because it's not professional standard.

Terlip: Well, and—and that would be understandable. I guess I'm saying that it seems that you need to speak to the faculty members more directly than going through the Department Heads and community representatives, and maybe just some plain old, you know, off the street faculty folks might be helpful.

O'Connor: Oh, yeah. We—we talk to them on a daily basis. Absolutely.

Brislawn: Sure.

Peters: Other questions or comments on this topic?

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I call the question.

Peters: Ok. The question has been called. All in favor of proceeding to a vote on the resolution, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “no”? [none heard] The resolution again is *that Faculty materials associated with teaching, scholarship, or service work be exempted in full from the Visual Identity and Style Manual requirements; and that the Office of University Relations cease all review of Faculty-created materials developed for the purposes of teaching, scholarship, or service (except in those cases where Faculty explicitly ask for such review) and abide promptly and without question with the actual duplication orders placed by Faculty.* All in favor of the resolution, please say, “aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “no”? [none heard] The motion carries. It sounds like much of the work has already been done, so thank you for a good discussion on that.

DOCKET #1071, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH UNIVERSITY RELATIONS
(TERLIP/BRUESS)

Peters: And with that we will just go right into a broader discussion about issues with University Relations, and Kim [**Brislawn**], you have to take off. Is that correct? You need your flashdrive back?

Brislawn: No, no, no. When we are done. I’ll grab the flashdrive when we’re done.

Peters: Oh, ok. Ok. And I tell you—I’ll start you off with the soft ball. I’ve been reading a bunch of Inside UNI, you know, about this new Inside UNI. Do you want to give us like a—not—we don’t have—you know, we’ve only got about 45 minutes, so give us like a 5-minutes or less—maybe like a 2-minute summary of what this—what Inside UNI is and how it’s going to benefit us.

O'Connor: Well, I'll let Stacey [**Christensen**] answer that. It's—it's—it's her area.

Christensen: I know many of you, but I'm Stacey **Christensen**. I'm Manager of Public Relations so do a lot of work with media relations, outreach. A smaller portion of the responsibility has to do with internal communication, certainly a very important communication piece. We have a couple of editors in our office that work on UNI Online and MyUNiverse News, and essentially UNI Online and MyUNiverse News will cease to exist this Thursday.

We are very excited to launch Inside UNI for Faculty and Staff and current students, so tomorrow will be the last UNI Online. Inside UNI for Faculty and Staff really is a multi-media website. It's a communication platform that many universities and colleges are going to. It's a better way to tell the University's story. So instead of just a laundry list of today's dining specials/these are the hours, we are able to tell faculty stories; we're able to share accolades now; we're able to give top news stories, breaking news. And so, essentially, you'll still get an email in your inbox on Tuesday and Thursday mornings. Really that's just to prompt you to go to the Inside UNI for Faculty and Staff website, and there will be a massive link on the bottom that will take you there. So, really, when you look at your email, you're only going to have just a very few announcements, because we want you to go to your Faculty and Staff page, and it is the Faculty and Staff link. The whole UNI website, the HomePage and the SubPages have been redesigned, and you will see that on Thursday.

So, the Faculty and Staff page has been designed to communicate more to you and to share information with you about your colleagues. So when you go to the page, there will always be a weekly feature story, Get to Know, you know, Professor **Edginton**, and then you'll go in; you'll see a nice environmental photo and the story may be about a recent research he did with a student or some wonderful, you know, award that he's gotten. And so we have several stories that we're working on, and so one of the requests I would have is for you all to share your suggestions on faculty and staff in your Departments that would make a good story. A couple of reasons for doing that: you get to learn a little bit more about your

colleagues, and the outside world of prospective students and families get to learn more about what the faculty and staff are doing at UNI. So, we're very, very excited about that.

The second thing will be the ability to have real-time announcements, so instead of just getting your announcements on Tuesday and Thursday, daily that site will be updated. So, when we get people submitting things, "Gosh, I missed the deadline. This is a great thing happening tomorrow. I haven't had a chance to tell anybody about it." We can go right in and pop it up, and it will be the first announcement on the page. So we really have a lot more flexibility to get that news out there now as well. And then we also have the ability share some of the great news releases and stories that we're doing and coverage we're getting as well. So, a brand new feature that I think will be of interest to all of you and that I would like a little input about is the new accolades section. So accolades is kudos, so it's an opportunity to talk about faculty and staff awards and honors, and having a little bit of—oh, a challenge, I guess, in trying to determine—because you have such limited space, and if you put everything in there, it just becomes this laundry list of things that nobody will ever read. And so at this time we weren't going to do presentations and publications, but we were looking more for significant national and international—and I hate to even say "national and international"—but we need it to be high-level, significant awards and honors that we can update on a weekly basis. And so there will be an accolade submission form for that as well. We can't use everything, just like we can't use all the announcements, but I am always really open to communication and to suggestions and would welcome that, if you have questions along the way as we unveil this.

