

Regular Meeting
UNI FACULTY SENATE MEETING
09/23/13 (3:01 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.)
Mtg. #1739

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Smith** called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Press present included MacKenzie **Elmer** from the *Waterloo Courier*.

Provost **Gibson** simply noted that Professor **Chancey** [Cliff, Head, Department of Physics] is now in China and under the care of professionals.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** in extensive remarks first asked that the Minutes from the Fall Faculty Meeting be appended to this document, and that was approved. He then issued a challenge to all to be aggressive in support for UNI and to voice an urgent need for greater resources from the Board of Regents as well as the State of Iowa [see full remarks below]. Chair **Funderburk** then discussed the Rod Library Feasibility Study, the upcoming UNI Open Houses, and the opportunities for Alumni Association Tailgating events.

Chair **Smith** in his comments stated that he would discuss an upcoming special meeting with Board of Regents President **Rastetter** under New Business. He then noted that Senator **Nelson** has agreed to serve on the University Writing Committee and that an opening still exists on the Student Conduct Committee. Faculty Chair **Funderburk** reminded Chair **Smith** that the Regents Awards Committee will also need a member nominated.

Chair **Smith** also noted that a faculty representative was granted for President **Ruud**'s new Enterprise Risk Management Council, and he suggested that this position become part of the ongoing duties of the Faculty Senate Vice-

Chair/Chair-Elect and received nods in approval of this after some discussion. Also, the Expedited Student Grievance Policy needs revision and improvement, it was found, after the Committee attempted to follow it last year. Senator **Peters** will draft a Faculty Senate petition to be considered and referred to the EPC for further work.

Chair **Smith** then reiterated the need for faculty participation in the upcoming Open Houses but also called for better advertisement of the Open Houses so that faculty time spent will be indeed useful. He also reminded Senators of the upcoming meeting with local State Legislators on October 28th and the UNI Day at the Capital next spring as opportunities to advance UNI politically.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

September 9, 2013, Minutes were approved as submitted (**Strauss/Cooley**).

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1153 1051 International Travel Safety Policy—Faculty and Staff (regular order 10/14/13)

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/international_travel_safety_policy_faculty_and_staff_.pdf

Motion to docket in regular order on 10/14/13 (Nelson/Terlip**) Passed.

1202 1098 Request for Emeritus Status, Cherin A. **Lee**

1203 1099 Request for Emeritus Status, Stephen **Fortgang**

1204 1100 Request for Emeritus Status, Donna **Raschke**

1205 1101 Request for Emeritus Status, Robert H. **Decker**

Motion to docket all four in regular order (O’Kane/Abebe**). Passed.

4. New Business

1206 1102 Consultative Session with Board of Regents President **Rastetter** (executive session 10/07/13)

**Motion to docket as executive session in regular order on 10/07/13

(Peters/MacLin). Passed.

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1200 1096 Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** Regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation (head of the order 9/23/13)

**Discussion completed.

1198 1094 Performance Review of Senate Budget Committee in quasi-committee of the whole on 9/23/13 (**Peters/Terlip**)

**Item delayed due to lack of time.

1199 1095 Request for Emeritus Status, John W. **Swope**

Motion to approve (Cooley/Heston**). Passed.

1201 1097 Consultative Session with President **Ruud** (head of the order 10/14/13)

**Future business.

5. Adjournment (5:00 p.m.)

**Meeting adjourned by acclamation.

Next special meeting:

Monday, 10/07/13, executive session (current Senators only)

Presidential Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Next regular meeting:

Monday, 10/14/13

Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 73 pages, including 3 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 9, 2013
Mtg. 1739**

PRESENT: Tilahun **Abebe** (alternate for Michael **Walter**), Jennifer **Cooley**, Barbara **Cutter**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Blake **Findley**, Jeffrey **Funderburk** (as Faculty Chair and as alternate for Melinda **Boyd**), Gloria **Gibson**, Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Melissa **Heston**, Tim **Kidd**, Michael **Licari**, Nancy **Lippins**, Kim **MacLin**, Lauren **Nelson**, Steve **O’Kane**, Scott **Peters**, Susan **Roberts-Dobie** (alternate for both Chris **Edginton** and Todd **Evans**), Gary **Shontz**, Jerry **Smith**, Mitchell **Strauss**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip** (23 present)

Absent: Karen **Breitbach**, Syed **Kirmani**, Marilyn **Shaw**, (3 absent)

CALL TO ORDER (3:31 p.m.)

Chair **Smith**: All right. I’m looking at 3:30, which means I’m going to call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Smith: And as usual, I’ll begin with press identification. I believe we’ve got MacKenzie **Elmer** from the *Waterloo Courier* here. I don’t see Lihn **Ta** from the *Northern lowan*.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Smith: Comments from Provost **Gibson**.

Gibson: Just one FYI that Professor **Chancey** [Cliff, Department Head of Physics] did make it to China, and so now he is under the care of professionals, so I think that's great news.

Smith: Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Smith: And Faculty Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: Thank you. I have fairly extensive announcements and comments today. First, I want to thank the faculty for participating in the Fall Faculty Meeting held last week. I also want to thank those who offered very thoughtful comments including Senate Chair **Smith** who issued a provocative challenge to faculty. I particularly want to acknowledge Regent **Mulholland** who joined us on a very busy day from her schedule and offered very supportive and enthusiastic comments about UNI on behalf of the Iowa Board of Regents.

We have collected transcripts of remarks from each of the speakers, except that I forgot to send Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] a note. So if you could get your comments, we'd like to collect those with the minutes that our faculty Secretary, Scott **Peters**, has prepared. And I'd like to ask at this time that the Senate would authorize those minutes for the Fall Faculty Meeting be attached to the Minutes of today's [Faculty Senate] meeting and be distributed as an attachment.

Smith: Could we do that, take that as authorized? [heads nod around the room] Any objections to that? [none heard] Consider it authorized. [see Addendum 1 to this transcript]

Funderburk: Thank you. We at UNI have many goals and projects for the year ahead. However, it is absolutely critical that our number one goal for UNI be to secure better funding for this institution. President Ruud has established that the priority for this year's budget is to make the one time allotment of \$10M a permanent addition to the UNI base budget.

In order for us to achieve this—achieve success in this, it is important that every member of the UNI community take it as a personal responsibility to aggressively push for this support. Faculty can and should discuss this critical need with friends, neighbors, political representatives, or just perfect strangers you run into!

As I mentioned at the faculty meeting, historically UNI has not done a good job of “blowing its own horn.” Our voice has often been drowned out by the loud and constant crowing of our larger and much richer sister institutions. Interminable slide shows about the hospital’s latest multi-hundred million dollar addition or the latest in seed corn advancements dominate hours of Board meetings with little said about the smaller sister institution laboring away to educate and serve the State of Iowa with minimal financial support.

