

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**09/26/11 (3:16 p.m. – 4:55 p.m.)**  
**#1699**

SUMMARY MINUTES

**Summary of main points**

1. Call for press identification indicated none present.
2. President **Allen** was given the floor for comments and then took questions on topic ranging from budgetary concerns to proposed tuition increase.
3. Courtesy Announcements

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered comment on the need to appoint a member to the Regents Award Committee now rather than waiting until Spring.

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reserved her comments because she has posted a petition (Calendar 1092) for docketing.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included naming the Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee (**Breitbach, Neuhaus, Swan, Peters**), appointing **East** to assist with work on website upgrades, noting upcoming Rod Library digitizing work on archival Minutes and Senate materials, reappointing **Terlip** to the Regents Award Committee, taking nominations for the Facilities Planning Committee for election at the next meeting, announcing the upcoming Leadership Breakfast attendees, noting that Vice President **Hogan** has a willingness to come to a Senate meeting and answer any questions, and finally moderating a very lengthy discussion on possible responses for the Chair to forward to President **Allen** on the tentative/working proposed tuition increase of 3.75%.

4. Minutes for 09/12/11 had no corrections and were approved by acclamation.

5. Docketed from the Calendar

1092 990 Committee on Committees Deliberations and Recommendations from January 18, 2009. Docketed in regular order (**Bruess/East**). Passed.

1093 991 Report on the Current UNI NCAA Certification Self Study. Docketed out of order for October 24, 2011, at 3:45 p.m. (**Neuhaus/Roth**). Passed

6. Consideration of Docketed Items

1086 984 Consultative Session with the Director of the UNI Museum on its current status and planning for the future, a report, docketed for 4:30 p.m. on 09/26/11 (**DeBerg/Swan**). Consideration delayed due to illness of guest speaker.

1088 986 Motion to reserve West Gym (WST) for academic purposes, regular order (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**). Vote to call the question (**DeBerg/Peters**), passed. Motion then passed, with one opposing vote.

1089 987 Request for Emeritus Status, Ron **Abraham**, Accounting, effective May 31, 2011, regular order (**Wurtz/Smith**). Vote to endorse request, passed.

1091 989 Moratorium on LAC Category Reviews, regular order (**Smith/DeBerg**). Not considered this meeting due to time.

7. New Business

Appointment of Ad Hoc Bylaws Committee:

Senators **Breitbach, Neuhaus, Swan, Peters**

Reappointment of Regents Award Committee member from the Faculty Senate:

Senator **Terlip**

Faculty Senate member nominees accepted to serve on the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee, for election at next meeting.

## 8. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:55 p.m. (**Bruess/Roth**). Passed.

Next meeting: October 10, 2011; Oak Room of Maucker Union, 3:15 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
September 26, 2011  
Mtg. 1699**

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

**Absent:** Syed **Kirmani**

**Guest Speaker:** President **Ben Allen**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m. saying: Ok, I think we are at the time everyone, so let's come to order.

**CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION AND INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKER**

**Funderburk:** Before we begin, let's call for press identification. I see none today. I would like to thank President **Allen** for joining us today. We agreed to have him for a Consultative Session at the very beginning today, so I think I'll just turn it over to you at this point.

President **Allen:** Thank you, Jeff. I'm not sure what "consultative" means (laughter with a few suggestions offered simultaneously), but I thought I would say a few things and then maybe have Q&A to better handle issues that you want to discuss. And I thought I would handle a couple of, I think, very positive things like the quality of faculty.

First of all, we had lunches the last 2 days—no, not the last 2 days, the last week, the Provost and I with the Regent Faculty Award winners, and those lunches are good reminders of the outstanding work being done by the faculty here at the University of Northern Iowa. I'm a little disappointed that the Regents do not have the old routine of having these individuals recognized collectively with the other two Universities at an evening meal between the two days of the Regent meeting, but that was discontinued under Michael **Gartner**'s regime—tenure, I'm not sure what to call it. I'm not sure that's going to come back, but it was good to do that.

Secondly, as you know, the rankings of *U.S. News and World Report* got us back up to #2. That reflects the criteria that *U.S. News and World Report* uses, but I say that under all that is the quality of the faculty that makes it possible to get that ranking. And there are quite a few public universities in that Midwest Region. So it's not like 2 out of 5. It's probably 2 out of 46 or something like that. And so it's a significant accomplishment, and if we get rid of Truman State, we'll be #1.

**Male** voice: Let's change our name.

President **Allen**: Yeah. I know. Dan **Power**'s been working on that. (laughter) There is some issues about that transformational change they made down there with the name and their way of doing business.

Fund raising is moving forward. This economic climate is making it difficult, but as I said when I was Dean, "I never raised money, I collected money that faculty raised." There are exceptions to that sometimes when you have people who just randomly come in and drop money, but usually it's tied to some faculty member that—or maybe a group of faculty members—that treated this person very well, gave that person the first step in life so to speak, and to them. Or, they have confidence in the faculty and the programs that we have. And there's no doubt in my mind that Dick **Jacobson** gave the gift here for the Literacy Center because he had faith in the faculty in the literacy area.

And then what I've been hearing from the Provost on the Cornerstone courses is that that's been very, very well received, very positive, and I guess it will be evaluated, but the question might be “How do you scale that up moving forward, if the evaluations are going to be as positive as they appear to be?”

Second issue here, before I get to kind of the content that I want to focus on, trying to do a couple of things this year, both internally in terms of communications and externally in terms of advocacy for the University. The new Board leadership, hitting advocacy first, has had several discussions with us about not only allowing us to do more on our own, and we can talk about that if you want to, but expecting the Universities to take more of a leadership on advocating for their own University. It's been in the last 4 or 5 years done in a very unified, forward-driven approach. And so that was kind of the mindset of leadership, and I think they found out that we could do better with our legislators and others by having people at the University talk about UNI or Iowa State or Iowa, because we have more information, we have more passion, we have more context when we do go out and talk. So I think that is a positive, so we've developed a plan here. But one of those setbacks not planned was that Joe **Murphy** resigned. And Joe Murphy was our State Relations Officer, our--basically a lobbyist, and we are now in the process—the Board is in the process to try to find a replacement. Having said that, it's not completely into our hands yet, but we have a lot more freedom to do what we want to do to make our case.

Internally, and I talked to **Jeff** about this early on, about having these breakfasts that would have a context to it in terms of both Faculty Senate and P&S Council, that there will be questions that would be—great questions, the first ones that Faculty Senate gave us were too deep for one lunch, but they were very good. And I think that—at least I thought the first meeting went well. Maybe, **Jeff**, you have a different view on that.

**Funderburk:** I thought so, also.

President **Allen:** We had others there attending. We are going to have Town Hall meetings this year, and that will be based around topics that will

be, I'd hope, of interest and importance. I think we've actually scheduled one, but I'm not sure we've publicized it. We are still working out the details. But these will be throughout the year. October 13<sup>th</sup>, or something like that, is the first one. I think we'll try to do that late in the afternoon to the degree possible avoid these class conflicts. I don't have any details on this now.

And for right now, for those who have served on the Campus Advisory Group, I'm putting that on suspension right now just to see how this other system works, because we started getting less and less turnout for that last year.

So a couple things about the Board meetings: the last Board meeting, last Wednesday, and the next Board meeting. The next Board meeting is here at UNI, but the last Board meeting, the main thing that came out of that in terms of helping the University of Northern Iowa was the proposed legislation for UNI for a special \$4 million funding. So I want to put that in context. The basis of that really is that we have argued that we were treated unfairly. I mean, you look at what we were getting per student, in-state student in particular, since out-of-state students are supposed to be paying their total cost; in fact, they pay more in most cases. If you plan on a per-in-state-student, we were getting less than half of what Iowa was getting and about—a little bit better, relative to Iowa State, but—but yet when you looked at that, it was not seen as fair. Even if you adjust for different disciplines, even if you adjust for different missions, we—I don't think we argue we should be the same, but we couldn't believe that that difference was justified. And, we were actually building the initial arguments on that graph. In fact, I think the Provost sent that in to Michael **Gartner** early on in this, because Michael **Gartner** asked about this at an early meeting, and we can expect, or as you can expect, for some reason Iowa State and Iowa didn't like that graph. We need their support in this, so we backed off on that graph, but basically that was the push. Now we argue, and this is also true, that we were particularly hit hard by the cut in the budget. We get a bigger impact on—let me say this very precisely, for a certain percentage reduction in State funding, say 10%, that will lead to

ceteris paribus 5% reduction in our budget; for Iowa, ceteris paribus will lead to a 3% cut, just because of the nature of those costs or the revenue.

And then we argued that we are being penalized for serving Iowa students. So we went for the numbers. We went for emotion. We went for it all. (laughter by all) And I think all of those arguments—and then we said that we have a higher percentage of our students that stay in-state, so we educate students who then serve Iowa, and that's all true. We have 62% of our graduates who live in the State of Iowa. I think Iowa has about 34%, and so you look at those numbers. So, the good news is that we had to get through this process first to have any chance at all. But, as you know, there are many, many steps from here to getting it funded at the end of the legislative session in the Spring of 2012.

