Special Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
04/01/13 (4:01 p.m. – 5:08 p.m.)
Mtg. #1732

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Press were not in attendance today.

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** noted that the 2nd candidate for the position Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs will offer a public presentation on Wednesday of this week and that a 3rd candidate is being vetted and will likely be on campus next Tuesday and Wednesday.

Chair **Peters** stated that the Agenda for next week's regular meeting will be posted and announced later today. He encouraged Senators to look at the several items which will be up for docketing and that, because of this, the Senate likely cannot complete all its work on April 22nd, the last regularly scheduled meeting for this year. He advised all to pencil in April 29th to complete this year's business at a final specially-called meeting.

2. New Business

Docketed:

1189 1085 Improving faculty participation in University planning and budgeting process, regular order (**Terlip/Strauss**)

This item of new business, a late posted petition, was docketed in regular order for consideration at next Monday's meeting.

3. Consideration of Docketed Items

1184 1080 Recommendations of Senate Budget Committee on Allocation of Resources within Academic Affairs, regular order (**Heston/ Neuhaus**)

A lengthy discussion took place from many perspectives with Chair of the Senate Budget Committee Adam **Butler** in attendance.
**Item referred back to the Budget Committee for incorporating today's ideas into the final resolution.

4. Adjournment

**Meeting declared adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Next meeting:

04/08/13
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 35 pages, including 2 Addenda.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
April 1, 2013
Mtg. 1732**

PRESENT: Karen **Breitbach**, Gregory **Bruess**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton,** Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston** , Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, Michael **Walter**

Absent: Melinda **Boyd**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Betty **DeBerg**, Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**, KaLeigh **White**

CALL TO ORDER (4:01 p.m.)

Chair **Peters**: Ok. Let's go ahead and come to order. And I believe Adam [**Butler**, Chair of the UNI Senate Budget Committee] will be able to join us. [voices continue visiting] If we can come to order, we can try to get out of here as close to 5:00 o'clock as possible.

Strauss: Is that April Fool's or

Peters: Yes, so you can all go now. [laughter]

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Are there any press present? No? No members of the press present? Ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost **Gibson**, do you have any comments.

Gibson: No comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**, any comments?

Funderburk: Very briefly. Of course, we have the 2nd candidate in and the public presentation on Wednesday for the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. I can tell you that there is a 3rd candidate currently being vetted through, and hopefully that person will be on campus Tuesday and Wednesday the following week.

Peters: Tuesday and Wednesday, ok.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: Just one quick comment from me and that's that the Agenda for next week's meeting should go out later tonight, and you'll note on it a lot of items for docketing for our last regular meeting. You may want to pencil in April 29th as a—as one last meeting, when you see all the stuff we have yet to get through. We'll do our best to get through it on the 22nd, but I'm not hopeful that we can get to all that on the 22nd.

BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

Calendar Item 1189 for Docket #1085, Improving faculty participation in University planning and budgeting process

Peters: There is one item of new business I emailed you about, and that's just to docket something for next week, and that would be another Budget Committee task, and that is some recommendations on the Budget Process and what we want regular faculty Budget consultation to look like with the new president . So actually all we need to do is docket that in regular order, and then it will come up at our next meeting. So could we get a motion to do that?

Terlip: So move.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**, thank you. Is there a second?

Strauss: Yes.

Peters: Senator **Strauss** seconds. Any discussion on docketing that in regular order? The Budget Committee has been asked to come up with just kind of a basic—some basic principles or kind of an outline of what regular faculty consultation in budgeting will look like under the new president. So that's what we'll discuss next time. Seeing no discussion, all in favor of docketing that item in regular order, that's Calendar Item 1189, please say, "aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say "No." [none heard] The motion carries.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1080, RECOMMENDATIONS OF SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE ON ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES WITHIN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, REGULAR ORDER (**Heston/Neuhaus**)

Peters: And with that, we'll go to our docketed item, but we don't have our Budget Committee Chair here. So, I don't know if Secretary **Edginton** can maybe lead us through this since he's also on the Budget Committee?

Edginton: Well, let me report on the work of the Committee and the challenges that the Committee faced. The Committee has met 3 times. The first time I chaired the meeting, and our task was to review the charge of the Committee which we understood to be to identify criteria so that the—that could be useful by the Provost in making decisions about distributing funds focused on academic activities. And then the 2nd charge was to, in the long haul, review the faculty's involvement in the budgetary decision-making process.

So, and our—we had a meeting following that, and one of our Committee members promptly resigned, and so we didn't get very far with the conversation. And then we had a 3rd meeting, and there was quite a bit of conversation, but it wasn't necessarily focused around the—focused around the charge of the meeting. There was a need to clarify the charge. And we asked Jerry—Jerry **Smith** to come in—Senator **Smith** [Vice-Chair **Smith**], and I had been in one of the subcommittees at the Retreat, and we had a pretty lively discussion about priorities there, and I had hoped Jerry would share that information, but we, indeed, in that meeting got a little bit off-track with regard to the charge of the meeting.

Subsequently, Adam [**Butler**, Chair of the Committee] then prepared this document then [projected at meeting; see Addendum 1; also found at: http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/criteriaforfacultylines.pdf] which is a basic framework for decision-making—very simple, not very complex—that discusses 4 areas. I suggested a 5th that might be included as criteria, but you can—it—I don't know if you have this, but you can see that the criteria focuses on "labor demand, student demand, signature programs, and program uniqueness." And we thought a 5th category that Adam said go ahead and add was the "potential for new programs" that the Provost might be responsible for that would provide an opportunity for an investment that would provide some kind of yield in terms of student enrollments that perhaps we, you know, didn't discover through some other mechanism. So, there weren't a lot of metrics, you know, that were defined as we went through this conversation in terms of identify—I guess the thought was that we wanted to enable the Provost to have a degree of flexibility.