THIS MUST CHANGE!! and we must take it upon ourselves to be part of that change.

This University offers Iowa incredible tangible benefits including a world class education for its children, a well-educated work force, and easily-defined economic benefits that are highly significant in the Cedar Valley but extend to every other county in Iowa as well. A dollar spent in support of the University of Northern Iowa returns many more dollars directly to the State of Iowa. With over 60% of our graduates remaining in the State, this financial support for education directly impacts Iowa.

While our sister institutions could literally survive without State funding by relying on money from out-of-state students as well as large federal and corporate grants, UNI cannot. We have been scraping by with a mere 16-18% of State money controlled by the Board of Regents while the other institutions receive the lion’s share without the requirement to demonstrate need for such opulent support. One institution recently flaunted their affluence when \$6M in support for a new building was denied and the institution decided to continue the project using other internal resources available to it. If you think about it, in order to cause a financial impact similar to the one we felt 2 years ago here on the UNI campus, one would have to eliminate all State funding at the largest of our sister schools.

Yet, when seeing greater competition from UNI and growing support for stabilizing our funding, our siblings begin to aggressively recruit within our own town with billboards, and even a reception, hosted by one the other school presidents only a couple of weeks ago, happened right here in Cedar Falls. They will fight to keep their generous cut regardless of its impact on us.

So, faculty, with this I call upon you to be more aggressive with your calls for increased financial support. Do it in a way that brings great attention to this fine institution. Explain why we are outstanding stewards of the funds we receive. Tell them about your stories with research and teaching. Share your student success stories. But do this as publicly as you can. It is not enough that folks within the University hear....we already know. Reach out to the broader community through every channel you have.

Throw off the mantle of humility that has shrouded UNI's many successes and crow a bit!

This year, we need to join our new President to help increase the awareness of UNI as the outstanding and successful institution that all the data shows us to be.

So, while Chair **Smith** challenged you to chart a course for the academic side of our institution, I challenge you to take every opportunity to speak out on behalf of this institution.

It is critical to everything we do that our funding be increased whether that be by increased State allocations, reallocation of resources already in the control of the Board of Regents, or through a combination of both.

I appeal to you as educators to help in this cause, because, most importantly, increased and consistent financial support is critical in order to maintain and improve the quality of education we offer to our students.

Colleagues, it's time to celebrate the University of Northern Iowa as the gem of the Iowa Regent System. It is THE Comprehensive University of Iowa and helps to make Iowa a better place. Start looking for opportunities to tell our story. Make a personal commitment to help. Do that which is within your

power by speaking out. Make no mistake, our voices can, and will, make a difference in this effort.

So, I have a few other announcements then of things coming up, some of which I think you already know about.

Rod Library Building Feasibility Study

The Rod Library has a building feasibility study going. I think some of you got emails about this. The Rod Library and Facilities Planning are embarking on a semester-long library building feasibility study. This is intended to be a systematic look at the library space. OPN Architects from Cedar Rapids have been hired to work with the library on this study. Library consultant Sam **Demas**, who's the former Library Director at Carleton College, will also be assisting with the project.

The goals of the library building feasibility study are to analyze how library space is currently used, explore space trends in academic libraries, get feedback from various user groups across campus about what they would like to see to meet their needs, and then develop a 20-year vision for library space changes. The result will be a report which will be shared with the campus and which will guide future library renovation projects, including the potential for a library-wide renovation at some future time.

I believe that everyone will agree that the library is, at the very least, the symbolic hub of any university. For that reason, I hope that faculty will actively take part in these discussions as the library seeks to chart a course for the future.

The following opportunities are available for the faculty on this. On Tuesday, October 1, Sam **Demas** will be giving a presentation and leading a discussion on library space trends from 4-5:30 p.m. That will be in the University Room, Maucker Union. On Wednesday, October 2, a faculty focus group will take place from Noon-1:00 on the library's main floor, aka "second floor," near the double elevators. Bring your lunch – and your ideas. Then also just for reference, there are student groups scheduled in order to get their input on the library usage as well.

UNI Open House event

This Saturday, September 28, will be the first of five UNI Open House events that will take place this academic year. These events are an effort directed by President **Ruud** to help increase UNI's visibility and increase our general recruitment efforts. Hopefully your Department is taking part in this event as I believe all have been invited to participate. According to information I found online, the schedule Saturday will include the following: 8:00-9:15 Check In/Browsing Fair. That will be located in the Maucker Union. 9:15-10:15 is welcome and General Session. The location of that seems to be the Lang Hall Auditorium. 10:30-11:30 they have a Major and Career Opportunities event with no location listed for that. Even if you are not already involved, consider coming by to see what is happening. At the very least, you can greet our guests and future students.

You might have heard, Oct. 4 there's an Installation Ceremony for President **Ruud** [light laughter around] Please plan to attend and march in the procession if you can. The Installation Ceremony will take place at 10:00 a.m. in the GBPAC Great Hall. While this Ceremony is to welcome President **Ruud**, it is also an opportunity for UNI to demonstrate to the public and the State leadership in attendance our commitment to the well-being and continued improvement of this institution. A large audience and large attendance will send an important message about the unity of mission we all share. If you teach classes during that time, please be aware that there may be students who will need to attend the installation. Please be as flexible as you can in dealing with these situations. Whether you march in the procession or not, please come!

Alumni Association Tailgate Events

Then the last, the Alumni Association Tailgate Events. I mentioned in an earlier communication to faculty, I had the pleasure of attending the Alumni Association's Tailgate event before the Iowa State Roll....I mean Game....and found it an excellent opportunity to meet some UNI Alumni and also visit with former students. The Alumni Association will be sponsoring tailgate events before each of the remaining home football games. I encourage all faculty to

drop in to visit. There is even free food and a cash bar! And the prices are pretty cheap at the bar.

The next event will be this Saturday, September 28 from 2-3:30 p.m. It will be located just south of the McLeod Center. In the event of inclement weather, they will be moving inside to the Alumni Suite in the McLeod Center. Please consider this opportunity to help and support the efforts of our Alumni Association. Our Alumni will be critically important for the continued health and growth of UNI, and they deserve our support. Thank you.

Smith: Any questions for Faculty Chair **Funderburk** on any of this? [none heard] Ok, we all appreciate your comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JERRY SMITH

Smith: I have my usual plethora of comments. And the first one is going to trigger a mistake on my part. I want to announce that arrangements for our meeting with Board of Regents President Bruce **Rastetter** have been finalized. We are going to be meeting in executive session with President **Rastetter** on October 7, two weeks from today, from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. in the Presidential Room of Maucker Union. Now, I didn't realize that I should put this on the docket as a Calendar Item, because I figured since it's executive session, the rest of the campus didn't have to know about it. But as Scott [Senator **Peters**] correctly pointed out, it really should be put on the docket. So I will bring this up as New Business for us to docket and to talk about "do we want to do this?" "Are we willing to do this in executive session?" Previously, we had expressed a willingness to do that, and he's coming here on the assumption that it will be executive session. So this will come up again a little bit later today.