So, with anything new—I mean, launching a new website and launching a new communication platform is—is huge. There's bugs along the way that you have to work out, and it's never completely done. And so we had feedback with Inside UNI, when we made changes this Fall, and I met with Gloria in the Provost's Office and some faculty, and we made some changes along the way. So I'm always open to that feedback. So that's at the high level.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, just a couple of—there are bigger issues than this new platform to talk about today, but I don't understand when you say, "We don't have room for all the announcements?" How can you not have room for everything on a website? That doesn't make any sense to me.

Christensen: You certainly have room. I guess it's in best practices, so, I mean, you have page tabs at the bottom, so I guess it's in what you want to do. I mean, you could put up 75 announcements a day, but on the actual HomePage itself, say you're only ever going to see 12.

DeBerg: On the front page?

Christensen: Yes. So if you—you know, so if you do that, then it gets—it just becomes this noise in the background, and that's what we heard with UNI Online last Spring and the cha—why we made the changes. We did a survey. We did focus groups. And we had faculty and staff telling us that it was becoming the John Deere Swap Sheet, and I would agree. Right? Like, everybody was trying to put stuff in there. You know, "Today's Dining Special," or "Today's

DeBerg: I—I like that.

Christensen: Sure, some do. It's a

DeBerg: I mean, there's nothing that sucks much more than the UNI Calendar page that we were all directed to for special events. [many murmurings] I mean, what a wo—what a bad idea that was. The other thing I want to say is that I—I love reading faculty kudos. I read every single one. I don't care how many of them are on there. I think if a faculty member or if a Department thinks that it's something that should go in, fine. And my last qu—comment is a question. Is this like an alumni magazine? I mean, what is this new website then?

Christensen: No.

DeBerg: It's just for faculty?

Christensen: It's ke—yep. So when you go to the UNI HomePage and you've got your links for audiences, you have Current Students, Faculty/Staff, Prospective Students. When you go on your Faculty and Staff link, it's your HomePage now.

DeBerg: Ok.

Christensen: And what's great about that is that in addition—I missed a whole part. So the central part of the Faculty and Staff page is resources for faculty and staff.

DeBerg: Ok.

Christensen: So it will be a series of 6 boxes and links about living, working, doing business. This is just in addition.

DeBerg: Well, like our—like MyUNlverse.

Christensen: A glorified MyUNlverse. So, like, one is on Employment and HR Services.

DeBerg: Ok. Ok. So my other comment is I think that the faculty knows that it's a good faculty. I think that the public needs to know more that we're a good faculty. I think the Administration and you all need to know more that we're a good faculty. The Legislature needs to know more. So I guess I want to see stories about faculty and faculty kudos not just for us. We see—that seems to me to be the least important audience for that.

O'Connor: You're—you're right. And we're talking about specifically that page. What we haven't talked about is the HomePage, the University HomePage.

Christensen: There's a link, yeah.

O'Connor: The top of the page will include—will include stories about faculty every time.

DeBerg: Wow.

Christensen: Yep.

O'Connor: And there will be links to faculty kudos from the University HomePage.

DeBerg: Wow.

O'Connor: So those things—what we're telling you is what we'd like to see you folks do is make Inside UNI for Faculty and Staff your pop-up page, so when you turn on your computer every morning, there's the most recent announcements and all that sort of stuff. But when you just type in UNI.edu and you go to the University HomePage, you'll see stories about faculty. You'll see stories

DeBerg: Now?

O'Connor: Yeah, starting Thursday. So it's—we're very excited. It's a completely new approach.

Christensen: There's been many about faculty, though, Betty. There's many on the UNI HomePage now, yeah.

Peters: Let's see. I had Chair **Funderburk** next and then Senator **East**.

Funderburk: So, there will still be an email, but the actual announcements won't go out in any sort of an email form anymore?

Christensen: There will be—there will be like 3-5. Let's say, 3-5 in that email that really prompts you to go to that website where you'll see the—the additional announcements.

Funderburk: Well, I mean, because the issue is unless the website works better than everything else, the University is pretty useless on your mobile phone, and that's how I get my reminders. I think every bit of research

shows that in a passive form if I can look for announcements never works versus an active one,

O'Connor: Right.

Funderburk: and I hope that in this change, unlike the last one, it's wide—you know, we had quite the exchange just to be able to publicize the campus-wide faculty meeting this Fall because it was outside the boundaries of an announcement.

Christensen: We did. Yeah. I mean, I hope you all can appreciate

Funderburk: I'm kind of the opposite of Betty [DeBerg]. I don't have time to read the faculty kudos all morning. When I get a break, I'll go look for them.