The one last comment I'll make, that emerged in both our discussions at the Senate Retreat and also this was re-emphasized in the conversations that we had in the meetings, is that if there are any surplus funds, we'd rather see those funds go for instructional services, instructional programs, than to be placed in—even if they were one-time-only funds—be placed in other activities. And I'm going to give you an example. I'm not sure we have money for professional development leaves, so the burden, financial burden, or the burden rests on faculty members when a person gets a professional development leave to support their activities, and there aren't funds that come back to any of the units when that development leave is granted. So, if you have one-time monies, why wouldn't we use those funds to support adjuncts to replace the teaching responsibilities of those individuals? So, in summary, [laughter because Committee Chair **Butler** had just entered], you know, that was the work that we did as a Committee. And I'll turn it over to Adam at this point. [more laughter]

Butler: I apologize. I went to the basement of the Union.

Peters: Oh, sorry.

Butler: Deedee **Heisted** was there and no one else.

Edginton: And, Adam, to catch you up very quickly. I just went through the 3 meetings that we had and what transpired and very briefly talked about your matrix.

Butler: Ok. I don't know what more there is to say since I missed what Chris [Senator **Edginton**] said, but these were—the sole focus of this was to determine faculty lines. I understand that there would be a potential for broader interest in resources, in addition to or other than, faculty lines, but these would be criteria for determining faculty lines. And, well, I guess it's open for discussion. Those are the conceptual criteria and then how we would measure them. And then I think, obviously, there's a lot of stakeholders in any decision of this magnitude, but assuming that you have a comprehensive list of operationalized criteria that people feel are fair, then you should be able to use those criteria to make decisions.

The question then becomes how do you use them to make a decision? And that's a complex issue. But I would argue—I am arguing that using some sort of actuarial judgment is superior to using what we would call clinical judgment. I think Jerry [Senator **Smith**] can back me up on that [light laughter around] as a fair amount of research on that topic, and even something simple like a linear combination of these factors, we know produces superior decision outcomes to people going "Mmm, I think that's who deserves it." So,

Peters: Then you would propose—just to be clear about what you're saying when you say "actuarial," you're thinking of some kind of rubric or something that would be used to kind of assess?

Butler: I do not want to speak for the whole Committee here. I will only speak for myself and say that to me what makes sense is to create a spreadsheet form where you would plug in the numbers, and it would spit out a number.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I just had a question on your rubric. One of—is there anything that accounts for Departments which teach a large number of courses but they have small majors or minors, so they do a lot of Liberal Arts Core, for example? Or is Liberal Arts Core reflected somewhere else there?

Butler: Well, "signature program" would certainly be reflected as Liberal Arts Core as that is a signature of the liberal arts education that we offer here, and perhaps "class size."

Terlip: Yeah. I just was curious because, as we know, majors and minors—some Departments do a lot more service than certain majors and minors.

Butler: Yeah. Uh huh.

Terlip: So, I just wanted to see how that factored in.

Peters: That—I'll just mention that that came up in an email

Butler: Yes, it did.

Peters: that I got as well. I think Adam [**Butler**] was talking about that email from Cindy **Dunn** in Anthropology that there are Departments who, if you focus, you know, exclusively on the size of the Department, the size of the programs, even the strengths of the programs beyond just size, you may miss their contributions to the University. Senator **Strauss**, I think was next in line.

Strauss: Yeah. Thank you for putting this together. Are these factors evenly weighted, or is there priority on this list? Or—I'm just curious.

Butler: If you'd like me to rate them, I could. I don't think that would be the job of this Committee, but they ought to be weighted, yes.

Strauss: Ok.

Butler: In my view, they ought to be weighted.

Strauss: Secondly, I'm not sure what actuarial versus clinical means. Does that mean you weigh when people are going to die in the program? [laughter all around] What's the—I mean

Butler: A clinical—yeah—well, a clinical judgment would be that you look at a bunch of information, and you use your expert judgment, like the Provost is pretty well familiar with the programs on this campus, and she could sit there and say, "You know what? In my view, given the demand for courses and all this, I think that this program needs it." And that—it's not that she's not using information; she is using information. She's using her expertise to arrive at a decision. And a lot of people do that. It turns out, however—if you want to believe the research, which I do—that when people create a mathematical model and plug in numbers and weights, that their decision outcomes are better.

Strauss: Ok. Thank you.

Neuhaus: Just a

Peters: Senator **East** is up next.

East: I have a question and a comment. The question is about the—in the term "signature program," and the definition uses the word "central," and having gone through that wonderful process we went through a while back, those terms were used differently. And so that would need to be clarified. "Signature program" had to do with something with quality of the program in ways other than mentioned in other aspects there. And "centrality" had to do with centrality to UNI's mission, and the LAC could be both central and signature. I suspect it's not considered signature at this moment by the terms that we were using, but they're working to make it more so. So I think those terms need to be clarified, and if they're not talking about the same thing, perhaps a new category needs to be entered in there.

The comment I had—the other thing I wanted to talk about—is that this looks very program—existing program/department centered, that there's no way for anything new to happen, that we're only looking at what exists. If—and there's no evi—avenue for something new to be proposed within this, because all the data points have to do with history. And newness has nothing to do with any of these. A new program can't be a signature program. A new program can't have lots of students demand. It could have labor demand, I suppose. It can't be—well, it could be unique, perhaps, but the numbers that you can plug in for something that's going to be new is minimal, and in this day and age where things happen so quickly in all—almost all of our disciplines, it seems to me that we would not want to encourage decision-making based on history and what is—silos? Is that what they refer to them as? The pieces that work only in a vertical infrastructure and never talk to each other?

In particular, there's no mechanism for enhancing interdisciplinary work here. I've been involved in 2 or 3 attempts to make interdisciplinary majors happen, and they just don't very often. They end up looking like—"Oh, we'll put a few of your courses in, and a few of your courses in," and they're not interdisciplinary. And two Summers ago? Two years ago, we had—two Falls ago we had a day spent on thinking about how we could—

how we might think about more interdisciplinary and tried to get more of that in. And I think then it was recognized that you have to build in some mechanism to allow that to happen, to encourage that the happen. And this does not. So I think it's very much lacking in that sense.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**, did you have a direct response to that?