Second, [Senator] Lauren **Nelson** has agreed to serve as the Senate's representative on the University Writing Committee. And so I want to take this opportunity to finalize this action. Are there any other nominees for that position? [none heard] Any discussion? [none heard] Then I will take it that Lauren is approved for this position by acclamation. She is now the Senate's representative on this committee. You may have noticed that I forwarded

you a copy of the report that the Committee submitted to the Senate in April of 2012. As time permits, in a meeting in the near future, I'm going to ask the Senate to talk about what we might do, through the University Writing Committee, to improve student writing on campus. I'm pleased that Lauren is willing to serve as our point person and liaison with the Committee in that endeavor.

Maybe the final unfilled committee position is for a faculty representative on the Student Conduct Committee. It's a four-year term. Senator **Strauss** is currently on the Committee. Senator **Gould** was recently appointed to serve a term. We still have one appointment to make, that I could make, we could make, out of the faculty at large. I did want to see if there were anybody else on the Senate that was willing to volunteer for that Committee. If you're interested, Mitch [Senator **Strauss**] could tell us how much time commitment is involved. Is it

Strauss: It's—there's 2 forms of time commitment. One is there's usually an annual training to get people up to speed. Then the other is on demand, if there are adjudications that are required. And they usually seek volunteers first, and, depending on what your schedule is and your availability, then you can or cannot serve on them. And those kinds of adjudications may run several hours in the afternoon.

Smith: Ok. If nobody volunteers from the Senate, then I will have to go to the faculty to try and get somebody for this Committee, and I wasn't sure—Scott [Senator **Peters**] and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] would know better—do I do that myself or does Chris **Neuhaus** and the Committee on Committees do that? What's the effective way of doing that?

Funderburk: I was always able to get someone here you could recommend and then bring it in for a Senate vote.

Smith: Ok. I can take recommendations. You could stick it to one of your colleagues. [light laughter around]

Strauss: You just as well throw in a card with a name. [loud laughter around]

Smith: And so there is a precedent. [more laughter] If we don't come up with somebody—yeah, Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**]?

Funderburk: I wanted to note we also have one other committee we need an appointment for the Senate, which is the Regents' Awards Committee as well.

Smith: Ok.

Funderburk: So, if you are trying to decide on your opportunities, there's two.

Smith: And that could be—that's from the Senate though?

Funderburk: It has been, yes.

Terlip: I've done it the last couple of years.

Smith: Ok. I think I did it once or twice as well. So, think about that one. We'll have a—I don't know how quickly that's coming up. This one [Student Conduct Committee], we've got time. It isn't like a time press. But that one might...

Funderburk: It's not a rush. The materials aren't usually out of the College Senates until toward the end of this semester, so just know that we need somebody from the Senate assigned.

Smith: Ok. As it turns out, there is another—beyond that, another faculty committee position that's been authorized, and that's as a result of our request of President **Ruud**. He's added a faculty representative, along with some other representatives, to the Enterprise Risk Management Council. If you remember, I brought this up last time. It was suggested we go right to him, and he's quite supportive. We will, I'm told, soon receive formal notification of this, but I want to move ahead and staff the position. And I've already broached it with the relevant parties. What I'm going to propose is that we make membership on this Committee [*sic*, Council] a normal part of the responsibilities of the Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect who, in this case, would be Tim **Kidd**, but he's been appraised [*sic*, apprised] of this. This Body,

Enterprise Risk Management Council, contains fairly—or includes fairly senior administrative people from across campus and often gets involved in issues of importance to faculty—remember the issue we had with the after-hours access to buildings—so it’s good for the Chair-Elect to get—it’s a way for the Chair-Elect to get acquainted with key players and engaged with important issues. So I think it’s a nice kind of segue for that person as entre. So any discussion of that suggestion to have the Chair-Elect be the—our normal representative on that Committee?

Strauss: Are there continuity issues that you lose when you turn that representative over annually like this?

Smith: Conceivably some, but I—you know, in some ways it’s kind of nice for the Chair-Elect then to be in the Chair and have familiarity with the issues. So, I think that might be an advantage. Having somebody there for a longer term may be beneficial, but, of course, with the Senate it’s always kind of up in the air, because you—you know, you don’t know if they’re going to be around for 3 years. Any other discussion of that? [none heard] Can I take this as supportive then of what I’m proposing, that the Chair-Elect be our normal representative on that Committee [Council]? [heads nodding] Then it is so taken.

An issue that came up at our last meeting concerning which I’d like some additional guidance, and that’s the need to revise and improve the Expedited Students’ Grievance Policy. Now it’s not a high priority time-wise, simply because there are more urgent matters that are currently being addressed by the EPC, but I’m assuming I’ll have to draft a petition, put it on the calendar, and then refer to the EPC for their recommendation. To do that, I wanted to know something more about what’s deficient in the current policy. Scott [Senator **Peters**]?

Peters: Yeah, actually this is not just my suggestion. It’s also Jordan **Bancroft-Smith**’s suggestion. He was the President of NISG last year who had to kind of make up rules as he went along to try to sort out the grievance that was being followed—grievance that had been filed. Granted, what happened last year was exceptional in the sense of the attention to it and the pressure of it, but the current Policy says that once a student has filed a grievance dealing

with make-up work that this grievance has to be settled within a very short timeframe, 5 business days, I believe. And it is the responsibility of the President of NISG to convene the Committee to—well, and that’s about all the Policy says. And then it says that the Committee will listen, will try to find an informal agreement. If it can’t find an informal agreement, then the Committee will make a decision. Where Jordan [**Bancroft-Smithe**] ran into problems was, “Well, ok, what does—you convene the Committee, now what?” So, little things like “Who goes first in terms of presenting, you know, the case—their version of what happened?” I’m trying to think of what some of the other things were, but there were several little procedural things where it took some back-and-forth among the various parties involved to get them to all agree that this was an ok way to handle it. And Jordan’s feeling, and my feeling having been through that flurry of emails and phone calls, was that if we could lay things out more clearly, it would benefit everybody. And I would be willing—in fact, Jordan has suggested that he and I could get together sometime and just make the recommendations. And I know he’s willing to do that. I would be willing to do that. I could then file it as a petition, which presumably we would then refer to the EPC for further discussion, and then it could come back to us.

Smith: Yeah, if you are willing to do that, I’d appreciate it. I think that’s an appropriate way to go. Ok. Yes, Kim [Senator **MacLin**].