Christensen: Right. Yeah, it's—it's—you know, it's a grey area. It's one of those things you're never going to make everybody happy, right? I mean, I just—I'm in a position where it's the nature of the beast. Not—can't make everybody happy, so you've got people who scream that you have so much stuff in there. You have people who scream that you don't have enough in there. But the one consistent thing is that--and like it or not, right?—and I don't know if I'm a 100% sold on it, but it is what it is—we have the University Calendar of Events, and that exists. And to replicate and spend all that time basically putting all the events into a newsletter just isn't efficient.

Funderburk: The Calendar of Events is fairly useless.

Christensen: Yeah. People are open to their op—yeah, that's not my area, so I can't speak to it.

Funderburk: It has—well, I—I mean, ultimately it is. It has 25% of the events on there, so therefore, if you're actually trying to schedule something or find something, it's fairly useless, because it's not utilized enough to make it an effective combined calendar. You have multiple

calendar systems even for their own offering on campus that haven't been fully integrated.

Christensen: Yeah, I think at a higher level that needs to be discussed—absolutely needs to be loo—I think people would agree that it—it's not perfect.

Brislawn: You made a good point I just want to touch on briefly—is you said you get a lot of those on your phone, and the new website that is launching is responsive, so it'll reformat for the mobile side or for a tablet or for the web, too, so I—I think it's going to be a great resource.

Funderburk: And I guess the point is that I would not click on a link because I don't want to tend to want to use up my data looking for that, but my email, it's there. So, if it's not on email, they are not very useful to a lot of people.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I have a similar kind of concern about the push versus pull. If—if you want me to see something, want me not to see something, the way to have that happen is to put it in the webpage someplace, because I'm not going to go look.

O'Connor: That's why we're sending an email.

East: You have to get my attention, so if there's some—so we need to be sure that anything that all of this group should see should—is not just access via the webpage. You have to send me a message saying, "Go look here."

O'Connor: You're going to get those twice a week.

East: And—and I've been doing that. I've been doing what I thought was my job almost religiously looking at UNI Online at least scanning the entire thing back even when it was huge, scanning the entire thing to see, ok, is there anything I really need to be paying attention to? I agree that it's

better to have the stuff that I don't have to pay attention to not be in there, but if I have to pay attention to it, then you need to directly send me something saying, "Pay attention to this."

Christensen: Right.

East: Don't—you cannot bury it in a webpage somewhere and expect me to go find it or look for it, because I'm not going to use it. I'm kind of like Jeff [**Funderburk**]. I'm—I'm not going to go look at those things. I'm—I'm task oriented. I have plenty of work to do. So I'm going to do the work I have to do, my teaching, my scholarship, my service, and if there's time left over I might be curious about what else is going on at UNI, but I'm not very—I'm not nearly as productive as I used to be, so it takes all of my time now just to do my job. So, it—it's very—it will be very important for that—somehow that information gets pushed to me so that I actually see it, and—and so—I—I—and I worry about who's going to decide what the faculty should see.

DeBerg: Or have to see or need to see.

East: What's important for the faculty to see. We're talking about a policy revision process, and we've been told that there are hundreds, if not thousands, of policies that need to be revised, and somebody on the faculty should probably see all of those or should be aware of all of those. That sounds to me like something that fits the mold for "You don't see all of these." They get buried somewhere in—in a posting that says, "These things are up for review." But if you don't know that they're up for review, then you don't go looking for them. And so it's—it's—it's critical that you figure out who's going to be deciding what gets pushed to the faculty or to P&S or to merit or just particular majors and—or just students in general, and that's not a decision I want you making.

Brislawn: The Associate Deans have said they would help.

East: I'm not sure that's a decision I want the Deans making. I mean, by themselves. But I do know that if the Deans or the Provost or anybody is going to expect me to see them, then they need to make it clear to you that

you have to send it directly to me or send me a direct information about looking at that directly.

O'Connor: Uh huh.

East: Now I might—you might say, “Ten policies are up for review.” You don’t have to send me a message that says the 10 messages, but you need to send me something that says, “Go look.”

Peters: Senator **Strauss** is up next. I’ll just note in the interest of time that we’ve spent about 15 minutes on this, and I did start us off with this because I know a lot of people have been getting these emails, and people wanted to—you wanted to know what—what it was about. We can always, you know, as we see it roll out, we can send emails

Christensen: Absolutely.

Peters: to—to Stacey [**Christensen**] and Jim [**O'Connor**] and everything. So, in the interest of time, I just wanted to remind people that I know there are other things people want to talk about. Senator **Strauss**.

Strauss: Thank you. I was going to change the subject. Mr. **O'Connor**, I think our fathers are roommates?

O'Connor: They were, until last week.

Strauss: They were until today, so I don’t know if we qualify as “family” or not. [laughter]

O'Connor: Well, extended.

Strauss: Well, then it pains me to ask you a pointed question.

O'Connor: Sure.