Edginton: Yeah, I do. As I indicated in my opening comments, we did recommend a 5th category that said "Potential New Programs," and Adam [**Butler**] asked me to enter it into the grid, and I didn't. I forgot to do it. So, it should have been there. I'll just share this email message with you. [Edginton provided a copy of his email sent to Butler to Senator East reflecting his offering of a 5th category focused on "potential new programs."] It's very short, but we were, I think, cognizant of the importance of that. I think it's a really good point.

Peters: Senator **Smith**, did you have a remark? A direct response to that?

Smith: No.

Peters: Ok. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Yeah, kind of a little maybe combination about a couple things folks said. One of the things on this—"well, it's better if this thing is actuarial." Gosh, I mean, you could come up with a lot of different models. I like to hang out in your sciences, so I really like all the climate modeling we can do, and you can model all kinds of different things, and a lot depends on how you want to hook the numbers up.

So, I guess if we were going to play that game, I'd sure like to see a lot of tweaking and some very visible transparency—like, "Here's a bunch of different models, and here's how they play out in this." So, before we ever decided, "Let's go with one," let's see what we end up with? Do we like what we end up with?

The other things, and I don't know, maybe this falls into that 5th category, but maybe it's a little closer to what Tim [Senator **Kidd**] sent something out

by email about some of the things you guys in Physics were bringing _____ about this. This possibility of finding some very wealthy people out there—corporations, individuals, whatever that is—who suddenly get convinced that they would like to donate some big money on that. Now maybe that's not money from students. That's money from something else. It also misses this—this would just be a really good idea, but we don't have anybody with money right now, and I don't know how to get at that, but I'd really like to see some experimentation with this.

You know, it's just—the bottom two are insanely subjective. I mean, it's just—what do you do with that? That sort of this—is it unique? Well, you could come up with a thing. "We define 'unique' to be this." But ehhhhhh! I can immediately think of all sorts of outcomes where that just wouldn't work.

So, whatever we come up with, I'd really like to see us play with it a bit. I mean, we're all experimental types. That's why we're here. So whatever we create, let's play around. Maybe bring in a couple folks that like to model things. But make it real clear to everybody, as we're playing with this, "Yeah, this goes this way, when we do this. This goes that way." And then, do we like it? And, if we don't, what's—let's talk about what we don't like and then how we might change that.

But I, too, agree with Philip [Senator **East**]. Not—creating something that's not innovative, I mean, that doesn't allow for innovation, would be another problem. So maybe you need just a whole nother category that this falls outside of that, and so this is—this is new, and this is innovative, and let's like give it a chance, regardless of what the model says.

Peters: I have **Smith**, **Heston**, **Gallagher**, and **East** in that order. And then **Kidd**.

Smith: Ok. I'm **Smith**. [laughter around] In organizations, when you allocate resources—resources have to be allocated to serve the strategic goals of the organization, and I would argue that in this organization, for the foreseeable future, the #1 strategic goal is enrollment. It has to be. So, when allocating resources, we have to be thinking, "What can we do to

improve enrollment? To increase enrollment?" And that's not just on Student Affairs side. That's on the Academic Affairs side. "What can we do here?"

Now, obviously, if we fund growth programs, we get faculty in programs that have lots of student demand, and you offer better programs, and you get more students, that does it. But there are other things as well. I would argue that the most plausible, going forward, identity for this University is as the premier, undergraduate, public institution in Iowa. And to really deliver on that identity, we have to have a general education program, the Liberal Arts Core, that really sings, just out there, that we can put on a flag and say, "This is it. You come here, you get well educated."

Now, there are things that can be done to improve that program, and I'm not just talking about faculty lines in the various Departments that then some of those, you know, their teaching loads will be in the program, but what was done, for instance with the Cornerstone course, I think is improving the teaching of writing and of communication on this University, and we need to do more of that stuff in various ways to improve writing, but also to develop and improve our students' thinking skills. There were some other things that came out of the team that worked on Liberal Arts Core. I would argue to the Provost that you ought to be funding some of the things there that would improve the general education program, because, in my view, that's most likely to have a significant effect on our enrollments in the near future.

Peters: Senator **Heston**.

Heston: I want to second what Senator **East** and Senator **Edginton** said about this not obviously, although there is some language for generating new programs, but I have real concerns in particular about labor demands. Part of what creates labor demand is the number of courses you require, how long your major is. And we have majors that range from 36 hours to 78 or 85 hours. Some of those majors that are long require very intense resources because of the nature of the major. And I do understand that certain majors have certain resource demands that are unique, music being one of them. You can't have one music educator to teach all of the

different instruments and the vocal and the history and the—I get that you have differences among programs and their demands, but I also am concerned that when we start with an unequal playing field where majors have not been held accountable to trying to withhold, at least not very well—you know, we have extended majors; we have very long majors. This emphasizes the notion that the way you get resources, depending upon how it's weighted, is you add courses, although that might be harder in the future, and you keep your course sizes as low as possible so you have to offer more sections, because then you have to hire more adjuncts. I really have trouble with the issue of labor demand without taking in all the contextual factors that create labor demand in an academic program.

I also have a little concern in that I would really like us to see something that responds to the realities of hiring good faculty these days. For example, spousal—dual-career couples. This would not have any flexibility to acknowledge that sometimes you need to do a hire that recognizes a dual-career couple situation where you are actually getting two really good faculty potentially, but they're not in the same area; they're not in the same Department; they don't necessarily have the same opportunity to compete for a position here because there's not one available in this program or that program, who could perhaps bring some interdisciplinary—

I would like to see a little more flexibility allotted to some subjective judgment. I don't think subjective judgment is entirely a sin. And you can do things with metrics that actually create really, really inequitable situations. And if you don't believe that, just look at Education. [light laughter around] K-12, Special Ed., Higher Ed.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Well, she made a very good—a point I was going to make is our fear of subjectivity, and I really—yeah, this idea that subjective and objective, as if there is such a thing, such a division. There isn't. And exactly what Senator **Heston** said, that we need to be able to make judgments. We can't run from them, hiding under some cloak of objectivity that isn't real. And as much harm can be done by the pretense of

objectivity, I think. I mean, this is subjective, choosing these things here [pointing to projected screen, see Addendum 1]. This is a subjective exercise. I just wanted to point that out and support what she said.