MacLin: I was part of that process, so I can forward my feedback to Scott [Senator **Peters**], but essentially when you’re actually trying to use the Policy as a recipe for what to do, there are many, many gaps. And so we had to, as a group send lots of emails in very compressed amounts of time, come to agreement because we were making it up as we went along, because it was not clear what to do. When you look at the Policy, “Ok, what do we do next?” Everyone was like “Huh?” And so we didn’t—we didn’t know what to do, and it was—it was very tough, and he handled it very well. But it was very tough on Jordan [**Bancroft-Smithe**] to have that responsibility to interpret policy to that level. It shouldn’t have been that way.

Smith: Very good. So it sounds like the Policy needs to be fleshed out in considerable detail.

MacLin: Yeah, in some step-by-steps of what happened, and it fell down in terms—things of—even things like where—who calls the meeting? Who communicates with the parties? Who's allowed to be present? That was a big one. You know, all these sorts of things. It—what are notes—what are the minutes that are taken? Is the outcome public? And what does public mean? So I have a list. I can send it to Scott [Senator **Peters**] and let him see it.

Smith: Ok. Any guidance we can give the EPC will—I'm sure they'll appreciate it. Scott [Senator **Peters**] will kind of be the point person on that.

MacLin: Yeah.

Smith: Great. Let's see. Got that [checking off his notes]. Oh, I'm going to talk to some of the same issues that [Faculty] Chair **Funderburk** did. Pass along the request President **Ruud** made when he met with Tim [Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect **Kidd**], Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] and myself. I think it was last week or the week before. Asked that we encourage the faculty to participate actively in the upcoming Open Houses, and also that we take any opportunity we can to let Legislators know that we need the extra funding requested in the Regents' proposed budget.

Now, regarding the Open Houses, I don't know what's happening in other Departments or Colleges, but I have to say I'm a little disappointed at what I'm seeing coming down through my Department. I suspect it may be common. Ask for faculty to participate, basically to sit at a table, and then if you can deliver "some type of fun interactive experiences for prospective students," you could propose to do that. I mean, I think we could do a lot of things like—I mean, I've taught courses to people that would be like this on—lectures on critical thinking topics and some other things that are interesting to parents and new students that I think would be—show what we can do in classrooms. And, you know, could be beneficial. But to do that, we have to feel there's going to be broad publicity so that you're not ending up doing it for 3 people. So, I don't know what's happening here or what's happening on the administrative side to support this, but I would like to feel that there is this kind of support and that it kind of calls for faculty to do this. And, you know, I'm going to be staying in this weekend. My wife's not happy about it,

but if I'm just sitting at a table and meeting 3 people, you know, I'm going to have to explain why I stayed here all weekend just for that. So, it should be something where, yeah, faculty contribute. But on the otherwise, make sure you make good use of faculty time. And I'm a little concerned that maybe that's not being done as well as it should. So I'm hoping, you know, the administrative side kind of takes charge with that.

As far as talking to Legislators, we're going to have an opportunity to do that on October 28th, when several of them are scheduled to meet with us. The two—I think we're standing right now with two senators from this area, Jeff **Danielson**, and I forget the name of the other one [**Dotzler**].

Then the other opportunity would be during UNI Day at the Capital, which is 2/24/14. As I've mentioned this to you, I'm inclined to reserve space for a Faculty Senate table at this event, in the hopes that we can come up with a good way of using that opportunity. But it would be a venue for us to get to Legislators and make a case, and I think—I don't think we should forestall that, at least at this point. Hopefully, we can really take advantage of that. So those are my comments.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Smith: And we are now ready to move on to the next item on the Agenda, which are Minutes for Approval, Minutes from our last meeting on September 9th. Drafts have been circulated. Are there any additions, corrections, or discussion of the draft Minutes? If not, I'd like a motion to approve.

Strauss: So move.

Smith: Moved by Senator **Strauss**. Do I have a second?

Cooley: Yes.

Smith: Second by Senator **Cooley**. Any discussion of this? [none heard] Then a vote. All in favor of approving the Minutes as circulated, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] The Minutes are approved. Ok.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Calendar Item 1153, docket #1051, International Travel Safety Policy—Faculty and Staff (regular order 10/14/13)

http://www.uni.edu/senate/sites/default/files/petition/international_travel_safety_policy_faculty_and_staff_.pdf

Smith: Now, consideration of calendar items for docketing, the first of which, Calendar Item 1153, was previously docketed as 1051 and then referred to the EPC. This is the International Travel Safety Policy for Faculty and Staff that I've talked about at some of our earlier meetings. And as I explained last meeting, the Administration wants to be able to show progress on this at the October Board of Regents meeting. It's caught up in an audit thing, yellow flag, red flag. Let's not go over to the red flag. Let's be able to show progress. So for that reason I'm try—we're trying to move this along. I've got it scheduled for the—would like to have this treated in regular order on our next regular meeting October 14th. That meeting will begin with a consultative session with President **Ruud**, but I'm hoping we'll have time at the end to address this. Is there any discussion of this item before I recommend that it be docketed in regular order for our 10/14 meeting? [none heard] That's what I like to hear. So, I'm going to recommend that—yes?

Terlip: Jerry, we have the Policy. Has the EPC come up with any feedback on that Policy? Are we going to get that ahead of time? Or is that just going to be presented at the meeting?

Smith: I got an email from Francis **Degnin**, I think it was today or earlier this weekend, he said that they had looked at it, and they're feeling pretty comfortable with it. They'll get something out maybe before that meeting that I could share with you. If not, it would be at that meeting, and he'll be here to speak to it as will Associate Provost **Klafter**, so they'll be here on the

14th. So I am asking that someone move that item #1153/1051 be docketed in regular order for consideration at our next [regular] meeting on 10/14.

Nelson: So move.

Smith: Senator **Nelson** moved. Seconded by?

Terlip: Second.

Smith: Second by Senator **Terlip**. Any discussion? [none heard] Then we're ready to vote. All in favor of docketing this in regular order on October at our next [regular] meeting on 10/14, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] This is approved.

Calendar Item 1202, Request for Emeritus Status, Cherin A. **Lee**

Calendar Item 1203, Request for Emeritus Status, Stephen **Fortgang**

Calendar Item 1204, Request for Emeritus Status, Donna **Raschke**

Calendar Item 1205, Request for Emeritus Status, Robert H. **Decker**

Smith: Next on our Calendar Items for Docketing are four emeritus requests, and to save time, I'd like to docket these en masse. I think we've done this before, so I'm not treading new ground here. Before doing that, is there any discussion of the advisability of docketing these in regular order for our next meeting? [none heard] No discussion of that, then I'd like a motion to docket in regular order the following emeritus requests: Calendar Item #1202, an emeritus request for Cherin A. **Lee**, which would be docket #1098; Calendar Item #1203, an emeritus request for Stephen **Fortgang**, which would be docket #1099; Calendar Item #1204, emeritus request for Donna **Raschke**, which would be docket #1100; and finally Calendar Item #1205, emeritus request for Robert H. **Decker**, which would be docket #1101. And again, I'm asking that these all be docketed in regular order for our next meeting. Do I have a motion to that effect?