Strauss: And I’m going to. There was a recent AAUP Report which was critical of the University and its—and its relationship with faculty, and then

there was an—a difficult, what I would characterize as a difficult letter from Ben **Allen** to the public, and I find it difficult because then I’m—and I’m quoting our—our Senate Chair, it—roughly, it portrayed the faculty as being opposed to taxpayer, public, and student interests is—is a way that you could interpret it. And it also portrayed the University as a victim to the AAUP, and my question to you is, “Are you involved in advising President **Allen** how to put out these communications? Do you fit in that workflow process?”

O’Connor: Most of the time, yes.

Strauss: Then, could you explain what the thought was with that response from Ben **Allen** to the public?

O’Connor: Well, I can’t speak—I can’t put words in the President’s mouth, but I think it’s pretty obvious that in that letter he was representing the Administration of the University, and he was taking offense at what he saw the faculty union trying to do, not the faculty in total but the faculty union and AAUP. And I think I can leave it at that.

Strauss: I—I—I guess I’ll follow-up with one final statement, and as—and I’ve been here, this is my—working on my 15th year now, and—and I think that the University relations between faculty and Administration are probably at an all-time low, and—and those types of statements that President **Allen**’s putting out don’t help, and so I would request personally that—that some of the statements be temp—tempered a little bit, and—and consider also that the—that the University is the faculty. We are the—the weavers that make the fabric. And without the faculty, there is no University. Nobody cares about dorms or—or—or cafeterias or tours around. We are the bricks and mortar of the University, and so to be portrayed in a negative light, whether people think it’s the Union’s fault or not, is—is difficult. Thank you.

O’Connor: I would agree wholeheartedly.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I would like to follow that up. I mean, before the AAUP letter when the program cuts were announced, I mean, the kinds of _____ stuff that came out of your office was so insulting. “Faculty hate change.” You know, it was just—they were ad hominem attacks on the faculty. I mean, I’ve had reports of faculty sitting in on committee meetings that had nothing to do with what you all do wondering whether or not they could have a no confidence vote in you and your office. I mean, well, how can you justify characterizing the faculty the way you did? That’s my first. And my second question is “Do you work for Ben **Allen** or do you work for the University?” I mean, there seemed to me to be no differentiation in any—any of the thinking or work that I saw coming out of your office that the good of the University may not be the same thing as the good of Ben **Allen**. So, I have those 2 issues.

O’Connor: I honestly don’t remember the quote that you quoted at the first part of that. I don’t remember that ever coming from our office.

DeBerg: Well, it did, either in writing or in an interview.

O’Connor: And the second one I think I appreciate your statement, Betty. We’re in a tough position because many of you know us. We’ve worked with you for years. We spend day-in and day-out—one of the things we’re trying to do is promote what you do, the research you do, the work you do, because you are the University. We also work with the President and for the President, so we’re in that tough position as well.

DeBerg: Well, I just want to personally say that I was—I don’t think there’s any unit of the Administration outside of centr—any unit of the University outside of Central Administration that I have been more upset and felt more letdown by than you and UMPR.

O’Connor: I can understand, especially in your position.

DeBerg: In every single thing that you said in the last year and a half, I, you know, have yet to see anything really redemptive out of you.

O’Connor: I understand.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I do understand that you're in an awkward position on that, because ultimately there's a Chief Executive Officer who makes decisions. However, I do hope that some careful advice along the way of Ben's—I thought Dennis **Clayson**, and I'm always hesitant to agree with him on something, but he has a piece in the paper, and he made a very good point that the wording you use clearly said—implied that the University was the Administration. It did not say “the University Administration.” It said, “The University is under attack,” meaning that somehow we are not a part of that. [**O'Connor** and **Christensen** vocalizing agreement throughout this turn at talk of **Funderburk**] And I think there were several other indiscreet wordings made on a number of issues that have arisen that I think, had your office been able to persuade the President and others, might have been more effective messaging as well, so I hope that something can come out of that for good, because I think some of it just made things worse than they needed to be.

O'Connor: Uh huh.

Peters: Professor **DeSoto** next and then Secretary **Edginton**.

DeSoto: Yeah, I had a question. Jim, you know I came into your office on October 24th and told you that the story that I had heard Stacey **Christensen** quoting on the radio as I went in to work was not an accurate representation about my course policy, talking about the student grievance. And then it wasn't an hour later and you had—and you were then coming back from Ben **Allen**'s office where you had been talking about a press release, and that press release still went out even after I had told you that that was not accurate as far as it's gone. The student's grade was never in jeopardy. The overall story was false. And I would like to ask you now that you're here if you can tell me why Ben **Allen** went ahead and sent that--that horrible email that went out? And I would also like to take issue with you trying to parse (?) the Faculty Union from the Faculty Statement and to equate the AAUP censure with the Faculty Union. The AAUP censure is the overall umbrella organization of the AAUP which represents

the professional organization of faculty. There is collective bargaining congress (?) which is formally affiliated with the AAUP, but it's actually separate, and I would just like to say that, for the record, the Administration was censured by the faculty not by the Union, and also for the record the President of the Union at the time, and I know this firsthand because it was me, they—she was asked—I was asked 3 or 4 times to spearhead a vote of no confidence in President **Allen**. Each time I said, “No. I wasn't going to be involved with that.” So, it is not the Union that's having problems with the Administration. It's the faculty.