Secondly, we still—I think we labor under this because we still don't have a real sense of common purpose as a University, and that's been brought up before, and I think it needs to be brought up again. What does it mean to be a Comprehensive University right now in this day and age? Senator **Smith** mentioned strengthening the Liberal Arts Core. Should we go further? Should that be our Core? What is—you know, what is our common purpose really? And I think that we have lost sight of that and have failed to have discussions about that.

And finally, the program uniqueness—I heard someone mention the idea that it—we would take into account the degree to which the program contributes to our mission, but I don't see the word mission up there, so I'm concerned about that.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I want to respond about the new programs. I think when people hear the term "new programs," they think, "Oh, Computer Science is offering a new program." That's not what I meant. I was specifically talking about program—I mean, I think Departments are responsible for evolving their programs as the discipline changes and you learn more. Most Departments, they generate—most disciplines generate knowledge, and you can't continue to teach the same discipline by teaching the same courses because there's not enough time in the day to do that, and so your program has to evolve, and sometimes it becomes a new program. That's not what I was referring to.

I was referring to some mechanism that allows something beyond the Departmental focus, and that, to me, needs to be very explicit. And I don't know how to do that. We tend to get into, "Let the Administrators do those kinds of things," and a number of years ago I was on a strategic— Faculty Strategic Planning Committee, I think we called it—and we recommended a process rather than a result. And the process was that

people competed, that, if they had good ideas, they put them forward. There was a mechanism for doing that. So, instead of strategic planning being an exercise where everybody tried to make sure that their own little fifedom—fiefdom?—whatever—got covered in the Strategic Plan so they would be, for the next 5 years, included, that strategic planning meant that Departments did strategic planning within themselves. Colleges could not have a Department's goal as a strategic plan. The University could not have a College's goal as a strategic plan. It had to be something that applied to the University, not just to the Dep—to a Department or a College.

And I think the same thing needs to happen with respect to this. There needs to be built-in some sort of mechanism where faculty from across campus are encouraged to think about new ways of doing things that will require some resources. And I don't know how you get it started. Do you allow the Provost to make some sort of decision or have some sort of ongoing availability of something like that? And you end up having to allow for some subjective judgment about what's good and what's good for the University and that kind of thing. And I think that those—that it's harder to put those—that judgment into the numbers based on how many students are enrolled in a program and etcetera.

So I think that there are things beyond—well, I don't necessarily disagree that we need to worry about student enrollment. I think that's not—that can't be our singular focus, if we wish to continue as a, and improve as a, University.

Peters: One quick follow-up on that Senator **East**—and I just wanted to mention, Professor **Butler**, anytime you feel like you need to jump in to address specific things, just give me a little signal, and I can prioritize you in the list.

Butler: Thank you.

Peters: But I guess maybe I'm mishearing what you had to say, Senator **East**, but are you suggesting that—I mean, you seem to be suggesting a role, an exclusive role for curricular demands or curricular needs that isn't quite—isn't quite expressed up here on the document [Addendum 1] as it

is. It's kind of implied maybe, with labor demand, where it says "Key aspect of discipline unrepresented by faculty," that some notion that—some notion that, as disciplines change, the curricular needs change as well, and that those don't—but then the second part of what you were saying, if I understood you, is that those curricular needs aren't necessarily located within a single Department. They may be.

East: They often are not.

Peters: But you have to encourage people to look for—I'm thinking—so, if we think of the, what's it called?—Interactive Digital Media [voices agreeing] Major that was approved last year that seems to be, from what I can tell, seems to be doing quite well and has gotten some accolades from—what did it? Didn't it win some award? Some technology award or something recently?

Terlip: That was the Technology Association Award.

Peters: That the—that it—is that kind of an example of what you're….?

East: I think so. I happen to think that my [Computer Science] Department's uniquely positioned to interact with almost anybody on almost anything. We're not necessarily doing that, although we are a part of the Interactive Digital whatever there is. I think we are a part of that. [light laughter around]

Terlip: [joke with much laughter around—but words not caught]

East: Thank you, so—I—we need to build in—if you're going to build a structure that says, "This is how we allocate faculty lines," you need to build in something that doesn't—that really—that you really think you can do something new and different and is not just part of the "what we've always done." And just putting a new thing that says new programs will focus most of our attention on, "Oh, I want to offer a different program in Computer Science," rather than make Computer Science go talk to those people and work out a way that they can need to work together, not necessarily just this course and this course and this course, but some new

combined courses perhaps that need to be team-taught or scholarship that needs to happen across disciplines that—on which we had the UNI connections is to encourage cross-disciplinary scholarship. And so those kinds of things that we—where we can build in more of getting outside the Departmental boundaries, I think, has to be part of any structure you build.

Peters: Senator **Kidd**.

Kidd: When I saw this list I thought of something we're doing in the Physics Department which is kind of a self-assessment. I don't know if you guys saw the email I sent out pretty late today [see Addendum 2], but—so it's in addition to these kind of metrics, we put in things like program quality and centrality, like actual metrics. So, for example, I was thinking of things like incoming student ACT scores, let's see, students with scholarships at the university level--just a judge of incoming student quality.

And then things like student opportunities once they're here, so if they have opportunities to do research, fellowships, internships with companies—if students are doing these things, that's going to attract more students to come, I think. Scholarly output with the faculty because we're an undergraduate institution. Scholarly output involves undergraduates. So, the more involvement you have with students doing things that might apply to their fields, the better, I think.

What else? Even things—something like, number of out-of-state students who come to the University for that program, because if you're attracting students out of state, that means you're recognized nationally and internationally. And I think those things are important to consider when you look at overall allocation. I'm not saying they are singularly important but just something in addition.