O'Kane: Moved

Smith: So moved by Senator **O’Kane**. Second? By Senator **Abebe** [who indicated]. Any discussion? [none heard] Then all in favor of docketing all four of these emeritus requests in regular order at our next meeting, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard] They are approved and docketed. Ok.

NEW BUSINESS

Calendar Item 1206 for Docket #1102, Consultative Session with Board of Regents Present Bruce **Rastetter** (executive session 10/07/13)

Smith: Now, New Business. As Scott [Senator **Peters**] correctly pointed out to me, we do need to docket the executive session with Bruce **Rastetter**, if we’re going to have that on October 7th, and that is 2 weeks from today. I did talk with him at the Regents meeting, you know, talked about basically the option we have a regular meeting or we can do executive session. And he did express a fairly strong preference for executive session. So, I would—is there any discussion of the advisability of calling a special meeting on October 7th that would be used exclusively for the purpose of having an executive session discussion with Chair of the Board of Regents or President of the Board of Regents Bruce **Rastetter**? Discussion of that? Senator **Swan**?

Swan: So, it seems like according to our rules that we would be treating this as a consultative session, and so we could approve having a consultative session. Then, to go into executive session, we just would do so at that meeting for any period that we need to be in executive session. I don’t see how our rules provide for any executive sessions, just plainly. Right? We have different kinds of meetings in which we move into executive session when, as our rules say something like “the discussion of that specific matter would do irreparable harm to an individual or the University.” I think it says just that. But, so we could have a consultative session with the understanding that he expects it to be mostly in executive session, that you would move into it, into executive session, almost right away after greetings or whatever, and then you come out of it to close the consultative session.

Smith: Now, if we do that, and I can understand your point of wanting to do that, we would, though, have to provide for taping and transcription, if all we're doing in the meeting is just moving into executive session.

Swan: For the beginning and the end, you would.

Smith: Well, that's a huge hassle for our people [administrative assistant and audio technicians], and I would want to waive that requirement.

Peters: Yeah, I think for something like that we could, sorry Laura [Faculty Senate Secretary **Terlip**], just have the Secretary take traditional Minutes for the few minutes—what presumably would be the very few minutes of an open session. [laughter around and by the Secretary for the added work and jokes about maybe the Secretary of the Faculty, i.e., **Peters**, could do it, with loud laughter all around]

Smith: So we have another way of taking minutes that would serve our purposes without going through the full taping routine. [voices agreeing] Would that be comfortable for everybody?

Swan: Well, the problem only would be if we did more in the consultative session outside of executive session.

Smith: Yeah, and, I would kind of refuse to do that, right?—unless the Senate really insisted. But we shouldn't do that. We just want to have a consultative session.

Peters: Yeah, and I mean, this—I had asked Jerry [Chair **Smith**] if the docketing of this item was going to specify that it is expected to be an executive session, and I think Senator **Swan's** point about the—about whether you can, in fact, specify that in advance, but the reason I had raised that with him is you don't—I wouldn't want to get into a situation where we expect everyone's ok with executive session; you make special arrangements to get here; you get here; we vote to go into executive session and it fails; and then what do we have? So that's why I thought it was useful to do it at the docketing stage so we could talk about this now, if people did have objections to it.

Swan: If we have objections, we should talk about them. [voices agreeing]

Smith: Senator **Nelson**.

Nelson: Do we have procedures for short-term changes to our rules so that we could accomplish something? I would see two advantages to being able to specify that it was an executive session. One is that it could change then at the last minute. And then, two, people reading the Agenda for that meeting would be alerted to the fact that they would probably be asked to leave.

Swan: Well, I think the Agenda, if I may—I think the Agenda should say that we expect this—this is a consultative session that the expectation is that it will be entirely, all substantive portions, be in executive session.

Nelson: Ok, that would satisfy that concern.

Smith: [Faculty] Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: There's another work around which would be if we schedule it as a retreat. We are outside the bounds of the Bylaws and can schedule it as a private retreat with other rules.

Smith: Yeah, and that's how we did things with the President this summer. We could do the same thing. That would

MacLin: I think there's benefit for it being a real meeting, and that he's here for a real Senate meeting. I appreciate the retreat notion, but I don't think we need to go that route. I think that it makes good sense to have him on the books as coming here for a Senate meeting, and then we're accommodating our all—all of our desires to have it be an executive session so we can have the most productive meeting possible. And plus, as Jennifer [Senator **Cooley**, sitting next to her] pointed out, if you have a retreat, you have to bring food. [laughter all around]

Smith: I've got extra Hamburger Helper at my place. [more laughter]

Swan: I had this—I sympathize with that sentiment, but at the same time if all substantive matters are going to be in secret, I don't see how it is a real Senate meeting. I understand that we want to accommodate a desire to meet, and so we would do that, but a retreat could do that as well without saying to the faculty that we are having a Senate meeting. Either way, though, I see that you do want to meet with President **Rastetter**.

Smith: I want to be assured that the Senate's going to be supportive of a meeting with President **Rastetter** and doing so with Senate only in attendance.

Nelson: Yes.

Smith: If we're on board with that, then we're fine. I'm inclined to go with the way we talked about it as having it as a regular meeting, announcing it but making clear it will be executive session. You know, we'll start consultative, move to executive session. That's the only thing that will be transacted or happen.

Peters: I just wanted to suggest that given the recent history of executive sessions that you may want to send out a special email to faculty assuring them that there's no decisions being made, it is not to announce any bad things that are happening. Maybe you and Jeff [Faculty Chair **Funderburk**] say like this is just part of us building a relationship with the President of the Board [of Regents]. I just would not want, you know, that Agenda to go out without comment, because I think there would be a lot of nervous people then.

Terlip: You'd get a lot of email sharing. [laughter around]

Smith: Could I put—could we put the comments on the Agenda per se? [mail voice replies “Yes”] Just put them on there and saying “Assurance”—I mean rather than send—I don't like to send out emails unless I really

Peters: You can do that.

Smith: But if I put it on the Agenda and make it clear. Are you comfortable with that? [heads nodding around room] Ok.

Swan: It sounds like we were also the ones initiating this. Is that accurate?

Smith: It's a bit of both. He was very—he made it very clear—when we talked to him when he was first elected President that he wanted to meet with the faculty, and we just followed up, and he was

Swan: But it's just for communication.

Smith: Yes.

Swan: This is what I was getting at.

Smith: Yes. Yes.

Swan: Ok.