Female voice [**MacLin?**]: I'd like to hear an answer to her first question.

DeBerg: Yeah, I want you to speak to what the President did to Professor **DeSoto**.

O'Connor: I can't.

Female voice [**MacLin?**]: At least in your role, that she came to you guys and gave information.

DeBerg: Well, the press release came from your office.

O'Connor: Yes, it did. You expressed your opinion to me. The President expressed his opinion and directed me to send out a communication to the media.

Christensen: I was in that meeting as well. We were directed to send it.

DeSoto: It is not my opinion how my class works. It is the fact of how my class works.

O'Connor: I'm—I'm saying you—you explained your side. Sure, you explained your side to me, and I was—I was directed to send out the news release.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: You all have talked to us about best practices several times. If you had that information ahead of time, I don't believe issuing the report you issued goes along with PRSSA's best practices.

O'Connor: True, and I—and I would agree completely, but that's not the whole story, but I'm at—I'm not at liberty to share the things that went on in that meeting because that would be breaking confidentiality.

Peters: I apologize to Secretary **Edginton**. I skipped him on the queue.

Edginton: That's all right. I'd like to defer back to Professor **Strauss's** original comments and also Senator **DeBerg's** comments about the process that's taken place. You know, it seems to me again in this notion of shared governance had you can't—came—come back to the Faculty Senate and asked them for a read on this—that particular letter from AAUP that you might have been able to temper the President's comments coming out. And, in fact, the responses that came back from the Union and from the Faculty Senate seemed to be the more reasoned responses than what came out of the President's office. And I think by just taking that little step of involving the faculty to get a read on the—on their sense on what's going on, just talking to Sen—Senate Chair **Peters** and the head of the—the Faculty, Faculty Chair **Funderburk**, would help you in framing those responses so we get out of this adversarial relationship. And I just would strongly encourage you to seek their wisdom, seek their advice, because you're not coming out of this, you know, view—viewed in a way that is positive for the University and—and at least in most of the people in this room's opinion.

O'Connor: I appreciate that, thank—I think that's a great suggestion, and I look forward to doing it.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I have to—I'll go further than that. I mean, I think that the role that you all played has been disastrous. I think that the role that your office played has increased the rancor. It—it's just been disastrous.

Christensen: I would—let me comment, and I

DeBerg: The AAUP mentioned the kinds of reporting that came out of your office in its report as highly negative report.

Christensen: I—we've been here about the same number of years, 13 years. I love this place. I—my graduate degree is from this place. I mean, I—I would disagree with you, respectfully disagree with you. In the position that I'm in in working with the media, I would argue that we are our own worst enemy sometimes. Our own employees, our own faculty and staff who contact the media with false stories and you feed the beast. I call it the beast. They feed the fire. It's—it's not always our statements going out. We have to then respond to a reporter who heard from some angry faculty person. You know what? It's not just us. I mean, it's an ongoing, daily issue with these hot topics that are very emotional topics for people. I get that, but then we are forced then to have to come up and then counter. And it makes us look like, to the public, that we have all of this infighting going on, which some of it is true and some isn't. But I guess I would respectfully say that I feel that many faculty and staff have caused some of those issues in their outward communications on social media and the media as well.

Peters: Oh, Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, you know, I personally feel that there's not much point in blaming these people. Are you Vice-President? Vice-President O'Connor? He reports to the President. They are part of the Administration. What can he do, if the President tells him something? He can give his honest advice, but after all, he—he is part of the Administration, whatever they expect from him.

O'Connor: I would like to say that we worked very closely with a lot of you folks over the years, and I know that this has been a very contentious time, and we've listened very closely to what you've had to say today and in other conversations before this, and we look forward to speaking to you afterwards as well, and we look forward to moving forward. And please

give us the benefit of the doubt. Give us another chance. We appreciate that.