The other thing is for program uniqueness maybe, or signature program, you might want to take a look at the peer institutions. Do our peer institutions have this program? If they do, and we don't, is that—you know, why do they have it? Or if we're thinking, you know, of closing down a program or reducing it, would that make us look like odd ducks? You know. Other things are, can we compare some of these metrics with our

peer institutions to see where we stack up? Graduation rates, things like that. And finally to take into account service courses and maybe Liberal Arts Core courses. How many students are taking classes that are not in the major per se but are offered by faculty in that program? Some just things like that. And if you're really interested, I could send you the whole list.

MacLin: I just did.

Kidd: Did you? Ok.

Peters: Professor **Butler**, do you have….?

Butler: I just wanted to note because several times people were defending "subjective judgment," which is fine. What we're proposing is—what we're proposing is that, if you are going to make subjective judgments, that you need to quantify them. So that's all I wanted to clarify.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, one of the things that I think probably needs to be considered, and I don't know if it's an equal criterion or partial or something, but I think the cost of delivering a program beyond faculty lines probably needs to be factored in there. We might not be able to have something, not because we can't have people but because we can't afford the equipment investment or those kinds of things, and so that has to be somehow factored into it. Plus, if we're going to move to online environments, I don't know how that affects it. But online might make us more popular, but the research I've been reading has said that's still pretty expensive. We don't want to assume it's going to be less expensive to do it that way. So, I think delivery and equipment needs to be at least correlated with that somehow.

Peters: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I think that if we push this out, especially to our politicians in the State, and if we didn't recognize workforce development as an important criterion here in our decision-making in terms of distribution of resources,

we would be wrong. And so I think, you know, that's something that is important to be incorporated, and it also cuts at the issue of the nature of this University. And as a Comprehensive institution, we not only are responsible for having a strong general education program but having very strong Professional Education programs in place that support that workforce development. I get concerned at times when every time I come to a meeting like this, or in the past when I was Director of the School of HPELS, all the core conversation is around strengthening the Liberal Arts Core, and there's never any conversation around strengthening Professional Education programs on campus. And maybe that occurs internally amongst the Departments, but I think that both—the conversation on both those issues has to go on simultaneously, and I think if we don't do that, we're in error.

Peters: That brings up a question that I might ask you, Provost **Gibson**, and that is I think probably all the Colleges and many Departments have some kind of advisory boards today.

Gibson: Uh huh.

Peters: And those help the Colleges and Departments with finding out about the kinds of

Gibson: Jobs and work

Peters: Yeah, the kinds of jobs available for their graduates. How do we— how do we as a University find out about places in the economy that— where we're not even preparing people to fill jobs? You know what I'm asking? I'm not saying it very well, but how do we find out about the needs—the workforce needs of the State and of the region now and 5 years—anticipated 5 years, 10 years from now where we don't already have those ties with Colleges and Departments in those areas of the economy? How do we—what mechanisms are there to learn about that?

Gibson: Well, one mechanism is the State itself that puts out a report. We had Bob **Frederick**—was it last year?—who came to Academic Affairs Council and talked about Workforce Development, where we are now as a

State, where we might be in 5 years, in 10 years, what are the jobs that we need to—and careers that we need to prepare our students for? There's—that data is there, and we did look at that data. And I can't—there was a top 5, and it—I do remember that Special Ed. was on that list, very high. But I'm sorry, I can't—I don't remember what the other—what the others were. And some of those we have; some of them we don't. I think Actuary Science may have been on there. So, yeah, I mean, that data is available for us to look at.

Edginton: If I could just interject, the Occupational

Peters: Go ahead, Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: Federal Occupational Handbook is an outstanding source to look at job trends, workforce needs, and we should be monitoring that on an ongoing basis.

East: The Bureau of Labor Statistics produces 5-year, 10-year, 20-year outlooks as to where the workforce is needed. My recollection is that there are a bunch of them in healthcare, not doctors necessarily, but just the healthcare field. [voices agreeing] And, of course, computer sciences and engineering is way up there.

Gibson: It's available. [other voices agreeing]

East: So, those are available and certainly on the national level.

Peters: Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: The other thing, too, is these are done more infrequently and sometimes on a regional level within the State, but laborshed analyses are done oftentimes for a specific region that might include the university or community colleges, depends on what you're interested in looking at. It also might be topic specific. I know we're developing one, a laborshed analysis, for STEM jobs. So, you know, there are those as well. They're not annual publications like what the Bureau of Labor Statistics might put out

or what the State might publish, but as long as you're using a relatively recent laborshed study, you can have some confidence in those as well.

Peters: I was just thinking—Senator **MacLin** is up next—but I just wanted to comment that I was just thinking that when a presentation like that gets made to the Deans, obviously the Deans, you would expect, that it—something triggers them, "Well, you know, wow, this is an opportunity for a program in my College." So they'll probably go to the Department Head and talk about that. But I'm wondering if the kind of thing that Senator **East** was talking about with things bubbling up from the faculty, maybe we need to think about ways to at least distribute some of that information a little more broadly so that faculty members can—they might say, you know, "Wow, this could be…." It might not always occur to a Department Head. It might be—it might be several members of the faculty who realize there's an opportunity here for growth in our area. Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: I have 3 quick things. One, I would like to see program quality be in the rubric in some fashion. I think it is sort of embedded in there in some fashion right now, but I would just like to echo Tim's [Senator **Kidd**] remarks that he put in his email about some specific indicators. Their program is doing very, very well in attracting really excellent students, and that could be a reason for—it goes to the growth in programs that other people mentioned. So that was one thing.

The other thing is a reminder that we don't want, you know, perfect to be the enemy of good—is that the reason why—I think, one of the reasons why we or people were interested in some sort of rubric was the sense that sometimes in some Colleges it seems like people get lines and people don't know why. I mean, "Like, well, why didn't we get a line?" Or, "We need a line. How come they got a line?" And so that sort of form of subjective judgment is extremely damaging. It puts a lot of infighting. It puts people against each other within Colleges and across Colleges, and so I think having some sort of—some guidelines that have some data embedded in them can help alleviate those issues that I don't think are helpful for anyone who is trying to get people into the—you know, a new faculty line from the Provost or wanting to understand why other people are getting lines and their Department isn't.