And so, getting back to the advocacy thing, I might be—I think a critical piece of this advocacy is the Faculty Senate. And so—and we are—I am meeting with the Speaker of the House on Friday. We met with the Governor already on this. So it's just a matter of trying to convince people that these arguments have merit. That we are treated—that we have unique issues here at UNI, and we'll see how that works.

We also put in money for a 4% inflation-type of increase. We had to say where we will spend that. We indicated undergraduate education was \$1 million, pre-K through 12 was \$1.4, and safety was about \$500,000. That's about \$2.9. We also asked, like we do every year and never get it, for money to cover salaries. Ten years ago and beyond, we used to get those. We were part of the State salary funding, but we haven't done that lately.

We also asked for economic development, because that was taken away, so we asked for that back. We get about \$500,000 for that operation. And we also are connected to an Iowa State-proposed funding for Ag and Bio-systems, and we have 4 or 5 pieces of that. So, if you add all that up, it looks pretty good, but the problem is keeping all that in there is going to be impossible. I'd like to keep the \$4 million of it, and it kind of depends upon how many people support us. But the Board of Regents supported this, and

Craig **Lang** went out on a limb and supported it again, and Dave **Miles** did. And so we got both the Democratic and Republican parts of the Board.

Now, moving forward, next month much earlier than last year we put in tuition proposals. Last year we did it in—what was it? In the Spring, right? (Provost **Gibson** agreed.) This is how much—this is done by the Board, but we kind of have input in the process, but the Board decides how much we will increase--or decrease—increase tuition. We are doing it differently this year from the last 2 years by moving it early. Parents have told us they want to know for budget planning, and it's a good argument. We waited the last couple of years because we kind of wanted to know what was the State going to do to us, because that would affect how much money we would need on the tuition side. And we also, at this same meeting in October, which will be here as I mentioned, will talk about our mandatory fees, which add up to about \$990, not insignificant. And our academic administrative fees, which is a separate set. And then the 3<sup>rd</sup> set is kind of what you find in your classrooms when test tubes break and things like that.

So all of that will be put together at one time in October, so it could be an interesting meeting, because the tuition is always of interest, even without Michael **Gartner** on the Board. And the mandatory fees are pretty high but less than what they have at Iowa State and Iowa. This year our mandatory fees we want to keep—this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> in 3 years of that technology fee increase, and so that bumps it up a little bit. So it will be interesting. The point is the tuition bump, what should it be? In-state and out-of-state. The Board does not care—I shouldn't say it this way—the Board is less concerned about what we charge out-of-state, if it is basically doing two things. It has to cover the total cost of education, at least the average. And secondly, the increase better be as large, if not larger, than the increase for in-state for political reasons. When we get into that in a little bit, I'll tell you more about that.

In-state is where they really focus their concern, because that's the group that they want to serve—you know, it protects them. So that is the number that right now is the same for all three Universities. Right now, Iowa has a

higher out-of-state tuition than we do. Iowa State is a little bit less than Iowa but more than us. But we are the same, notwithstanding the supplemental that each University has put in.

So one question for the Faculty Senate is “What do you want?” And by the process of the Board of Regents, we'll get input from the students, we'll get input from the Faculty Senate and P&S Council. Right now, though, what they are kind of—we don't know. Nothing is official. I'm glad the press is not here, or they'd run with this. Right now they are kind of using the mid-point as they normally do of the HEPI index, which is the Higher Education Price Index, and I think it's such a range, like 4.5 to 2.7. Anyway, they are using the 3.75 now as kind of a working number for such an increase for in-state. 3.75 But that is nothing in paper. That's just something which at least I thought we could put on the table to get reaction. And I want reaction to that, or **Gloria** needs to get that, but it's moving pretty quickly. In fact, I think we have to have our input in soon. Last time we had until 3 or 4 months. This year it's moving much faster.

FY12 Budget. I can stop there. That's this year. It is--I think most of you know that it came out originally at 3.6 deficit--\$3.6 million deficit based upon the enrollment of 13,350. That is a number that we didn't reach on enrollment, and so the estimated deficit is larger than that. The numbers are still coming, but it's going to look more like 4.5 or 4.6 total—not additional but total. But we have been looking at how to solve that extra piece in the last couple of weeks. I'll quit there and attempt to answer any questions.

**Funderburk:** Questions? Senator **Dolgener**.

**Dolgener:** I think I heard you right when you said that the special funding for UNI that's being proposed is \$4 million, but yet like last week in the Courier on the front page they were identifying \$12 million. Is there—what's--what's the difference?

President **Allen:** Well, I say \$4 million because I want to try to get the \$4 million first. It's a 3-year deal.

**Dolgener:** Oh, ok, yeah, right. \$4 million for each.

President **Allen:** Each year is an additional \$4 million. And it is not one-time money. I should make that clear, if we get it, is to put it at the base of our budget, so if we got that build-up each year, it would be \$12 million. It would be obviously very helpful.

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

**DeBerg:** Well, does knowing that whether or not we'll get this 4—this additional appropriation go into the last budget negotiations in this Legislature again? I mean, is this when we will know? Is the special request?

President **Allen:** The \$4 million?

**DeBerg:** Yeah. Does that—will that go through the entire fiscal cycle?

President **Allen:** Yeah. I think—and who knows how this is going to come out? I think the—it's important that we get some appreciation for our challenge here from the Governor because if this is in his budget, it sure helps, first of all. I'm not saying it will be, but it will help. We clearly have some—the Senate is going to take on a different mix maybe this year now with that change in Cedar Rapids.

**DeBerg:** Swadi

President **Allen:** Yeah, Swadi going to that position, and so before I'd say, “Well, we would have to convince Michael **Gronstal** that this is necessary.” Senator **Gronstal**, the Majority Leader. Now it means that will be more complicated if the fact that the Democrats lose that seat, which we will find out in a little bit. So far there are more Democrats than Republicans. We won't know until the end, and I hope the European mess is done by then. I hope the stock market is stronger. I hope tax revenues are stronger, because all those will be used to say, “Well, we'd like to help you, but we don't have the resources.”

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

**Smith:** Yes. You mentioned the *U.S. News* rankings where we moved up to #2, where we'd been previously, I know. The Provost has suggested at one point that we should be #1. I would like to be #1, and I'm wondering what do you think this University would have to do differently or better to be #1 in those rankings?

President **Allen:** We probably could almost simulate that. You probably would do it better than I am. I mean, the University of Iowa does that on the MBA program. They basically have a consulting service, "Ok, you tell me what you want to be, and we'll tell you how to get there." Because it is all based on 6 or 7 criteria. I think what we have to do is reject more people. I mean, if you really—and so how do you generate a lot of applications that you can reject? (light laughter)

**DeBerg:** Well, then that's it.

**Smith:** All right, then, back to the rankings. How can we be a better University?

President **Allen:** Ok. What they did there, as you might know, first of all they—I don't know how they did this, but somebody might know—how they got the State of Missouri to make them a very selective University. I mean, their ACT score—I think, I may be wrong—is 27-28, and so that is—and if you knew that school before that, it was a different type of institution, so it was amazing how they got that. They changed the name. And that's why Dan **Power** keeps seeking to have us change our name because having a region—I mean a direction is probably not the best for us. But I think they did it with, first of all, changing the nature of the students. I think, **Jerry**, and I think they—they probably—probably have done some things on the curriculum side. I just don't know. Maybe others do. I think they have a strong Liberal Arts Core that--that's very important to them.

**Gibson:** Strong assessments. Very strong assessments.

President **Allen**: Strong assessments.

**DeBerg**: Well, they shrank. And there is no Division I athletics there. So, it's like really focused on being a really great liberal arts school. That's where its money goes. They got permission not only to be more selective but to be smaller.

President **Allen**: And then both of those might be tough. Probably better—it's harder for this State to say to be more selective. University of Iowa wants to be more selective. And if we said that we want to be that, I can see University of Iowa saying, “No, we are.” You know, if you look at their professional schools, both undergraduate and graduate, they view themselves as being very selective. We tried to be smaller. But they probably would try to take the argument of being selective. It would be an interesting conversation to have with what legislators'd say, “We want to be more elitist.” It's hard to make that case.

**Jurgenson**: But there would go your argument that you're serving Iowa students.

President **Allen**: Yeah. Yeah. If we get the \$4 million, that argument will go.

**Funderburk**: Next question? Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg**: If there are no others—so I know that this was talked about over lunch, but what's going to happen to our Enrollment Management Division to kick up our recruiting effort? I think the problem is with our budget, one of them is that we fell behind on the enrollment projections. So, what—what changed? I mean, you run the Enrollment Management Team, so you're the right person to ask.