Peters: Ok. Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: And then I would just broaden the conversation a little bit to say that touching base with faculty members and maybe even more broadly with the Faculty Senate, since we represent so many different faculty members. I understand you—you interact with faculty all the time, but when you come to this Body or a subcommittee of this Body or talk to our Chairs, they are—they represent so many others, and then we can provide feedback. I'd say that visually speaking I love the marketing campaign that I've been seeing around town on the billboards, but—but placement has been strange at times and some of the photo choices have been strange for some of the neighborhoods that the billboards are in. They are beautiful billboards. I think that kind of advertising, any advertising is good, but I think it could have been better, and I think that you all are busy people doing a million things that sometimes tapping in to existing faculty expertise to say, "Does this make sense? Is this messaging going to work in this neighborhood? Is there anybody on the faculty that has some knowledge about that? How do you want to see UNI represented in the town that you live in?" I don't live in Cedar Falls. "How do I want to see UNI represented in Waterloo, in East Waterloo?" And I think that there's just a wealth of resources, and if we're not in an adversarial position, if Stacey [**Christensen**] isn't constantly feeling like faculty are the ones that are—that are making her job more difficult, then she and others and the rest of you all can tap into feedback and resources that are—that are in the faculty, because as Kim [**Brislawn**] mentioned earlier on another issue, we are supposed to all be in this together, and you may have your allegiance, ultimate allegiance to upper Administration as Syed [**Kirman**] pointed out, but we're supposed to be here for something bigger and more common than that.

O'Connor: I appreciate that.

Brislawn: I smile when you talk about those billboards. Those—those billboards were—I got a lot of calls about those billboards. They were part

of the “Imagine the Impact” campaign, and the people selected on the—on the billboards were actually selected by the Foundation. And so I was given, “These are the people that are going to be on it, and we want, you know, as much coverage as possible.” And so some of the boards were added bonus ads, part of the negotiated as part of the buy. So, I hear what you’re saying.

O’Connor: Believe me, we hear the same things.

Brislawn: I hear what you’re—I hear what you’re saying. Yes. But it was—it was not a campaign. We designed the campaign, but we did not have control over the copy or the photo selection, so

O’Connor: Or placement.

Brislawn: Good feedback, though. And I—I don’t live here. I live in Cedar Rapids, and I commute. So I’m always asking, “What do you think of these locations?” or, you know, I mean—so, I appreciate that. And I will be in com—more communication.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**. Oh, sorry. Senator—sorry, Chair **Funderburk** first. I almost skipped—almost skipped in my order.

Funderburk: On a practical note, if you don’t already have it on your radar to be redoing the PowerPoint format that’s been used by the University for quite a few years now, each of the last 4 meetings I’ve heard side comments about how tired and dated the format is. So, I hope that that’s coming up to be changed soon.

O’Connor: It actually is.

Funderburk: Maybe lose the “it looks like paper but it doesn’t” format.

Peters: Now Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: I—I would just encourage both the [Faculty] Senate and your office to try and meet more often. Now I know this was not a terribly

comfortable time. We—we hit some—hit some nerves I'm sure all around, but I think things will get better only if we talk back and forth a bit more often. If you guys can steel yourself to come back again

O'Connor: Sure.

Neuhaus: I think that's—that's good for everybody all around on that.

O'Connor: Absolutely.

Neuhaus: And we're—we—we can be pretty tough on the Athletic Department as well and then other folks that come in, but this is one way to at least get things out and about. Now, people are going to have their different perceptions on—on where things are coming from. There are going to be things that you have to do that we initially may not fully appreciate, but that can also go the other way as well.

O'Connor: Sure.

Neuhaus: So I—I would encourage the [Faculty] Senate in future years to—to—to invite this office here. I would encourage you to, despite maybe some of the lumps you got today, to—to come back again, because I do think, you know, despite how difficult this is—this is what's needed, is—is—is this kind of conversation.

O'Connor: Sure.

Peters: And, if I might, I think one thing that I think we the faculty and University Relations—and—and the President and the Provost for that matter—need to figure out a way to work better together on is precisely what I think it was Senator **DeBerg** who was talking about the—the need to communicate the faculty's contributions to community, to the State, to the Legislature, to—that, I think, you know, we get—it hasn't happened yet this year but usually we get those terrible articles written about all the—the quote unquote “wasteful PDA's” that professors have gotten, right? [several voices commenting at once] Yeah. And so we're put in—we're put in this position and you end up, you know—we're put in this position—I

mean, there was—the one last year was particularly bad, and—and we’re put in this position of—of once a year it seems like trying to defend some research project which obviously has merit to everyone around the room—this table would—would see it and think it has merit, but it sounds funny to people on the outside, and it gets pulled out, and it gets mocked. And that’s the—that becomes “the faculty” to the public. But if we can—if we can figure some way to highlight faculty contributions on a regular and ongoing basis, we—we’re—I think faculty are very good at going out into the community and giving talks and doing things like that. I think community members all over sort of know this on a micro level, but I’m not sure it gets fully appreciated on the—on—as the sum of all those contributions and how much that contributes, and I think we need to do a better job.

Christensen: No one wants a positive—a positive story more than myself. So, I mean, we are looking for news. So I encourage you, if you’ve got something good to share, send it, please.