Smith: So, then I guess I have a request then to docket this item. And, I mean, it's not on your Agenda, but it's going to be 1206, Calendar Item 1206, Docket #1102, consultative session that will be held in executive session with Board President **Rastetter** on October 7th. That's a special meeting, on October 7th. So do I have a motion to docket that in regular order for the October 7th meeting?

Peters: I move.

Smith: Motion by Senator **Peters**. Do I have a second? By Senator **MaLin** [who indicated]. Any discussion of that?

MaLin: Where's it going to be?

Smith: Presidential Room of Maucker Union. I was able to get it for that. Any other discussion? [none heard] Then all in favor of that motion, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Any opposition, say, "Nay or no or whatever." [none heard] Ok. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Smith: Now, Consideration of Docketed Items. There are 4 items on our docket. The last of which, the consultative session with President **Ruud**, is to be addressed at our next meeting—our next regular meeting, October 14th. And with the Senate's permission, I'd like to make one change in today's order of business. Since Item 1198/1094, the Performance Review of the Senate Budget Committee is a rather open-ended matter that we plan to discuss as a quasi-committee of the whole, I'd like us to be able to handle that at the end and handle the emeritus request 1199/1095 before we do that. Are there any objections to the change in the order of business? [none heard] Ok.

DOCKET 1096, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH PROVOST **GIBSON** AND ASSOCIATE PROVOST **LICARI** REGARDING THE CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT LEGISLATION (head of the order 9/23/13) (**KIRMANI/PETERS**)

Smith: So we are going to proceed with the first item on our docket, #1200 Calendar Item, Docket Item 1097 [*sic*, 1096], a Consultative Session with Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari** Regarding the Continuous Improvement Legislation, and I'll ask them to make opening statements after which there should be an opportunity for questioning by Senators. So, I'm going to turn it over to our Provost.

Gibson: Ok. Thank you for the opportunity. We began discussions about continuous improvement last year. It was brought up at Faculty Senate a couple times as we were going through the process. What I would like to do is refresh your memory about the timeline. I also have some documents that I would like to pass out and make a few general comments about the process, and then I'm going to turn it over to Mike [Associate Provost **Licari**] who will talk more specifically about what we've done on our campus. So, I'm sorry if you already know this information, but I just want to make sure we're all starting off on the same—with the same information.

So, in October of 2011, [Iowa State] Senator [Herman] **Quirnbach** sent a letter to the Board of Regents and to the Board asking for assistance in drafting legislation that would require faculty members to address continuous improvement in their teaching. So, the Senator felt that this was an important issue. From his standpoint, what is most important is improving undergraduate education. So, he made that clear to the Board and to Diana **Gonzalez** [Chief Academic Officer, Iowa Board of Regents].

On October 26, 2011, the Senator [**Quirnbach**] came to the Council of Provosts' meeting and met with the Council and talked about once again the importance of continuous improvement and the need for—the need for a process. Now, at that point in time, and actually even previous to that, Diana **Gonzalez** had spoken with the Senator to make sure that he understood what each campus was already involved in when it comes to the issue of continuous improvement. So, we had talked about the fact that a number of our programs on all three campuses are accredited, and that's a form of continuous improvement; that we have regular program reviews; of course, tenure and promotion can be looked at as a form of continuous improvement; annual assessments. But what the Senator wanted was a course assessment. So, even though we were talking about, you know, "This is how programs are assessment—or assessed," he wanted a course-by-course assessment. So we also had in October at the COPS [Council of Provosts] meeting presentations by each of the Assessment Directors, and those Directors reiterated some of the points that we had made—the Provosts had made—about continuous improvement. The Senator thanked us for that information. At that meeting, [Iowa State] Senator [Brian] **Schoenjahn** was also present, and again he thanked us for that information, but for Senator **Quirnbach** this was not enough. He wanted that course-level assessment.

So, as you know, in May of 2012 the legislation was approved, and I—you know, I—I didn't want to kill a lot of trees, but I thought it was important that you have copies of the legislation, so I made a copy for everyone [passed around 1 white sheet; see Addendum 2 to this transcript]. And if you need that as a link [on the internet], I can send it or you can get it as a link. [http://coolice.legis.iowa.gov/linc/84/external/SF2284_Enrolled.pdf --page 14]

So, all 3 institutions have been working on their particular instruments along with the Assessment Directors, and as we have gone through the process, the instrument has been vetted. Our instrument was vetted with the Academic Affairs Council. It was also sent out to Jerry [Faculty Senate Chair **Smith**]. Scott [Senator **Peters**], did you see? [voices clarifying] It went out to Joe, that's right. It went out to Joe **Gorton** [President of United Faculty], and that was earlier in August. And then in August—on August 22nd, a joint letter went out from Jerry [**Smith**] and myself pretty much explaining the process, giving a copy of the instrument and the courses that needed to have the continuous improvement assessment. So here is, just for your, again, your general information, a copy of the letter that went out, our instrument, and the list of courses that will be assessed this Fall [passed around a 5-page purple handout; see Addendum 3].

I thought it would be helpful for you also to see what the two—other two institutions are doing, so the gold [passed around a 3-page handout] is the University of Iowa, and sorry didn't have red paper, the pink is for Iowa State [passed around a 3-page handout].

So, I just want to make a couple other points, and then I'm going to turn it over to Mike [**Licari**]. It's important again to note that the continuous improvement is at the course level, and you can see in the legislation the enrollments that are necessary for the assessments. So, each year it will change, and we will be assessing more and more courses. Each President will include a summary report of their campus's continuous improvement efforts when they meet in February with the Education Appropriation Subcommittee. So, there—so that's why when Mike [**Licari**] talks a little bit about the time table that we have, we have to get information synthesized at the course level so that it can move to the next level, to the next level for synthesis, because the President will have to make comments on what we did, how we did it, when he meets with the Ed. Approps. Committee in February.

Finally, I think it's important to note that, you know, we worked on the form; we vetted the form; we tried to make the form as simple as possible. We didn't want to make it a lot of work for the faculty. We understand how busy faculty are, so we tried our very best so that it could be very straightforward.

However, we'll have to see how this process works this Fall, and see how the form works. We're not saying that the form is perfect. The form is not etched in stone, so we would certainly be looking for feedback from the faculty to say "Can we tweak this this way or tweak it that?" Or "The timetable was difficult." Or "Can we add—look at some of the questions and change them around a little bit?" So not—the process is not etched in stone. The form is not etched in stone. Whatever suggestions you have for next year, which will include even more courses, that will be very, very helpful for us as we move forward.

So, those are my general comments.