President **Allen**: Well, I think 2 things. One is we have to find out precisely what happened this year? And I think those data are not yet in. But I do know that for some reason, at least on the transfer students from the community colleges, I think we'll see that we got a slippage, and Iowa State

particularly had an increase. So the question—and if we had those students, we'd be where we ought to be. So, first of all, why did that happen with all community colleges? And did we do something differently this year or did they do something differently? No, Greg **Geoffroy**, who is President at Iowa State, tells me almost all of his increases are in engineering. We can't offer engineering, but my guess is that the community college students are going to a more diverse set of majors. I don't want to be stereotyping, but I just think that's probably the case. We have got to drill down first of all to what happened this year? Short term perceptions. If we got the wrong people there, or we don't have enough people there, or did we say something? So, one thing that Terry **Hogan** and I plan to do is to visit—once we identify—oh, first of all where—I mean, where did we slip? Not only community college but was it DMACC? Was it Kirkwood? Was it NIACC? And if we can get—if it's not across the board, it's only 3 or 4 of those schools, I'm going to meet that president and say, “By the way, we noticed that we slipped here. What happened? Did we do something? Or how can we better serve you to get that back?” And I hope they would be forthcoming. They threatened me before, so they usually are pretty forthcoming, the community college presidents. (light laughter)

In the long-run, that's a great question **Betty**—I think in the long run, there is a question about how do we position this University for—now, I've said, and you can disagree with this—I've said we should be about 14,000 based on the infrastructure that we have here. We could argue a little bit more, a little bit less, and we are at 13,200, so about 800. But the question is our biggest competitor, based upon marketing studies, is Iowa State. And so how do we position this University, relative first of all to that major competitor, and so do we do a price elasticity study that if we lowered our price, but I'm still a little concerned about that because I'd rather drop the discount price and not the list price, because some people still pay the list price, and so if it's a matter of pricing, we probably need some help on examining that. Maybe our good friends in the College of Business—if we need some—in terms of an elasticity studies?

I think we need to know about are we—the Provost can speak to her efforts on international—but what are we doing on out-of-state students, and

what's our upside of that? Now, quite honestly I don't think our upside is going to be doubling our percentage of out-of-state students. First of all, everybody wants out-of-state students. But I think, are we doing the right things in terms of our placement of—there's a lot of strategies there, maybe you are going to say, and it is a very big decision, for the State population is going to go down for another 3 or 4 years, and when it turns back up, it's not going to look like the population that we left because it's going to be a much more diverse. It's no longer compared with that. It's really what keeps me awake at night right now. It's on the enrollment because that's—we get 46%, 47% from the State now and 52% or 51%, and another 2% in there somewhere, from tuition. So we have to act a little bit more like a private school and really know how the price to market have to do with admissions. I do know there are some things in admissions that Iowa State—I'm not going to go into details on this—that Iowa State does that we don't do that might at the margin have parents say, “I'm ready to go to Iowa State.” And at the margin could be for 150 students. That's what we didn't get. So there's some processes I think we need to look at beside our admissions. The applications were up this year. Conversion from application to admission to matriculation went down. So the question is, “Why is that?”

**Funderburk: Senator Terlip**

**Terlip:** This is very extremely anecdotal, but I have twins who are getting ready to make a decision to go to school next year. They are seniors, and Iowa State has probably contacted them personally at least 5 or 6 more times than UNI. I mean, the recruiting process is very, very different, and I really think that's something that we might look at. They get personal calls, personal e-mails, some hard mail, but it—I mean, it's 2 or 3 times. And I don't know if it's a budget issue here or not, but it's a different strategy.

President **Allen:** Let me tell you what I know about Iowa State. I've been gone for 5 years, and after this special appropriations, I don't particularly answer phones anymore (light laughter), but about 9 years ago the President increased dramatically the budget for Admissions and for Marketing, intentionally. And they use a firm in Des Moines basically for

most of their marketing. Their Admissions is marketed very good, so.....but certain Colleges at Iowa State they have a very aggressive phone calling—I'm not sure which Colleges you are hearing from.

**Terlip:** Well, I've got one going into sciences and one who wants to do education actually.

**President Allen:** Yeah, Education is where they do it. It used to be the College of Family and Consumer Science. But it--that's where they used to have faculty calling students. “What can I do? Can I answer your questions?” I mean it was not hard sell, but it was a reaching out to—and I'm not sure how they got faculty to do that or which faculty did it. But that was one College. The other College was Agriculture at that time. Now Agriculture has more students than they know what to do with, but those 2 Colleges had faculty—and with that new budget model there. That budget model says, if you don't have the students, you don't get the money. So my guess is that might have encouraged others to do that. But I think you are right. We have some also anecdotal evidence that indicate that ISU—I don't know about Iowa—but ISU is more responsive to applicants or to a visitor than we were. And we have to figure out why is that the case? Is it resources? Is it process? Is it....so.....but the reaching out by phone calls is something which I think has been effective for certain Colleges at Iowa State.

**Terlip:** But it's e-mail, and they get handwritten notes, and I mean it's—it's different than either Iowa or--you know

**Funderburk:** I'm sure, that's the way it's done by the School of Music here. I wanted to point out that I spend an awful lot of my time doing that.  
Senator **Peters.**

**Peters:** I just wanted to--following up on that, I know that Iowa State is also particularly aggressive at getting financial aid offers out very, very soon, and that maybe there was a hiccup on that last year on our part. Is there any truth to that? That there were problems with financial aid?

President **Allen**: I don't know if it was a hiccup. We've never had it. What they do at Iowa State, one of the reasons for it, in 3 days you get a tentative approval on admission and financial aid. Now, the risk you run there is not much except for the fact that you may find out that—the person who does the follow-up may have some problems, but if you misstate financial aid, then you have to kind of backtrack or find other money to put that in there, and they have a much larger resource set aside to kind of act as a reserve. But wouldn't that be pretty impressive if you were a parent and say, “Well, you were admitted and you can get this much financial aid,” and knew that before the week's over?

**DeBerg**: All the privates do that, too.

President **Allen**: So, I think that's one thing we talked about already that we have to, if we're playing in that league, as we are, then we have to do that.

**DeBerg**: They have been talking about this for years, though, getting the financial aid out. I don't know why it doesn't happen.

President **Allen**: The other thing is financial aid set aside. Cost of going to Iowa State and Iowa is less than it is to go here. I mean, we have the same in-state tuition, but they have more set aside money, in particular to get out-of-state students. Their defacto price of going to school is less. Now we could—if you set aside—we set aside 18%. It's mandated 15. Iowa State's about 24 now. I think Iowa is about the same. And so how do we get that all into the mix to say we are going to be competitive on pricing? Per thousand for in-state it's all the same list price, because there is some aspect of what I call conspicuous consumption on education that price and quality are correlated. And so if you say, well, we are charging 2% less and 5% less, I think it is a difficult message to countervail.

**DeBerg**: I agree. I agree.

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

**Swan:** So, I'm not quite sure how to ask this, but I know that I and lots of my colleagues want to hear from the President something about this. So, on this campus, and you are in charge of it, there are lots of ways that we can become smaller, and one is to, you know, shrink non-academic enterprises and allocate those resources to academic enterprises. And so how is the President's Office and what you are doing to decide what UNI should be, because some faculty may want much more academics, but there's other things that go into consideration. We say, ok, we're not just fighting, but we want to know, well, why are we deciding to engage these other non-academic enterprises, especially in ways that don't seem to enhance the academic enterprises? Why are we doing this? Are we shrinking that? What is the Presidential thinking right now on that?

President **Allen:** On the auxiliaries?

**Swan:** We could talk about auxiliaries, if we like that language.

President **Allen:** It kind of depends on how you do view this University and what's the impact if you make changes in those areas. If we were not a residential campus, and we are, my view might be different on many aspects, including the Gallagher-Bluedorn, including athletics, including all those things that add to the total student experience. And we aren't online. I've got to say that we aren't. I mean, we are still a face-to-face on campus—what percent of our students live in the dorms or residence halls, as we call them today? Forty per cent? Something like that. It's pretty high. And so, the first question I'm having is, do we view our University being in that same model moving forward? If you view it becoming much more online, much more serving non-traditional students, then I would say some of the auxiliaries would have a different need to me.

The second aspect, and I don't know if we can argue this all day, is what is the value of having these other entities on the bottom line? In other words, we know what the cost is of having auxiliaries and athletics and whatever you might consider not necessary for academics. And Truman State did probably the best. They went from this to something totally different in transformation. You are just going to have to look at that. If

we lose 1,000 students for any reason—I'm not saying we would—but if we lose 1,000, then we'd be back in the same financial situation we are now. We wouldn't have any more resources to focus on academics, notwithstanding athletics. The question is how many people would not be here if you didn't have some of these auxiliaries? Say, the climbing wall. I didn't have a climbing wall when I was in college. (laughter) But who wants to go first on that? Who says, “Ok, we won't have a climbing wall?” We should find out, does Truman State have a climbing wall? (laughter)

**Male** voice: They have 3 climbing walls. (more laughter)

President **Allen**: I think those plans that we have, including our 5-year plan as undergraduates, is somewhat of a statement on direction. Pre-K to 12 is somewhat of a statement. But I'm not sure we said in that plan, except the fact that we have learning outcomes, what this will look like in 10 years. Quite honestly, that's what keeps me awake the most. Where do we fit in in the marketplace of higher education in all the changes? With all the new players who don't care about our values, they don't have to, how do we compete in that environment? And should we be where we are now, at a niche, saying we are a residential? Or do we say we got to first go online? And then push online? All this other stuff, if online why do all that other stuff? I personally think online is not the right way to go. But maybe a blend of it is or something. But it's a good question, and the thinking is basically based on the 5-year plan, try to keep in sync with it. It's discussions we had—it's really the question that **Keith** raised at the luncheon.