And then lastly, and it's beyond our discussion today, but just a reminder that it's really awesome if we get faculty lines, but it really sucks when no one applies for them. [laughter around] And so we have a bigger, broader issue and on—at this University that we are going to have to somehow tackle. I mean, Jerry [Vice-Chair **Smith**] already mentioned the enrollment issue, which is huge, but the issue that we have, you know, even those of us who have been, you know, very lucky to get lines, we have had terrible application numbers. Terrible, terrible, terrible—at Assistant Professor, Head, at all levels.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: There's just one other thought I had with the program uniqueness thing, and it's—maybe it's some other flavor in what you'd mentioned, Tim [Senator **Kidd**], the idea of looking at the peers. And we've got regions up there.

I almost like something like "program competiveness." Not maybe so much as competitive with other programs here, but how well can we fight with Iowa and Iowa State, you know, unless we get really good at pulling in students from around the country. And I don't think we're there yet, not even close. So we've got to fight for that Iowa pool. Right now I feel like the University of Iowa is winning that battle and winning it big. I mean, Iowa State's not doing too bad either, so part of this planning on this is how well can it stand up against the Regents? How well will it work against them? How competitive is that with the—is our Education program really competitive with them and to the point that they should just back off because we're really good with that?

One other thought on the keeping up to speed on what's going on out there in the world of business or the world of whatever—you know, ideas, technology, whatever's going on out there. Industrial Technology's invited me in to work with a number of graduate students in the last couple of years, and there's some really fascinating things they're doing. Their field's changing really rapidly. Digital printing is one area I've been looking at, and it's just—it's really hard to kind of keep up with that idea.

Those Occupational Outlook Handbook like things, they're really, really general. So, it's like, "Yes, we're going to need a lot of medical folks." Well, yes, but that really means we need a lot of maybe physician's aides. And not like in the next 2 or 3 years, but then there will be a new technology, and we need that. What they're trying to do in Industrial Tech. is to create a feedback system so, one, you're changing the curriculum so it's a little more responsive to what's going on out there in terms of what are the sorts of things folks need to know? But, two, it's also giving the people within that program a little better sense—students, faculty, as well—you know, "Where should we be pushing? Where should we—let's keep ourselves relevant. Let's keep ourselves really on that."

So, yeah, I think the feedback thing is really, really critical on that. And, you know, we—you know, some things are traditional. You would teach English—English has a sort of eternalness—well, it doesn't, because it mutates all the time, but anyway—mathematics, maybe that's better. But I think we need to be aware of where we can go strategically with these things, and it needs to be rapid.

And then finally, just a thing on the subjective thing. I have no problem with subjective. The only thing I mind, whether it's objective or it's numerical, is it's got to be transparent. We've got to look at what we're doing, create a model. We've got to know how it works, you know. It's not a black box. So, if it's not working well, we know why it might not be working well, and we can discuss it, and we tweak it, and we play with it again, so we are aware of that sort of a thing since it's the transparency thing that I'm really looking for and the willingness to experiment and keep playing with it, as it will change inevitably, too.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I cannot pass up an opportunity--the ACT scores and the criteria of attracting the best students—or not ACT, yeah, ACT. I could go on for days about those kinds of tests, and it will sound to a lot of people like I'm—I don't believe in excellence or something. That's not true. But there are so many problems with them, but let me just stick to the technical

aspect of it, something that is readily understood. How well do those tests really predict? The GRE predicts 30% of the variance. You may as well ask the student's shoe size. And yet we think the GRE is where it's at and somehow identifies this group of excellent, potentially wonderful graduate students. Yet the other tests are similar to that, and I think it is a collision course with some of our other values. I'll just leave it at that. I'm mistrustful of putting standardized tests in as part of the criteria.

Peters: Secretary

Gibson: May I? Or whenever.

Peters: Ok, Secretary **Edginton**.

Edginton: You know, I'd like to speak to the process that the Provost utilizes to disburse resources, because again in the Faculty Senate Retreat we talked about the opportunity for the Provost to go back to a zero base in terms of the budgeting strategy that she might use. And that is all of the lines, when they are vacated, ought to be pulled back into the Provost's Office. And the Provost then ought to use some criterion, and maybe people responding to each one of these areas, to make a decision about where those funds go. And until we liberate ourselves from holding onto resources and move it to a level where they can be reassigned to new programs or to meet labor demands or student demand or whatever, we're not going to change this process. It's not going to—it's not going to occur. So, you know, I would encourage us to encourage the Provost to pull this process back into the Provost's Office, to demand some kind of criterion to be addressed in written format as people seek their lines back or whatever—or new lines or whatever—to those decisions to be made. I think if we don't do that, we're not going to make any progress here.

Peters: Provost **Gibson**:

Gibson: Just to respond to that, Department Heads do—well, and I can't say that this happens all across campus, but, in general, Department Heads do present a rationale to their Deans as to why they need to keep a line when a line is vacant. And then the Dean does talk to me about why that

line needs to be filled. So, at—what you're talking about is a little bit more drastic where they would just automatically come back, but right now lines are not just filled automatically. They're—there is a process. It's more discussion of why that line needs to be filled. I think it was in the Fall when the Dean and I came to the College of—sorry, the School of Music about 2 lines that they needed to be filled and how that process was going to work. So, the discussions are going on, and I think those discussions are very important.