O’Connor: And the thing to keep in mind—we just did a study over the past month, I think, about negative/positive/neutral attitudes—you know, stories that were run in the mid—in the media, and it was overwhelmingly positive, but what we—and most of that was stories about what faculty are doing quite honestly. But the positive stories are the—you don’t tend to remember unless it was you or your colleague right next door. It’s the negative ones that you remember, and so we try to force ourselves to go back and look at—actually look at the numbers and look at the stories, and on a weekly basis, there are positive stories out there. It’s just we tend to get caught up and just remember the negative ones. But we—but please send us every story idea you have about yourselves, your colleagues, your students, the good things they are doing. We need to keep that pipeline going at all times.

Peters: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: Yeah, I would support what Chris [**Neuhaus**] said earlier that the Senate should work with the University Relations in a more effective

manner. University Relations can do a lot of damage as we have seen. So it would be better if we work with them more closely.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: I—I guess I have one more question. Did you all work with the Student Government last year to turn them against the faculty? I—I—did you help coordinate the “Support Ben **Allen** campaign”?

Christensen: No.

DeBerg: And the Student Government—that came with signs prepared and sat in our Faculty Meeting when we took the vote of no confidence? And

O’Connor: I would ask them.

DeBerg: I mean, they had ready-made signs. They were out in the lobby with a—with a packet for reporters, and you didn’t work with them on that?

O’Connor: No, but they—they could answer that very easily.

DeBerg: Ok.

White: [KaLeigh, NISG Vice-President 2012-13] No, that was not related to Student Government. That was a number of students who collaborated on their own.

DeBerg: It was who?

White: It was—it was a group of students that collaborated on their own to organize that. Student Government was not associated with the Support for Ben **Allen** group that day. That was all others.

DeBerg: Well, the President and Vice-President were leaders of it. Ok?

White: I didn’t—I

DeBerg: Ok. Ok, thank you.

Bancroft-Smithe: [Jordan, NISG President 2012-13] They may have done it on their own, but it was not in association with the Student Government.

White: Right.

DeBerg: I had heard that the students who brought professionally-made signs and had—were from Athletics, that they were put together by the Athletics Department. Do you know that?

Bancroft-Smithe: I have no idea.

White: We'd have to ask them.

O'Connor: What I—what I do know for sure is we [University Relations] weren't a part of that. This is the first I've actually heard of it. So, we—we didn't

Terlip: I actually asked someone, and they said your office handed them the sign. They don't recall that the student

O'Connor: No, I would—I would say that was a mischaracterization, because we had been at all

DeBerg: You had nothing to do with the student presence at the All Faculty Meeting?

O'Connor: No.

Peters: I saw a—I thought I saw [a hand up]

O'Connor: That's not part of our role.

Peters: Sure. We don't usually recognize members of the press, but Blake **Findley** who is—who's also a—just a regular student, not just a member of the press.

Findley: This is not related to my news role. I know the students behind that movement and, well, like where they got the posters and stuff. They had nothing to do with Student Government or UR, like at all.

O'Connor: Thank you.

Christensen: Thank you.

DeBerg: Thank you.

Peters: Yeah. Ok. Senator **Swan** and then Chair **Funderburk**.

Swan: Ok, we're just about out of time, and I've been listening throughout this period, and I want to ask you and your office a question about accuracy in facts. And so some of your responses said that you listened to people's opinions and then publish what other people tell you to publish, and you represent the whole University according to one area over others. And perhaps, perhaps you have to. Maybe that's your response. The—your employment condition is such that you cannot at—in certain times represent all of the facts accurately. You must represent what a certain group requires you to do, and if that's the answer, then that—that's what I want. But perhaps there's another answer that I'm not hearing. How do you decide to proceed when you have contrary representations of fact?

O'Connor: Well, I guess that—I just say that I agree with you wholeheartedly, but the key point there is fact—is what one person sees as fact and another person sees as opinion et cetera. Part of our job, our role, is to be eyes and ears and to try to make sure that decision-makers have all the information from all perspectives possible and to make—and make the case that they be objective and understand all the different perspectives out there, but like you said, at the end of the day we are a part of the Administration of the University, and there are times when we have to represent the President.

Swan: His administration.

O'Connor: Yeah. But you—you described it very well.

Peters: We've got Chair **Funderburk** and then Senator **DeBerg** and then Professor **DeSoto**.

Funderburk: Well, the thing that I was going to say initially was to just—just state for the record that the President of the Student Body was also not part of that group.

DeBerg: That the what?

Funderburk: That the President of the Student Body last year was also not part of that group. I'm stating it for the record if you will. I can't speak for the Vice-President, but I know for a fact the President was not. But that also the last thing you said led me to another question of that. When you were talking about representing all the opinions or facts as you find them, how do you ascertain what they are from the faculty if you don't think, meet, or speak with anyone from the faculty side of it? I understand that ultimately you answer to the President, but if part of your job, as you stated, was to represent it, where do you get this from without speaking to any of us?