**Swan**: Can I follow-up on that? So, it's not so much that some of these other enterprises might not be good and valuable to have in some fashion. Just maybe not to the degree or the league that we currently have. That we can have then replace the 1,000 students we might lose if we change things with another 1,000 who would be participating in some different league, some different manner. They don't need the national touring of Gallagher-Bluedorn. They could have local productions. Indeed, it would be great if we had our faculty, our staff, visiting artists, etc., using this facility. The students using it. That would

draw a whole set of students who are not drawn to seeing national tour. I find it also, myself, perhaps just wrongly, hard to believe that any student comes here for the national tour. And so we could—the other enterprises could exist but in a different way and attract a different 1,000 students to worry about those who—is that the thinking gone on at the Presidential level?

**President Allen:** Well, we have thought about that at the mandate of the Board of Regents to some degree last year. We might recall the amount of general funds going to athletics. And I said, “Well, we should make all the auxiliaries under the same analysis, which they did.” And, of course, if you didn't have Gallagher-Bluedorn, we'd still have Gallagher-Bluedorn. If we didn't have athletics, we'd still have the McLeod Center. It's a financial commitment, but we wouldn't have people using it. And so it's really difficult to extract the financial piece independent of the vision that you want to set for the University. There are other pieces that are not tied to facilities, but those are some of the things you have to consider. I don't know if your model would work or not. It depends. I still think that the best way to build student interest here is to make sure that we have high-quality programs. And then I think you have to take the risk of identifying certain subsets of those that you really market, because people more and more out-of-state are going off rankings and such.

**Gibson:** Do you think you can tackle one more?

**President Allen:** Oh, yeah.

**Funderburk:** I was just going to say I think your time is about up. Senator **DeBerg.**

**DeBerg:** Well, the reason—your use of the Dome and McLeod Center to justify Division I athletics is one of the reasons that I had this motion today that we don't—we don't remodel West Gym for wrestling. That ties us with space to a team that's not a conference team. Its Booster Club is not in NCAA compliance right now. I mean, why would you want to take a building in the center of campus where everything academic is and devote

it to what I think is a really marginal athletic enterprise here? I don't—and then you could argue, “Well, we've remodeled West Gym; we can't get rid of wrestling.” I mean, it's a circular kind of self-serving argument, I think, the space argument.

President **Allen**: Yeah, and you go back—and I'm not defending athletics based on facilities. I'm saying you can't extract the cost or at least all of the cost by eliminating athletics or other auxiliaries. And you can't—if you have a debt service on that for another unfortunately 25 or 20 years. I think the West Gym question happens to be valid.

**DeBerg**: Yes, it is. Thank you.

President **Allen**: And I'm not sure if that's much use academically though.

**DeBerg**: Oh, yeah, with remodels.

President **Allen**: I mean, you got to keep in mind that it is very energy inefficient. The floor collapsed last year because of a concert on it. And so I think we have to be careful about investing money in that for any purpose.

**DeBerg**: Ok. Well, especially wrestling.

President **Allen**: And, again, I'm not

**DeBerg**: Well, then why is Troy **Dannen** out promising the Panther Wrestling Club that he is going to work on this? I don't understand how policy gets made here. Does Troy **Dannen** make building policy? How does that happen?

President **Allen**: No, that's not making policy.

**DeBerg**: Ok. So he lied to the Panther Wrestling Club?

President **Allen**: He was afraid they'd beat him up. (laughter)

**DeBerg:** Well, here it is in the press. I mean, I didn't make this up. It's in the paper. I don't know how policy is set here then.

**Funderburk:** Ok. I think we are at time. We're at 4:00 o'clock. Thank you very much for coming in and offering us an opportunity to talk about many of these things.

President **Allen:** One thing we do—if you could talk about the 3.75. Again, it's not the proposed tuition, but it's something we need reaction to. You might think it should be 6% or 2%, but we need some type of feedback this Friday, I think.

**Funderburk:** Right away. Thank you very much. (applause) Ok. We're at the top of the Agenda now.

#### COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

##### **COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON**

Provost Gloria **Gibson** had no comments.

##### **COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON**

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson:** Just a comment. I had a request to warn early the Committee that decides who gets awards, the recipients. That Committee, however, is reformed each year and probably won't be able to do anything until Spring. So we have been asked to also consider the awards for the University Book and Supply. So we need to get a member on that Committee from the University Senate. There was someone. Who was on it last year?

**Terlip:** Me.

**Jurgenson:** Ok. So that's really the only thing. It may be out of order, but.....

**Funderburk:** I have it in my comments also, so that's good. Vice-Chair **Breitbach**.

#### COMMENTS FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

**Breitbach:** I actually have an item that's been docketed with respect to the Committee on Committees, so I could—I could reserve my comments until then.

**Funderburk:** Ok. Very good.

#### COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Chair **Funderburk:** I've got a few items to go through. Part of it is just to bring up to speed on where we are on some things.

I was actually surprised and fairly overwhelmed at your response for volunteers for the Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee. And I'm actually serious. It's the first committee I've ever heard of where I could have formed 2, so I'm actually turning people away for this. I don't understand. You did understand this is not for pay? (laughter) So, as I understand it, I could appoint that committee and don't need—I'll just inform you that Karen **Breitbach**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Jesse **Swan**, and Scott **Peters** are going to take charge of that and run forward.

Phil **East**, who was also on it initially, is going to now be helping--after meeting with the Provost, we're doing some additional upgrades and reworking on the website, and **Phil** has agreed to kind of use his computer chops to help us get that in order this year, so he will be working with that.

I've been putting a lot of you to work lately. Chris **Neuhaus**—I also want to let you know that we have identified funding, and the Library under Cynthia **Coulter**'s area will be digitizing—working to digitize as much of the last 10 years of Minutes and supporting materials as possible this year, for completion by the end of the year. And that will be searchable and available on our website, which is why we also wanted Senator **East** to be

involved in that part, to make sure it all actually works together after we get all this money spent and these things done.

Then the Regents Award Committee, I understand Senator **Terlip** did it last year and is willing to serve again, barring someone wanting to duke it out for that position. So I'm going to do this out of order so they can actually get something done about this. Are there other nominees for that position, or is there general acclamation that we can have Senator **Terlip** do this one more time? If there are no nominations and no shaking of heads, then thank you Senator **Terlip**. (applause)

**Terlip:** It's just a bunch of files to read.

**Breitbach:** It is. It really is. It's interesting to read the files.

**Funderburk:** Now, unfortunately the enthusiasm for committee work has not spread to the Facilities Planning Committee that I mentioned. We have had one person involved here do it, but Senator **Breitbach** is on that committee as well, and her term officially expires this year. It would be best for the Senate if the other senator could have a term that expires maybe in 2 or 3 years, so ideally somebody who is either in their first or second year on the committee. It only meets once a month.

**DeBerg:** When does it meet?

**Breitbach:** Thursday afternoons from 3:30 until 5:00, and they provide cookies. (laughter in appreciation)

**Funderburk:** And it basically meets on the Thurs—most of the time on the Thursday closest to the 20<sup>th</sup> of the month.

**Breitbach:** One Thursday a month, the third usually.

**Robert-Dobie:** Does that also have input on to what happens to the West Gym?

**DeBerg:** Yes, it would. And I

**Breitbach:** We are—we have to keep in mind that this particular Committee is an Advisory Committee only, so the—we advise. It does go up to the President's Cabinet, and, you know, there are times when they don't take our advice, so.... But it is very, very interesting. I—I love seeing some of the plans, the future plans that they have for the campus, and, you know, where the—where the group gets to see the floor plans for the renovations on campus. And other ideas come to us, and I very much have enjoyed being on that Committee. I've done it—this is my third time, my third stint over the years, so you would enjoy it.

**Funderburk:** Given that lavish endorsement, I would be willing to accept anybody's self-nomination from the floor at this time.

**Breitbach:** They are really good cookies. (laughter)

**Funderburk:** If not, at least if we could get someone. We have a bit of time in that the next meeting is October 20<sup>th</sup>, so if you would at least consider it, we do need to get a person on that Committee.

**Roberts-Dobie:** Jeff, am I eligible for that because I'm only here in place of **Chris**, so I don't think I'm eligible, am I?