What I wanted to really say is that—and I'm going to try to put as positive a spin on this as possible, although it's really not positive. There's no way to make it positive. [light laughter all around] But this discussion started last year when, in fact, I—we reallocated funds and those—we had salary savings. We closed Price Lab School, and we had some salary savings. So, you know, entering this academic year I probably—you know, Provost's Office had—has, I'll still try to use present tense, you know over a $1 million in salary savings. If you don't know, you need to know that UNI could be facing another financial crisis, and I would ask that either Scott [Chair **Peters**] or Michael **Hager** [Vice President for Administration and Financial Services] come to [Faculty] Senate to discuss the situation that we find ourself [sic] in because of enrollments. We are projecting a deficit for next year, and it could be a significant deficit. And so, you know, it's very nice, and this is what, you know, this is what I had asked that we do so that we could have a discussion on where new lines would go. We've had that discussion at Academic Affairs Council. My hope was to be able to come up with a consensus of what the [Faculty] Senate proposed, what Academic Affairs Council proposed, and to be able to launch, hopefully, some of those new lines next year. But we do find ourself [sic] in a precarious situation. I also think that you know that President Ruud has publically said that his number 1 objective in coming in this Summer is enrollments, to come up with strategies and plans to get our enrollments where they need to be. So, I think before this Body leaves for the Summer there needs to be a discussion about where we are financially, and the [Faculty] Senate needs to understand that.

Peters: I have been passing along information about enrollment, projecting shortfalls in enrollment, and have attached dollar amounts to those emails

to Senators and have gotten only a few emails back in return. So I was kind of waiting to hear what—you know, getting responses about that, but, I mean, we can certainly schedule. It would probably mean another—we would probably have to have another special meeting just for that,

Gibson: Well, I

Peters: unfortunately, when you look at our other business.

Gibson: That's your—that's your decision. I'm just saying I think

Peters: But, I mean, we—and we don't have to decide that right now. But, you know, maybe we can have an email conversation about that. As you know from the emails I have sent, it could be—it's, I mean, I guess at this point I would say it's likely to be in the millions of dollars shortfall from lost enrollment. And we're getting, if everything works out well, we're getting the additional 2.6% from the State's [fund] and the additional $4 million, but that's just going to keep pace with salary increases and increase in expenses on campus and what have you. So, Professor **Butler**.

Butler: I just wanted to move us away from this scary topic and back to some of the work of this Committee. [laughter all around] I've taken a lot of notes about what people said here, and obviously this is something that has to be decided on by the—we're—our role, I guess, is only advisory in this capacity, and really I think the [Faculty] Senate's passing of this would only be advisory to the Provost, but I do think, and speaking for the Committee, that we believe a quantified approach is a—will result in better judgments regarding faculty lines than what I was referring to as a "clinical approach," which is basically how the decisions, it seems, are made now, as Provost **Gibson** mentioned that she has consultations and she talks with people. She uses her judgment along with the judgment of Department Heads and Deans and the like, and they reach what they think is a best judgment. I'm not criticizing those decisions. I'm simply saying that this is a different way of making decisions. And to Senator **Gallagher**'s point that there are problems with metrics, yes, there are problems with metrics. However, making decisions with metrics results in better decisions than clinical decisions, and

Gallagher: How? How is that? I really don't want to [voices overlapping]

Butler: and—and if I could continue, if you and I—if you-and-I [distinguishing between "UNI" and "you-and-I" sounding similar when spoken; light laughter around] both had the same academic program, and I admitted students on the basis of their ACT scores, which explains only 30% of the variance in student achievement, and you admitted students based on shoe size, I would wager that I would have a much better program than you, in terms of the quality of students.

Smith: She'd have a better basketball team. [laughter all around and voices commenting]

Butler: And, therefore, would have less financial problems at the University. [continued laughter]

Gibson: And I just want to clarify, I did not—I didn't want to give the impression that Deans and Department Heads are not using data.

Male voice: Well, of course they are.

Butler: No, the

Gibson: They are using data, so I just want to make sure that

Butler: And if I could just clarify, too, I don't want to give that impression either. I'm saying clinical judgment does use data. It uses your judgment and expertise along with data to arrive at decisions. All I'm saying is, and I know that this is difficult for some people to accept or believe, and I would appeal to Jerry [Senator **Smith**] to back me up on this [laughter all around and many voices commenting], to show that you would make better decisions when you make them this way.

Peters: Senator **Heston**.

Smith: If you could—I would qualify that. [more laughter]

Heston: I think that, first of all, from all I've seen, some of these metrics are already being used. They already take into acc—when decisions are made

Gibson: Yes.

Heston: and lines are assigned, they take into account how many adjuncts are teaching major courses. They take into account how many—what students—I mean, I think the Deans and the Department Heads put their arguments together. It may not have a little formula that you then crunch the numbers through, but I think they do use some of that data. They may just not use it in quite the very linear, inflexible manner that a formula would require. And a formula is inevitably inflexible, because you pick your weights, and then you're stuck with them.

The reality is, and the hard part of all this is, no matter what we do, we will be robbing Peter to pay Paul. Someone will get more. Someone will get less. There will be perceptions of unfairness. You can put all the numbers on it you want. You can put any kind of weights you want. It will still be seen as unfair by certain individuals, certain programs, because they will lose out. There is no way—this is a—this is a—this is a sum zero game. It moves things around. And maybe that's as it should be. I certainly actually think it should be. We should be moving things around. We can't stay exactly the same.

But the notion that somehow by putting metrics onto it and creating a formula we will have created some sort of equitable playing field in a context in which there are so many inequities already is wishful thinking, from my perspective. And I appreciate the work that the Committee did, and I absolutely believe in transparency, and we need much greater clarity about how things are decided, and I'm not opposed to some sort of—to the use of metrics in some sort of reasonable way, but as Chris noted, I think that the tweaking is where the devil—the devil's in the details here.

And we may not—we may need to get onboard first about what our stake really is. Do we really want to invest more money in having a signature

undergraduate Liberal Arts Core and cheat, if you will, majors because of that? Because we will have to do that. Do we want to have a program that can really recruit interesting faculty because they know if they have a dual-career spouse situation we have faculty-friendly policies that respond to that in a meaningful way.   This formula will not take that into account, or whatever formula you might create, unless you build that in.