Smith: Thank you, Provost **Gibson**. [nodded to Associate Provost **Licari**]

Licari: More for nuts and bolts items now that you all have a copy of our report form [see Addendum 3], you can see that as Provost **Gibson** indicated the idea is, you know, to make this as simple of a process as possible. You know, the front side has a simple checklist of items that you may already be doing in terms of generating information about your own class, and if whatever you might be doing is not on the list, there's the bottom "other" to check off with a quick description of what you might be doing. There is no real requirement for you to change anything that you already do, but if you wish to start doing something that's on this list, if something seems interesting to you that you hadn't otherwise thought of, well, that's fine. But if not, all you need to do is check off what kinds of activities you already have in place for your classes. And then on the reverse is an opportunity to quickly jot down a couple of sentences kind of describing what those methods are and what you learned from them and what you intend to do with the results. So, again, it's something that you should be able to fill out—or any affected faculty member should be able to fill out—quite quickly and just move on.

In terms of what happens to these reports once you fill them out—if you are in a class, you're teaching a course that enrolls at least 300 students, this year you will be requested to fill out one of these. It is filled out and submitted to your Department Head. Your Department Head gathers all of the faculty reports in the Department and then synthesizes them into course-level reporting that goes to the Dean. And so if there are 20 sections of College

Writing and Research, the Department Head—and taught by 20 different faculty, let's say—Julie **Husband** would receive 20 individual reports from the 20 faculty teaching those 20 sections. It would be her responsibility then to distill those or synthesize those into “a report” on College Writing and Research that she would then submit to her Dean Joel [**Haack**, Dean of College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences].

The Deans then will compile a report that will go to the Provost, so she will get four reports, one from each of her Academic Deans. Then it is the Provost's responsibility to compile “the University Report,” that is submitted annually to the Board of Regents. And that will be the basis for any information that President **Ruud** has when he goes before the Education Subcommittee in February.

So that February committee meeting, I'm not sure—nobody knows when that's going to be. The Legislature is in its session obviously. But that is kind of the end point of the timeline that we needed to work back from in order to set this up. Given when the semester ends and when grades are due, and that the Wednesday following Finals Week is Christmas Day, and so what I think will work best for this is to have these reports due from faculty to the Department Heads by Friday, December 13th, which is the last instructional day of the semester. The Department Heads will then have a couple of weeks, really January 3rd, to get their synthesis completed and submitted to their Deans. The Deans will then have a couple of weeks to provide their reports to the Provost, so they will report on this January 17th, and then the Provost has a couple of weeks to put together “the University Report,” no later than, I think, January 31st so that come February the University is prepared and we can submit this material off to the Board in advance of the Education Subcommittee meeting. So that's the timeline.

One other question that I've kind of indirectly addressed it already, but one I'll bring it out and pinpoint it now, one question I've gotten and I believe Senator **Swan** asked me this briefly at the last Senate meeting, was how to handle classes that are interdisciplinary and span Departments, perhaps even span Colleges. We have several types, right, in the Liberal Arts Core courses, for example? Since the individual faculty will be reporting on their particular activities, each individual faculty member will report on their particular

activities to their particular Department Head. And then what will end up happening is if a class spans two Colleges, by the time Gloria [Provost **Gibson**] gets those reports, she'll be able to see the synthesized reporting on a Humanities class from one Dean and the Humanities class from the other Dean, and then she'll be able to bring those together. I think that's the easiest way. Otherwise, we will need to produce very elaborate reporting mechanisms, and I don't think that's—for right now, I don't think that's the most efficient use of our time. If it turns out later that we find that we wish we had more information about those classes, and we want some other mechanism, we can always change the process. We can change the form later. But we'll try it this way and hopefully get some good results. If not, we can always fix those afterwards.

Smith: Then to you.

Gibson: I just—the last point, which I already said, is that I think if we keep in mind the Senator's goal—you know, "What are we doing?" or "What can we do to improve undergraduate education?"—if we keep that as our focus, I think we will certainly meet the intent of this legislation.

Smith: Any questions for Provost **Gibson** and Associate Provost **Licari**? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, bear with me, I'm sure I don't understand this completely, but at the beginning they said they wanted summative and formative reports? Is that correct?

Licari: The—basically the response that—to the legislation that we put together and the other two institutions have put together, you know, have been—have been built—and Donna [**Vinton**, Director of Academic Assessment] can speak to this—Donna **Vinton**, I think, is over there [attending today in audience]—can speak to this directly, too, in collaboration with the Board in terms of their thoughts on whether or not these mechanisms across the three institutions will meet the legislative intent in their comparative roles, so this is what we have.

Terlip: Well, I was just—I mean, I see how it summarizes things. I was just wondering where the formative part comes in, if that’s going to be an expectation from the Legislature.

Licari: We shall see.

Smith: Senator **O’Kane**.

O’Kane: Given that this includes quite a bit of busywork for any number of people, I would be anxious to hear from either or both of you about, you know, the benefits to us doing this, other than appeasing the Legislature.

Smith: Yeah, Mike [**Licari**], go ahead.

Licari: As I mentioned—I was waiting to see what you [Provost **Gibson**] wanted to say. I didn’t want to speak out of turn. [light laughter around] As I mentioned, you know, I think of course we do know that faculty already think a great deal about their courses and take time at the end of every semester to reflect upon the classes that they’ve just taught. And so, there’s a couple of things. One is just the practical reality that we can use this much in the way that we just had faculty identify by survey all of the activities that they do. This is another opportunity to demonstrate to the public all of the things that go into teaching. It’s not just course preparations and grading and delivering material in the classroom, but then that faculty spend a great deal of time and energy and effort to reflect upon their work to make sure it’s as good as possible. So there’s—hang on [to Senator wanting to speak]. So there’s that. I would just say public information. We all know that there are some times are misperceptions as to what faculty do, and so any opportunity we have to provide information to the public about what faculty do, I think that’s useful. You might not like the vehicle. However, that is an efficient—not from your own individual perspective, but from an organizational perspective—that’s an efficient way to gather information and transmit it. So that’s number one.

Number two is as you review the list, as you find yourself teaching in a multiple-section course, let’s be honest, there are opportunities always, right? *Continuous improvement* implies that there are always going to be opportunities to do something different, do something new, try something

with your colleagues, have a departmental discussion as to what you want your multiple-section introductory course to do in your Department or major. I'll look at Scott [**Peters**], and I know in the Political Science Department we had had discussions about what we want to get out of the Intro to American Politics class. Any time that you're kind of provided an opportunity to do that I think is a positive.

O'Kane: I have just a quick follow-up statement. I can't help but have this seem more political than pedagogical, and I can just leave it there.

Gibson: If I could just add, I think that as—we know that Senator **Quirnbach** is an educator. I mean, he is a faculty member. And so we know that he is aware of basic ways in which we do assessments and evaluations, and, you know, he—but I think he also may be aware of the fact that not everyone has the same level of understanding about what goes on at the University and how faculty work continuously to improve undergraduate education. I mean, it's something that you do all the time, but, you know, not only the general public may not understand that, but other Legislators might not understand that as well. And this is a—this will be a report, a document, that will be easily read, easily understood, easily accessed, and that I think, and others think, will contribute to that sort of global understanding of what you do every day. So it does have—it does have some importance beyond what you might view as paperwork.