**Funderburk:** Probably not, unless you were willing to do it thereby committing **Chris** to it.

**Roberts-Dobie:** Well, I can't commit **Chris** beyond...

**Male voice:** Well, we'll let you on it. (laughter)

**Robert-Dobie:** But I could—I could ask **Chris** if he is interested in being on it.

**Funderburk:** That would be ideal.

**Breitbach:** It would be nice to have another female, even if only for a little while. (laughter and joking all around about this and Chris/Christine)

**Roberts-Dobie:** I will ask **Chris** if I and then he.

**DeBerg:** And I would self-nominate so we have an election.

**Funderburk:** Ok.

**Roberts-Dobie:** I will bring that to the next meeting.

**Funderburk:** Very good. Excellent. We have some dates for the next Leadership Breakfasts. I'm just going to let you know when the next one is. I think I've had confirmation from everyone who at this point. The next one is October 14<sup>th</sup>. Senator **Swan**, Senator **Roth**, Senator **Van Wormer**, and Senator **Breitbach** is going to substitute for me as I'm out of town that day. The key thing there is we need to refresh our question database, and basically the way these are working this year, if you come up with a question that would be appropriate, if you'll just fire it to me at any time, I'm keeping a folder up, and so that when we get close I can do like we did last time, send it out and have us decide via e-mail what we believe is the most pertinent at the moment to ask. I can't recall if I did this or if you want me to. Did I share the questions from the P&S Council with you? (Several "no's") Ok, because we—we did not get them in advance last time. I could share those. I found it interesting because at least one of the questions was one of the ones that was very close to us asking in the first place. So that kind of worked out pretty well as it turned out. So I'll send that e-mail so you can see what they were asking as well.

I need to get a sense of the Senate on something here. Vice President **Hogan**, following that breakfast and following our questions regarding enrollment and impacts of our enrollment being lower than projected, offered that if there was interest and if the Senate had questions that he would be willing to come to the Senate in a consultative session to discuss any issues and take any questions, if we felt that that was something we would want to do at this time. I think mostly I'm just going to throw this

out here, and if you feel that this is something we should do, send a note on e-mail. I think that should be our easiest way.

**Breitbach:** I would like to suggest that perhaps we could share his analysis of our enrollment.

**Funderburk:** I did send that out.

**Breitbach:** Ok, and then perhaps people have questions about that that would focus his comments.

**Funderburk:** And his was not time sensitive. He just said to let us know that at any time he was willing to come in and discuss this with us. So if something comes up later, just know that that's—that's available to us. And with the newest charge that we just did—just got, which is on having comments on the 3.75% working tuition increase, we have 20 minutes before our next speaker, so I'm not sure we can do much on that right here, but it's probably the sort of thing we should ponder a bit and take full advantage of the ONLYSenatorsONLY mailing list, and I'll send another note and just kind of tickling the brains, saying, "Ok, please give some feedback." And if you will, do a "Reply to All" so we can all see what's going on. Yes, Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Point of order. I assume Sue Grosboll would have told you, but she is ill today and won't be able to be here.

**Funderburk:** No, she has not told me that. So that is good. That would explain the non-answer to my e-mail, however. Well, now that I realize we have more time, although we still have more than enough to do today, we can do more of the discussion of that if people feel like they are ready to respond on the 3.75. Senator **Swan**.

**Swan:** Ok, so I would like to add the question about that for our response. It's not just the response that we think it's an appropriate level or not; it's what kind of responses is President **Allen** looking for? For instance, one response I could have is to say, "No, I want 0% tuition and \$500 million to

give for tuition coverage.” I mean, I have other ideas about covering the tuition, indeed lowering it. I'm not sure what kind of response the Faculty Senate is supposed to give. If 3.75 sounds like it's not so terrible, just as a number, but I know that it is. For poor lower-middle class/middle class lowans, this is really profound. But, I mean, the President knows that. I mean, so I'm not sure what kinds of responses from the Faculty Senate, and I wonder if you knew them.

**Funderburk:** I'll be honest. This is the first I've heard of this number is here also, so I need to digest it some myself. (Turning to the Provost) I don't know if you have any sense.....

Provost **Gibson:** The 3.75 is what is probably going to be proposed. And so I think **Ben** just wants to get a sense of what your ideas are about that. And it's based, as he said, I mean, I don't need to repeat what he said....but do you feel that it's too high? Do you feel that it's just about right? I mean, so it's just to—I mean he is required to discuss this with each of the units across campus, so he will be having a meeting with the students, P&S, Senate.

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

**DeBerg:** I think 3.75 is too high. I have students whose parents are so poor their parents can't co-sign a loan for them. I've had more students unable to buy their textbooks at the beginning of the semester. I mean we're at a kind of crisis level for people living below and right above the poverty level here with just more and more lowans. So I think that is too much. I'm not in favor of something as high as 3.75.

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

**Swan:** So then I would say that I would really like the President and the Board of Regents to explore alternatives to tuition to increasing funding. So that's, you know, another response. Whatever that is—I don't know—so that we don't have to always be increasing. And it's not just tax dollars, as just lots of politicians are pointing out. There are creative other ways of

trying to increase finances, and I would like to encourage that that be pursued even more vigorously than it has been, knowing full well that it is being pursued vigorously now.

**Funderburk:** I mean, I think we kind of have this discussion, but I do think that there would be benefit, based on from what I understood him to say, we need to respond by Friday about this, and the way our system works when we are doing things in here through Minutes, it will be a week even before we have Minutes approved let alone. So, if we are doing something on the ONLYSenatorsONLY list as follow through, I doubt that we'll actually have a document but at least present to him saying "Here are some of the comments back." I think it was here and then over there (indicating next speakers).

**Swan:** Addressing that, the point of—because we are in your Comments right now—is that I feel very confident that you hear me, that you take notes, you get the notes, and you represent these responses to the President in this way that will eventually show themselves in Minutes.

**Funderburk:** Right.

**Swan:** So I think that will be a very good way to handle it.

**Funderburk:** Certainly whatever I send him you will be copied on, so that you can see it.

**Swan:** And you are the spokesperson for the Senate, so that's good.

**Funderburk:** Senator **DeBerg** and then **Bruess**.

**DeBerg:** Well, another option is to say, "We can't respond in 4 days. Why not give us some notice? We'll make a report next year with some notice." I mean, what's this you have 4 days kind of business? I mean, I--I feel like saying, "Well, we don't—we can't get a—we can't get a response ready for you in 4 days. Sorry."

**Gibson:** Well, one of the time constraints is the Board meeting.

**DeBerg:** Yeah, but we knew about the Board meeting how long ago? And the Board meeting doesn't—the Board doesn't surprise us with Minutes of meetings. So, you know, we could have been asked for this a month ago and had some time to put it together.

**Gibson:** Well, as **Ben** said, that the Board usually considers tuition in the Spring, and so now that we—he said, we want it—we want it now—we want to do it this Fall.

**DeBerg:** So you found out about it last week?

**Gibson:** We just found out that there was going to be a—I mean, it's usually in the Spring, and so now they want it in the Fall, and that's helpful for parents so that the, as he said, so that they can budget, so

**Swan:** And that's a good response. I want to say that this change has caused a difficulty with the Senate, but that's find to register that that is one of the main responses.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Peters** and then Senator **Wurtz**.

**Peters:** I just had a question to clarify that maybe Provost **Gibson** can answer. Is—are we wedded to that figure once we propose it? I mean, so it--it

**Gibson:** The 3.75?

**Peters:** Yeah.

**Gibson:** Ultimately, that's the Board's decision. I mean, so we can—we can say we agree with it. We can say we don't agree with it. I mean, so what **Ben** will do is get the response from each of the groups. I mean, and he's always very in tune with what the students are going to recommend, and—and again he will pass that on to the Board, but ultimately it's the Board's decision.

**Peters:** Is--is the Board actually deciding in its next meeting this is what the tuition increase will be?

**Gibson:** They have—have to—there have to be two meetings, and the tuition is decided at the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, so the—this is the first of those 2 meetings.

**Funderburk:** Time to allow for public comment.

**Gibson:** Yes.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Wurtz** and then Senator **Breitbach**.

**Wurtz:** I think it is really important that in this discussion of setting tuition we don't lose sight of the topic that came up some time ago, and that's the student debt load. Our students are graduating with incredible amounts of debt, and that just really frightens me. I know that there were efforts to look into it to figure out why the lowan students are leading the nation in student debt. I hope that that as a topic of interest and inquiry has not been lost.

**Funderburk:** I will comment on that directly in that I read something when I was reading stuff trying to stay awake during the Board of Regents meeting (laughter)

**Breitbach:** Don't put that in the Minutes (laughing).

**Funderburk:** You can put it in there (laughing). It was actually showing that the student debt level on average had come down a notch, and I've been wanting to go back and look at that myself sometime soon. Senator **Breitbach** and then Senator **East**.