O'Connor: You're assuming that we don't, and we do. It depends on the specific situation.

Funderburk: Well, I've had 2 years as the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Faculty, and we've never had a conversation other than chatting over coffee at the Board of Regents or something.

O'Connor: That's a good point, but we've—until recently we haven't, I guess you'd say, been associated with the same issues. [some laughter, gasps, a "wow"]

Funderburk: I find that an absurd statement based on the past year's discussion in the newspaper.

O'Connor: Well, looking at our day-to-day work—yeah, but I guess, you know, at the end of the day

Christensen: We work a lot with the Provost's Office who we would assume is a representation. I mean

DeBerg: Wow! Well, that's a really bad assumption.

Christensen: We—it's not as if we're just working with the President's Office.

DeBerg: She got a vote of no confidence from the faculty, you know.

O'Connor: We hear you loud and clear. I think we've covered as much of this topic as we can.

Christensen: Uh huh.

Peters: _____ Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I do want to say one more thing. The press release of the National Guard student went out without any presidential—without the President even talking to Professor **DeSoto**. There was no attempt at fact-finding before this went out. I—I—so that makes me think that what you just have said is—it's, you know, there was no attempt to get down to the facts there. Zero.

Christensen: We're just not at liberty to discuss the details of that meeting, and

DeBerg: That's fine. But we know the President didn't talk to Professor **DeSoto**. We know that you didn't. She had to hunt you out. I mean, come on. This idea about, you know, going out for the facts and representing the whole University is just blatantly untrue in that situation.

Peters: Do you have anything to add or are we just—ok, Senator—Professor **DeSoto**.

DeSoto: I—I appreciate you coming here and hearing all that said. You know, I know, Jim [**O'Connor**], that you've—I felt that when I talked to you, you were trying to be empathic. I do, because I'm afraid I'm not going to get a chance to ask this later, I—I'm just sitting here trying to remember the name of that radio—or TV station from Cedar Rapids. It's not KC—is it KCRG?

O'Connor: It's KCRG and KGAN.

DeSoto: The news rep. from KCRG, which printed some false information that they got from UNI, and then the part that I want to ask about is that they apparently contacted Stacey **Christensen** about how to get in touch with me, and Stacey **Christensen** said I wasn't available. How did that happen?

Christensen: I got the contact from Nadia Crow at KCRG who I had no idea what the situation was because the National Guard member had gone to her. That's how we learned of the story.

DeSoto: This was after even hearing from the student.

Christensen: No, I never told anyone that they couldn't get in contact with you. A reporter is savvy and smart enough they would not, for something like that, even come through me. They would look in the Directory.

DeSoto: The director of the—of KCRG, I have an email that said—I said, "Why didn't you contact me?" And he said that he'd contacted you, and you said that I was not available. I've got the email.

Christensen: No, I didn't.

O'Connor: That's not how we handle things like that. We would—I mean, we—we—we send them to you.

DeSoto: Well, I'll send—this will be transcribed, and I'll send that back to them.

Christensen: Yeah, good.

O'Connor: Sure. Absolutely.

Peters: Anything else? Thank you again for coming. We do appreciate seeing you to talk over these things with you.

Christensen: Thank you.

O'Connor: You're welcome.

Peters: And, you know, as—as several people have said, hopefully as we—as we move forward, we'll be able to do this more regularly and not have, you know—not have so much history built up that it all comes out all at once. So, thank you again for coming, and

O'Connor: You're welcome.

Peters: And we—we'll all let you know about the new format for disseminating news, too. We'll let you know what we think about that.

O'Connor: All right.

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: Seeing no other business, I would be happy to entertain a motion to adjourn.

Edginton: So move.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**. And seconded by Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. All in favor, please say, "aye." [ayes heard all around]

Opposed, “no”? [none heard] And I’ll let you know about the Feb—about the next meeting when I know about it.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 02/11/2013

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

*** This document was appended to the minutes after they were approved, pursuant to action by Senate (1180/1176)

On Fri, Nov 9, 2012 at 9:00 AM, Adam Carros <Adam.Carros@kcrg.com> wrote:
That was Stacey Christensen with the office of University Relations.

Adam Carros

News Director - KCRG

501 Second Ave. SE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
(319) 368-8604
Adam.Carros@kcrg.com

From: Mary Desoto [mailto:cathy.desoto@uni.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2012 6:20 PM
To: Adam Carros
Subject: Re: Errors of Fact and Omission

Thanks for your note.
Who told you I was not available for comment?
-CD

On Wednesday, November 7, 2012, Adam Carros wrote:
Cathy,

We will not be issuing a public apology or correction for this story and stand by our reporting. However, KCRG would be interested in hearing your side of this story on camera if you are ever interested and available. We earlier attempted to contact you through the proper University channels but were told you were not available for comment. It sounds like you feel the University leadership threw you under the bus and we would be interested in sharing your side of that story.