The hard part, I think, in all of this is acknowledging that we are going to be making decisions, or the Provost is making decisions, that are going to be hurtful to our colleagues, and there's no way around that no matter what we want to do in terms of lovely data and metrics. And so I think we need to think a lot about how we communicate the value of this as opposed to the traditional way, whatever that is, which I think is actually more data-based than we might realize including these metrics. Because otherwise we're just—we're just trading one inequitable system for another one that's inequitable as well, and it may have—it may have better outcomes, but those outcomes are selected by criteria that are predetermined, and there's a subjective component in determining what those outcomes should be and why they're more valuable, why they're good.

This is why my colleague, Dr. **Gallagher**, is talking about "There's no different [sic] when you get fundamentally down to it." You make a decision initially and that is subjective. "To do this," that is a subjective decision, and after that what you put in there is a subjective decision. How you measure a lot of this is subjective decisions. It's a problem of the reality of measurement. It's not really—unless you're in Physics maybe, where you can really measure things down to the nth degree.

Kidd: We try. [laughter around]

Heston: In human reality, in human reality, it's much more complex than numbers.

Peters: I've got 3 people in the queue, and I think we'll try to wrap it up with that. Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yes, I think it's clear where the incremental resources we're going to get are getting absorbed by enrollment declines. There's not going to be a ton there. So the resources that are here to move around, and resources that are created when faculty retire, move somewhere else. This is the point that Chris [Senator **Neuhaus**] made, and the Provost talked to how that's done. What I would suggest is that the Provost's Office keep track of those kinds of things. Every time somebody leaves, what percentage of the time does that line stay in the Department? What percentage of the time does it stay in the College? And I would like to know—for us to know that and would like the Provost's Office to kind of manage that percentage down. You should try to increase the reallocations outside the Departments and outside Colleges. You, of course, do it selectively where the particular College or Department can't make a great argument, but recognize that by doing that you're creating resources to go somewhere else where there's greater need. So I would like the Provost to keep track of those numbers, and, in fact, to let the Faculty Senate know about it. That would be, for me, an important part of resource allocation in this University.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I want to comment about all of the discussion about program quality, and I think it's important to consider program quality, but it's a—would seem to me, it's a very minor consideration when you're talking about allocation of faculty lines other than perhaps the one that if—if a high-quality program loses—I mean, a faculty member retires, and that then because they are high quality they might want to be—to have some sort of extra—that would come into play. For new lines, you know, if I've got a—if I've got a perfect program quality, and I'm only going to get 3 more students if you give me another line, that makes no sense, to consider it in those kinds of situations. So, I—it seems to me that one has to be a little bit careful when you start talking about how critical it is to think about program quality in the allocation of new faculty lines. I also, I think—I agree with Jerry [Vice-Chair **Smith**] about what he's talking about on the—keeping track of lines, and to me that will reenergize the University if that's done. I want to remind him, however, that there's at least one College that's bigger than the others combined or thereabouts, and so having that

31

number, if they stay within that one College, that might not be such a bad thing

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

MacLin: I was just going to say that if I'm going to be on end of a hurtful decision, I'd like to be—I'd like to know that it was made by data and that I had access to how that decision was made.

Peters: Senator **Terlip** any closing thoughts for us?

Terlip: As we're talking about this, we've been talking about it in the context of new lines. We've just heard there might be cuts. I'm assuming you would use the same criteria to make cuts as you would to allocate new lines, and I think we need to make sure the criteria work both ways, because I—it doesn't make any sense to me to use different criteria for cutting. You're doing well, so you get new lines. You're not doing well, we have a different set of criteria for cutting? There has to be some overlap.

Peters: Well, I guess we have a couple different ways we could proceed here. I'm not sure that it's super important to the Provost that "the [Faculty] Senate" pass a specific resolution with a set of criteria. I mean, we've had this draft, and you've heard the discussion. And we could simply move to receive the report and pass it along to the Provost along with the Minutes of the meeting as our advice to the Provost. Is that

Gibson: That

Peters: Does that sound fine to you? Is that—or would you like us—or am I wrong with that and you would like us to try to take some of the stuff that was thought of here today and come up with something a little bit more thorough than this? You would—you would prefer

Gibson: That would—I would. That's what I would like.

Peters: OK.

Gibson: If the Committee could give it one more shot.

Peters: Ok. Let's refer it back to the Committee then. Is there any objection to doing that? Ok.

ADJOURNMENT (5:08 p.m.)

Peters: Thank you all. And without objection, we'll stand adjourned.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

04/08/13
Maucker Union Oak Room
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 2 Addenda to these Minutes.

Senate Budget Committee
Criteria for Determining Faculty Lines

Criterion	Definition	Metrics
Labor demand	Program requirement for faculty labor	Number of courses in program taught by adjunct; student:teacher ratio in program; key aspect of discipline unrepresented by faculty
Student demand	Student enrollment in program	Number of majors; number of graduates; class size; potential for demand
Signature program	Degree to which program is central to university's identity.	Subjective judgment
Program uniqueness	Degree to which program is unique among Regent's institutions.	Number of other Regent's institutions offering program

Email from Senator **Kidd** to other Senators prior to meeting:

On 4/1/2013 11:27 AM, Tim Kidd wrote:

Senators -

   I wanted to share some additional metrics I thought might be applicable for judging the importance/quality of a program. Since there are several, thought to send it out as a list before the meeting. These are mostly things we've thought of as part of a self-assessment process we are doing in Physics.

Program Quality Metrics:

1. Incoming Student ACT score / High School Ranking
2. Students with University/College level scholarships
3. Scholarly Output - Grants, Peer Reviewed Publications, Patents, (other metrics defined by department?)
4. Student Outcomes - Employment Rate, Salary, Grad School Placement, Satisfaction with Degree
5. Number/Percentage of out-of-state students
6. Number/Percentage of students participating in research,internships,fellowships

Signature Program Metrics (Mission Centrality)

1. Percentage of Peer Institutions that have this program
2. Number/Percentage of non-major students who take courses by faculty in this program
3. Comparison of key metrics (i.e. graduation rate, other obtainable data) with peer institutions and/or other regents institutions.

Best,
Tim