**Breitbach:** I'm, as a parent, trying desperately to help my children not contribute to that, but it is very disheartening when the increase in tuition for the 2 children that I have in college right now—just the increase in tuition is greater than my increase in salary. That—that's a major ouch, and that's happened for several years now. I'm also thinking about parents who

aren't as lucky as I am who are trying to set aside money to help their children down the road. What they are investing now and the greater return on that investment is not going to keep up, by any means, with the increase in tuition that we are seeing and have seen. So it's not just parents now. But it's—it's Scott, you in a couple years, you know. It's **Laura** next year. It's all parents who are trying desperately to help their children get a solid education, and—and not leave after 4 years and be in debt. So, I would like to see that increase more in line with the cost of living—the average cost of living here in the state of Iowa, for working class parents especially.

**East:** I'm—I don't like these kinds of questions. I—I think the Senate has little information to base anything on, so this is pretty much an opinion. Everybody speaks their opinion, and I—I dislike us to do that. It seems to me that—that we need to have a little more knowledge before we—in order to do this, to have any kind of reasonable effectiveness, we need more knowledge, and it seems to me that comes in one of two ways. Either we get a committee that deals with these kinds of things, and they stay up on it, and—and--and get a sense of the Senate, and—and--and try—and sort of try to follow those things and make recommendations for us, or we gain access to information, and I think this would be a good idea—idea, too. I don't think that our University or our Board of Regents either one—at--at least I'm not aware of it, and maybe it's just because of ignorance on my part, I understand that decisions like this—that the—the results or the actual decision is publicized, but a rationale for the decision is not. At least—and so if we had a history of the last X years, knowing a rationale for the decision rather—other than “Oh, it's kind of in the middle of the NAE or whatever statistics,” that would be a good thing to have. And I—I think that absent either of those things that anybody who receives our, or some other reasonable facsimile—anybody that receives our input is just getting a set of 20 pieces of opinion, and that's all it is. It's opinion-based on, “I have a job. I want more money.” “I have a student. I want them to pay less money.” And so it is very frustrating.

**Gibson:** If I could just add a bit. That is also, if you go back and look at the Minutes of the Board of Regents meetings, previous meetings, they also

have the same sorts of debate. And, as I'm sure you know, the—there—there's--there has not been unanimous agreement that there should be an increase in student tuition, so when the Board discusses this, they do exactly what you are doing now. They say, “I think that it should be raised for these reasons.” “I think that it should not be raised for these reasons.” So—so what—so this discussion is in line with the discussion that we sit through at the Board of Regents meetings.

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

**Boody:** Thank you. I can't disagree with the comments that tuition is too high, debt load is too high, and students pay too much. I have several children either in or going into college myself. On the other hand, when we throw out the faculty and staff side, is President **Allen** told the Regents 2 months ago that we were going to get rid of 100 staff this year. If we start cutting tuition down, it's going to be 100 next year, too. Because that's perhaps how we are filling the hole right now on the lack of money from the State, and our guaranteed raises through the Union contract is by raising tuition each year. It's right in the Regents' Minutes. So we're saying it's, you know, where the gap is and..... (?)

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

**Neuhaus:** Well, my concern is--and I guess I've got a question first maybe--maybe Provost **Gibson** would know. Is this—is this a—a decision—I mean, it's a decision everybody is pondering at every university or all the Regents' Universities. Well, if we all decide to raise tuition that much more, and we keep doing that, from what President **Allen** has already said, we're the ones that are going to hurt the most. Iowa and Iowa State have other ways of cushioning that blow. You know, we could raise it up a little bit, and here's a little bit more aid. So every time we go up another notch, I see UNI getting hit worse than the other two. On the other hand, how do we not go along with them at the same time? It's like, do you want to call the bluff? Do you want to say we're the first one to charge a little bit less, and then you could have a downward spiral, and that could go the wrong way, too. I think the real problem we have right now is unless UNI somehow

distinguishes itself in a financial way, something that either attracts more students with more money or less students with more money, unless we're—we become different, this—this is just a game then, you know. I don't know. Should we try it up a little bit? Should be try it down a little bit? But in the end I feel this is a losing game for us, you know. So—so if we said 3.5 or just 3, I think regardless, we're—we're--we're going to lose in the long run on that. Short term, who knows?

**Funderburk:** As no one has the floor, I--I will make the one comment I would have—is I—I feel like I would like to see any tuition increase, if there is one, matched with a comparable or larger percentage increase in financial aid to the students coming in. At some point that balance has to start going into this more directly than it does sometimes. (Another very quiet number of words—perhaps an aside.)

**DeBerg:** I agree with you, **Jeff**.

**Swan:** **Jeff**, so that was what I was—I mean, one of the things I was trying to indicate, that there are alternative means of supply in the financing for the students as well. There are schools that have extraordinarily high tuition at—for which no student pays it, him- or herself. There—there are funds, campaigns and this sort of thing. There are other things that Boards of Trustees do for univer—colleges and universities they are responsible for other than charging individual student tuition, even as the tuition goes up much more—to be at a higher level than we have it. And that's what I encourage the Board of Regents to do.

**Funderburk:** Senator **East**

**East:** I would like to reiterate I think a comment I—I made last year. Have--have we pursued or is it possible to pursue differentiated tuition. I know a college that this is—has done that with their majors, but it seems to me that we're spending that. We do have some students who hang around and--and take lots more hours, so it—it--has there been—is there any possibility or thought to giving—charging students tuition additional—the cost of—of--the full cost of tuition or of instruction after they've taken 150 hours or—or some number of hours beyond (a bit of laughter). No. I'm

serious. They—they--I mean, they choose double majors or triple majors or 5 extra endorsements on their teaching degree, and—and they pay 50% of the instruction for it. And, I mean—I--I think—I don't think we should force students to be right and take only 120 hours, but I—I think at some point in time they—they--we shouldn't subsidize—the State should not subsidize students' exploration of what they want to do when they grow up.

**Funderburk:** Ok, we have Senator **Wurtz**, Senator **Terlip**, Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Smith**.

**Wurtz:** I'm all in favor of pay-by-the-hour rather than pay-per-semester, that students would not register for such huge amounts—that it's coursework that they really can't do well because they feel like they are getting a bargain if they don't.

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

**Terlip:** Yeah, this is a long time ago when President **Koob** was here, I was on a task force that ran various models of looking at tuition, and one of the things I think we still ought to take a look at is the pricing of lower division hours as opposed to upper division hours. That would make us more competitive with community colleges to get folks in and do some of the kinds of things **Susan** is talking about.

**Funderburk:** Senator **DeBerg** then Senator **East**.

**DeBerg:** Well, since I think it's a kind of academic crime that we allow students to retake a course, I would like to charge them full price for retaking a course. I mean, I can't believe they "F" a course, and they can retake the same course. I—I'm appalled that we have that policy, but should at least have them pay full price to do it. That's another way to eek out tuition. Well-deserved tuition money in that case.

**Funderburk:** Senator **East**? No? **Breitbach**.

**Breitbach:** I—I do

**Funderburk:** Oh, Senator **Smith**. Sorry, my bad. Senator **Smith**.

**Smith:** I—I mean, I think we—there may be some good ideas here on what can be done for financing a university. I—I'm a bit bothered with some of the concerns that have been raised. It's easy to say, "Yeah, we shouldn't raise tuition," and "We should be creative," and "They should be creative in finding other ways of doing stuff." I guess I'd be more impressed if the faculty through the Faculty Senate were suggesting ways in which we could contribute to the issue, we could help stuff. Are we willing to teach larger classes? Are we willing to teach more sections? Are we willing to do other things that would lower the effect cost in structure around here? We tend not to put our stuff on the table. We tend to be saying, "Get rid of that athletics," do this, that, and the other. It's a little more, I mean, challenging for us to come up with the sacrifices that we're prepared to make. And I'd be more impressed if we would look into that.

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

**Breitbach:** Well, my comment was tailing on **Laura's** that if we did that, if we had a price break for lower—lower division courses and then enrollment went up, do we have faculty to cover those additional sections? Or do we have—you know, is it--is it good practice to have increased size in some of those sections?

**Terlip:** I—I just know that at the time the stu—there were—it was a task force that met for months, and we had all sorts of, you know, models that were run. At the time it was feasible. We—it was decided not to do it, but I don't know how the other variables have changed since then.

**Funderburk:** Additional comments? **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** Well, I just ha—I like the idea of taking it to the community colleges because the research I've read indicates that we will have a better graduation rate, if we get them here as freshmen than if we get them here as transfers. There—they are significantly less likely to finish the 4-year degree, if they start at a 2-year college. So, I like the idea of kicking

community college butt. (laughter—someone: Do you want that in the Minutes?) I'm sorry, I....

**East:** Competing effectively.

**DeBerg:** Competing effectively! There you go. (laughter and thanks expressed around) And, it is for the good of the students as well. It's not just—it's good—it's for their good, yes. They are more likely to complete the degree.

**Funderburk:** I have a sense that we have exhausted the functionality of this conversation. (light laughter) So, again, I encourage you, if you have some comments, do the ONLYSenatorsONLY if you think of something else, or a refinement of what you heard. And then we will try to put something together that I can forward to President **Allen** by Friday. Ok, moving ahead with the Agenda.

BUSINESS

### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

**Funderburk:** We have Minutes for approval for September 12<sup>th</sup>. I understand there was one minor change or correction that was made. Are there any additional amendments or corrections to the Minutes of September 12? Hearing none, I submit we can accept them by acclamation and approve them. Correct? Very good.

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

Consideration of Calendar Item 1092 for Docket #990, Committee on Committees Deliberations and Recommendations from January 18, 2009

**Funderburk:** Items for docketing. 1092 coming from Vice-Chair **Breitbart**. This is to revisit the Committee on Committees Deliberations and Recommendations from January 2009 and act upon those. Can we have a motion to docket?

**Bruess:** So move.

**Funderburk:** Second?

**East:** Second.

**Funderburk:** Second from Senator **East**. And this docketed regular order?

**Bruess:** Yes. Regular Order.

**Funderburk:** Move to docket in regular order. No discussion? All those in favor? (Ayes all around.) All those opposed? (One opposed.) Abstentions? None.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1093 for Docket #990, Report on the Current UNI NCAA Certification Self Study

**Funderburk:** Docketing 1093, Report on the Current UNI NCAA Certification Self Study, which in case you didn't know, we have visitors on campus beginning tomorrow on that, and they have asked to come in on October the 24<sup>th</sup> at 3:45 to offer their report and answer questions on what's going on with that. So

**Neuhaus:** Move to docket on that date at that time.

**Funderburk:** Thank you very much, Senator **Neuhaus**. Do we have a second? (A couple of 2nd's made.) Second by Senator **Roth**, because your name hasn't been in Minutes as much today (laughter). Any additional discussion? None. All those in favor? (Ayes all around.) All those opposed. (None). Abstentions? (None) Very good.

## CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #986, MOTION TO RESERVE WEST GYM (WST) FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES

**Funderburk:** Ok. As we have no guest today (Docket #984), we will need to figure out what we are going to do about that at a later time. So moving on then to Docket #986, Motion to Reserve West Gym for Academic Purposes. That was **DeBerg** and **Neuhaus** who made the initial proposal. Motion or discussion around that at this point?

**DeBerg:** I move that we adopt the motion. And the motion is: Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the President, his Cabinet, and the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee that West Gym be reserved for academic purposes and any remodeling of the building be done with only those purposes in mind.

**Funderburk:** Do we have a second for that?

**Neuhaus:** Still second.

**Funderburk:** Second by **Neuhaus** then. Ok. The floor is open for discussion. Senator **DeBerg**.

**DeBerg:** I would like to speak to the motion since it's mine. Well, imagine my surprise when I read, as an alert reader, the Courier on May 12<sup>th</sup> of this past spring where Athletic Director Troy **Dannen** appears before the Panther Wrestling Club, which is not currently in NCAA compliance I might add, and promises that he will lead a successful campaign to spend a \$1 to \$2 million to remodel West Gym for wrestling.

West Gym is the only central—it's the only building really in the central part of campus left for academic expansion and remodeling, and I know from my work in my College that we have at least two programs there that are in badly—in bad near of space. One is the Theatre—Department of Theatre, always in need of storage, if nothing else. And secondly, we have a Comm—we have a Communication Sciences and Disorders Department

that—whose M.A. Program is in the top 10 nationally. I mean, we have a really fine program there with a clinic that's out of space where it is. This clinic is community outreach. It is a nationally-ranked graduate program. One of the things that distinguishes its undergraduate program is that it has clinic experience for undergraduates. It's alone in the State for doing that. And it happens to be convenient to the faculty who reside in the Communication Sciences building. We also have a museum who's in need of remodeled space. And I think that—Ok, so that's the academic reasons that I can see for this building.

But secondly, let's look at wrestling. Wrestling is not a conference sport. We are out of compliance in regard to gender equity in our NC—in our athletic program. If we are going to drop a sport, wrestling would make the most sense to drop. So I don't want to spend this kind of money—oh, and one other thing. We were promised in the Imagine the Impact Campaign that this is the Campaign that would not be used for buildings. Remember that? This is going to be used for programs. And **Dannen** says, “Well, I'm to take 100 or whatever—I'm going to take a couple hundred,” oh, where is it? I have the exact number here. “I'm going to take \$100,000 from the portion of the Imagine the Impact fund raising campaign that has been dedicated for facility improvements.” We were promised that this campaign was not, for a change, for buildings. So for all these reasons I hope that the Faculty Senate can recommend to these 3 important people/groups that we not allow this money to be spent on remodeling the West Gym. I--I'm just appalled by the thought. The President wasn't willing to defend the decision-making process that led to Troy **Dannen** speaking to the Panther Wrestling Club. I mean, who's making policy here? Ok, thank you.

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

**Neuhaus:** I—I wanted to talk just a little bit to the Communicative Sciences and Disorders Program, because I've worked with them pretty extensively over the last, I guess, 7-8/9 years now and both teach many (mini?) workshops and classes in their program and then work extensively with the graduate students. This—this program has grown just extraordinarily. It

would have grown a lot more if they had the space. When I go to give a talk to the graduate students, we have people sitting on the floor. We don't have enough room to put everybody into that place. And that's just the graduate students. The undergraduates have been split into two chunks, and they put them over there in Schindler, and to get them together for one talk, which we did, really taxed that room. There just—it just really didn't work. The other thing is this clinic. And this clinic has been really brilliant in terms of outreach to the community, and it really attracts a lot of people in. It would be really nice to have that spot, because the parking is central. They can go to either building. And the location just would work brilliantly for that. Finally, this has been a real go-getter Department in terms of bringing in money, and I think if you were to look at the kinds of money that they have brought in, you'd have to really weigh in and say, "This is—this is exactly the kind of group that we want to support all the more." Now I did call up the Department that Carlin **Hageman** had talked with and a few others, and they did admit that that building would need some serious reworking on that.

**DeBerg:** Oh, totally.

**Neuhaus:** But the location—that they really felt that that would be ideal from a location standpoint.

**Dolgener:** I'm not 100% sure, but I'm almost 100% sure that what—what Troy **Dannen** is referring to is all private money. And that it's not General Fund money, and—and we—the last several years over in our area, we've gone through some extensive remodeling in that area, and it's strictly from private money, and so, you know, maybe some of these other areas need to be a little more aggressive in trying to secure outside funding sources for those kinds of things, because it's not coming from—it's not detracting from money that would be spent on academics otherwise.

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

**Breitbach:** I—I was, you know, spent a lot of time in that building 130 years ago when I was on our gymnastics team back when we had one, which was (laughs)...the building is not in good shape. It was not in good shape back

then. It has not been well maintained, but it's a prime location. It's some sweet real estate. (laughter) And I think that the University needs to think about it strategically. They need to look at the programs that need space and need the support in terms of—of, you know, resources, all types of resources, and to think about how they want to utilize that space. And I—I agree with **Betty**. I would like to see that—I would like to see sports, the athletics, consolidated over in the—in that area. And I would like to see that space used for a more academic endeavor.

**Funderburk:** Provost **Gibson**.

**Gibson:** I—I would just like to say, there are—there are a number of programs on our campus that are bursting at the seams, and what we need to recruit and have students go through those programs are faculty. We need faculty. A number of programs are accredited. This program is accredited. They can't accept any additional students unless there are more faculty. And, again, if you ask any Dean, he would be able to tell you, “Here are the programs—3, 4 programs—that he could grow with faculty.” So I—I agree we need space. With space comes the need for dollars for renovation, but we also most desperately need faculty.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Peters**.

**Peters:** I had some questions just kind of factually of where does the West Gym stand at this point in terms of the order of buildings on campus being renovated? Is it—is--has there been a State appropriation to renovate it? Has—is--I mean, are we making a motion here about a pure hypothetical? Because that's what it sounds to me like, that this is a pure hypothetical. (**Betty** passes him the article from the newspaper.) Well, I know he gave the speech, but he can give a speech to anyone saying, “I'm going to raise this money to do that with that building.” He could say, “I'm going to raise a bunch of money to—to give, you know, a—for an office in Sabin Hall to the wrestling team.” But that doesn't mean he can do it. I guess what I'm wondering is—is--is this—is this just a pure hypothetical, or are we at a point where the West Gym is actually in some sort of queue to be renovated?

**DeBerg:** Can I respond?

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

**DeBerg:** Well, buildings are never in a queue to be renovated unless there is a purpose for their renovation. So I talked to Facilities Planning just last week, and there is—there are planning stages for renovating this for wrestling, because that's the only thing that anyone has put on the table. Like, hello. But there's no bid—there's been no bids let. There's no commitment to renovating this building for wrestling. But, you know, that's—that's where it's going to go, I think, unless we can stop it. And by putting a stop on the wrestling remodel doesn't mean that there has—there's money currently to remodel it. It does—it's just reserving it. It's not remodeling—it's not putting \$2 million locker rooms in it that no other program could ever use. That's my point.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Dobie**.

**Roberts-Dobie:** I thought there was a queue. I thought that's like why the—like the—like Schindler is now in a queue and Price Lab and that we—how is it

**DeBerg:** There is a queue, but it hasn't gotten any

**Breitbach:** It goes to the Legislature—legislative funding. Those are the projects that are going to require—and they go through—they go from the Facilities Planning Committee to the Cabinet. From the Cabinet they go to the Board of Regents, and the Board of Regents can shuffled them around, take them off. They can do—it's only advisory. So we are advisory to the Cabinet. The Cabinet is advisory to the Board of Regents. They make the final decision, and then the Legislature can choose to, or not to, fund any of those projects. And—and the way it has worked—and correct me please, if I'm wrong, but the Legislature has in the past funded one major project from each of the major institutions, and that is why the Board of Regents doesn't put forth more than that. They—they look at, you know, maintenance of our electrical and, you know, things like that, fire and

safety and—and then—and that's kind of a blanket package. And then they look at one major building project per institution, and ours is usually a little slower than the others. Iowa seems to get the biggest piece of that pie, and then Iowa State, and then us. But we usually get one.

**DeBerg:** We didn't build in a floodplain.

**Breitbach:** No, no we didn't. (laughter around and many voices) So (to the Provost), if you have anything else to.....

**Gibson:** Yeah, I—I was just going to say right now what's in the hopper so to speak. I mean, you mentioned Schindler, but also the Bartlett/Baker--to renovate Bartlett and to eventually tear down Baker. I mean, that's where we are now.

**Breitbach:** And it's our priority. That's what we've put forth as our—the--the Facilities Planning, the Cabinet, that's their

**Gibson:** Right. Right. So—so there are projects that we are proceeding with, and then there are projects that are a bit—that are on a list. But, again, as someone said, these are projects that will be paid for through legislation. Now that's not to say that there might not be some donors that come along and say, “I want this auditorium named after my family” or something like that. But the major dollars are coming from the Legislature. You know, I don't know a lot about the—the West Gym issue. But what I do know is that, you know, **Troy** is saying he is going to go out and raise these dollars.

**Funderburk:** Senator **DeBerg**, Senator **Peters**, Senator **Swan**, Senator **East**.

**DeBerg:** Just a couple of things. It's not really General Education Fund money that does these building projects. It's a sep—it's a capital fund that's separate. We—we haven't chosen to or cannot spend capital fund monies on teacher—on faculty. Those are—that's a separate funding pot.

**Gibson:** Yes.

**DeBerg:** So remodeling West Gym for academics would not take away money for faculty lines. It's separate.

**Gibson:** Oh, I—I was not—I--I was not saying that. I was just making a point that we need faculty.

**DeBerg:** Oh, ok. Ok. Oh, yeah. Yeah. I can't remember what else I was going to say. Sorry.

**Funderburk:** Senator **Peters**.

**Peters:** I just had another question about the way the process works that maybe the Vice-Chair can answer. So if someone comes, perhaps to the Facilities Planning Committee and says, "This building's in need of repair. We would like to—I can raise the money, and—and we can repair it or renovate it for these purposes," at that point I assume it's open for debate, and it's public, and people can—can jump in and—and participate in that process. Or, if someone comes with money in hand, does the Facilities Planning Committee say, "Ok, go for it."

**Breitbach:** Ok, again, correct me if I am wrong, but Russell Hall—when they renovated Russell Hall, wasn't there some private funding?

**DeBerg:** A lot of it.

**Breitbach:** I don't know if it was—how much—but there was some, and I honestly—I--I can't say to what extend that influences where on the 5-year plan a project is placed. I do believe that the Facilities Planning Committee, that **Morris** does—does his best to keep the buildings on this campus in—in good working condition. So, it's—we've got a large campus. We've got some beautiful buildings. It's a tough decision to decide whether to raze or whether to restore. It's—why don't we just raze the West Gym? Why don't we just—whew.....

**DeBerg:** That's fine with me, too.

**Funderburk: Senator Swan.**

**Swan:** So, I don't know if I—what we've been talking about right now, but it seemed to me that the—the resolution that the Faculty Senate was being asked to pass was, and I don't have it in front of me, to say that the Faculty feels that this spot, real estate—that this real estate, borrowing Karen's term, we feel would be crucial to have an academic enterprise occurring there, in the refurbished building, in a razed building, new building, whatever. At that spot, the faculty feel that spot should be academic not some other enterprise, and that that's all we're sort of saying to everybody, to whoever, to the President, to Board, to the public. Just sort of say that the faculty—and my colleagues that I've talked to about this say, “Yes, obviously. That's the case.” And if nothing happens over the next 10 years for that building, we still just have said, “We want that spot for academic enterprises.” And that's why I think, “Well, I'm voting yes.” My colleagues want me to vote yes, just for that reason and not a specific purpose. But--but academic, and we're simply saying, you know, making that plain right now that in 5 years we might actually have to change our minds, but right now we feel that we want academics at that spot for lots of reasons that have been enunciated.

**Funderburk: Senator East.**

**East:** Yeah. I tend to agree with that. I think it's a—it's useful for the Senate to occasionally make these kinds of proclamations about things that they—that it's worthwhile for us being on record for when it does come up. (Vocal “yes” heard from several.) And so I—I would support the motion. I do want us to be a little careful about the examples we use. I—I think Communicative Disorders—I agree wholeheartedly about how wonderful they are and everything, but their tightness of space, etc.--I mean I think you have choices about where you schedule things. They may choose to schedule something where somebody sits on the floor as opposed to having to walk across the—the parking lot to be in the Ed. Center where there is more available space, so I—I want—and they can't grow more students without faculty is my understanding. Both—I think both the undergraduate and graduate programs are accredited at very specific rules

about student-teacher ratio that may well be lower—much substantially lower than most of us might teach in, so we want to be a little careful about the examples we use or at least as far as, you know, “They would do wonderfully if we just gave them more space. They would blossom.” I mean, that's not true. They have to have more faculty, etc. It's not just a space issue when we talk—so we need to be a little careful about the examples we use.

**Funderburk:** Was there someone else who was going to make a comment? So I have Senator **Neuhaus**, Senator **DeBerg**. With my fancy new glasses, I can see that tiny print up there that says we have 8 minutes left. So we either need to wrap this up or consider a motion to extend the meeting.

**Neuhaus:** I—I just wanted to, you know, with the undergrad program in that Communicative Disorders, that—that might well be true. But the graduate program in Communicative Disorders, say, like a Chemistry program or something else, if you are going to have a lab, and they have a clinic and a lot of the learning that goes on with those—those graduate students is clinic work, and you need to have space to run that clinic, and you need to have people interacting. You have people coming in from the community, and they are really tight on that, so I—I would agree, probably, their undergraduate if they can find big study halls. Their graduate program on the other hand, is—is a—it--there's more resources going on in the sense that a science building is necessary to—to do labwork and that—that thing.

**DeBerg:** I call the question. It's my turn.

**Breitbach:** The question has been called. Is there a second?

**Peters:** Second

**Funderburk:** Ok. All those in favor. (Ayes all around.) All those opposed. (None) Ok, so the question has been called for voting. All those in favor of the motion as written, say “Aye.” (Ayes all around.) Opposed? (One opposed.) Abstentions? None. Motion passes.

**DeBerg:** Mr. Chairman, would—would you direct then the secretary to send our recommendation on to the President, the Cabinet, and the Advisory Committee?

**Funderburk:** I think it's reasonable that we can have that forwarded, if there is general acceptance of this?

**DeBerg:** As part of the motion.

**Funderburk:** (Agreements heard; heads nodded) We'll just do that in a form letter. I'll take your guidance. We have 6 minutes. We do have an Emeritus Request that we might be able to get some low-hanging fruit. We have a lot of stuff coming up in the next few meetings.

**Female voice:** I'd like to take care of that.

DOCKET #987, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, **RON ABRAHAM**,  
ACCOUNTING, EFFECTIVE MAY 31, 2011

**Funderburk:** So, Docket #987, Request for Emeritus Status for Ron **Abraham** in Accounting. Motion Senator **Wurtz** moved; second Senator **Smith**. Comments?

**Wurtz:** I will take the privilege of having made the motion to be the first to speak very briefly. Ron **Abraham** has been a foundational piece in the College of Business and has served as a very firm foundation. He will be missed, but he has earned his time off. Senator **Smith**, do you care to add anything?

**Smith:** I was thinking I deserve my time off, too. (much laughter and many voices)

**Funderburk:** Ok. Any additional comments? Hearing none, all those in favor of granting **Abraham** emeritus status, say "Aye." (Ayes all around.) All opposed? (None) Abstentions? Hearing none, passed.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Funderburk:** The Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Bruess:** Move to adjourn.

**Funderburk:** **Bruess** moved. Second? Second from Senator **Roth**. All those in favor? (Ayes all around.) Opposed? (None) Thank you very much, everyone.

Time of adjournment: 4:55 p.m.

Next meeting: October 10, 2011, 3:15, Oak Room of Maucker Union

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss,  
Administrative Assistant  
UNI Faculty Senate