O'Kane: Can I—two sentences follow-up?

Smith: Ok.

O'Kane: I didn't mean for my statement to necessarily be disparaging.

Gibson: Ok.

O'Kane: But just to be clear, we're doing this for purposes other than, mostly, pedagogical [*sic*, pedagogical] reasons.

Smith: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So just a couple of things. First, Associate Provost **Licari**, why—why can't the Department Chairs/Heads and Deans and then you write a report that already satisfies what the Senator [**Quirmbach**] wants from all the material we already produce without asking faculty of individual courses to fill out this kind of form?

Licari: We tried. And that was part of the discussion where the Senator came to the Council of Provosts' meeting and heard a very lengthy, detailed, very high-quality presentation from the 3 Assessment Directors from the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa, and Iowa State on all of what we already do as mechanisms for, you know, continuously improving the quality of undergraduate education, and it was insufficient in his mind, and so

Swan: So what makes this sufficient? [cell phone somewhere in room begins speaking, causing laughter around] That was an interruption by Siri. [more laughter]

Licari: If we could get Siri to do these....[laughter]. He was very intent on hearing directly from

Swan: Each faculty member.

Licari: each faculty member teaching the classes.

Cutter: Can't we just raise our hand and say, "I promise on my honor to do my duty"?

Swan: Well, I do want to follow-up, but there seemed to be relevant comments.

Cutter: Well, I wanted to follow-up on Jesse [Senator **Swan**]'s actually. [several voices at once]

Smith: Just a minute. Following up on Jesse, ok.

Cutter: Yeah, because I just haven't had a chance to really look that closely at the University of Iowa one, but it's—is every faculty member in every

Department at Iowa have to fill out this? Because it seems like that's just one of the strategies that some Departments use according to theirs.

Licari: And I haven't looked all that closely, but basically Iowa State, Iowa, and the University of Northern Iowa's mechanisms are pretty well the same—pretty much the same in effect. But again, you know, what we've done here is to try to keep things to a bare minimum of, as Senator **O'Kane** said, "busywork," in terms of, you know, the time that it would take to provide the information, I guess.

Smith: Secretary **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I guess one of the things, and the reason why I asked the "summative versus formative" thing, is in the past when the Legislature has asked for test results in comparison to national standards, all those other things are there, but what they want to go to are those numbers. Now I know—so it troubles me a little bit that we're using those kinds of things as a way to measure this. We've already got Donna [**Vinton**] doing assessment reports on learning outcomes and those types of things which aren't test scores and that type of thing.

[quiet question/request from someone]

Smith: Yes.

Licari: Perhaps the Senator has misunderstood the form and the reports, but there's no requirement for that. If a faculty member happens to do those, they can check that off and write about them. If they don't

Terlip: But will the Legislature say, "Why aren't you doing that?" I mean, as soon as we put it out there that gives them a reason to ask a question.

Licari: The Legislature will not see these forms.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: I think a couple things. First, the Senator, that is to say the member of the Iowa Senate, who has—who is behind this, Senator **Quirnbach**, this is his thing. This is kind of something he cares deeply about. It appears that other members of the Iowa Senate do not care as deeply about it, and therefore he has effectively, from what I can tell anyway, he effectively runs the show on this, and it is entirely possible, I think, that he might look at what the three Universities have done, and say, “This is not what I imagined. I imagined.....whatever.....more specific course-level assessment of learning outcomes....and I want more of that.” Maybe he’ll do that. I don’t know. But what the take on it that all three Regents’ Universities have had and that the Board has had is that there—we are trying to convince Senator **Quirnbach** that we already do these things, and that what we do is sufficient, that it assures that we are always working on our courses, and so we are sort of taking that approach first.

Terlip: I agree that we are. It’s just that we do outcomes assessment with learning, so I don’t know why we have to do these other things. That was sort of dovetailing with what Jesse [Senator **Swan**] asked with the things we already do.

Smith: I’ve got Senator **Cutter** next.

Cutter: Jesse [Senator **Swan**] can go first.

Smith: Ok.

Swan: So—and I—nobody means be criticizing. I think Senator **O’Kane** tried to stress this, especially you, Associate Provost **Licari**, in a bad spot having to address these matters as though it’s very important. So interpret my questions further along with that in mind. My colleagues and I can’t help but take things seriously when we’re asked to do them like this, especially when they’re having to do with educating our students and our programs and disciplines, and so it’s hard to imagine responding to this form quickly. It’s hard to imagine in good faith just not checking something because, well, we could have met if there were resources and a real push to have us do the things that are implied or that are good to do in these areas. And so I just don’t know how to—I don’t know how to react to it. I understand the politics

of it. “Just check what you do and don’t check what you don’t do.” The Chair/the Head puts it together etcetera, yet I guess I don’t understand it, and I know my colleagues really don’t understand it, and we’ll try to get together. We’ll try to do this in good faith, yet feel that it’s not really working.

Gibson: I guess what I would ask is that you do try to do it because we are mandated to do it but that you think about whether there’s a better way to do it. I mean, as I said, this is not etched in stone. I mean, really, when we—and I don’t know if you want to have Donna [**Vinton**] say a few words, but throughout the entire process what was foremost in our minds is that we honor the intent but not make it onerous for faculty. I mean, that’s the—those

Swan: Can faculty, who already do something, substitute that through their Chairs versus this? Such as Intro to Literature—faculty already meet and discuss certain kinds of things.

Licari: I think if they are already doing something that’s along those lines, they can just document that on this form.

Swan: In “other.”

Licari: The idea—it—so I think Provost **Gibson**, you know, said it nicely. We’re trying to straddle that line between, you know, making sure that we take this seriously but then also not turning it into, you know, a huge hassle, perhaps for lack of a better word. The other thing that, at least in my mind, we’re trying to navigate is to not make this, “Here is the list of things that you *shall* do,” because we’re also trying to navigate academic freedom here in terms of allowing faculty to address this issue in the best way they think for their class. And so I don’t want to have this be a prescriptive list and, “Here are the things that you should—you have to do.” If you are doing them, like as you mentioned some faculty

Swan: Some people are doing it, yeah.

Licari: They might have a very sophisticated continuous improvement process already in place. If they do, that is super fantastic, and all they need to do is

document this on the form. If they do a few things, and this prompts them to further develop something, then the legislation has actually produced a benefit to the University. But the point is that those kinds of things, I think, are best done and created by faculty.

Swan: And so to follow-up, so for instance on #3 then [see Addendum 3, page 2 of Report], the open-ended questions, that could, you know—“3. In the space below, please provide specific details describing the method you used to gather this information.” That could be quite elaborate, and so you can’t fit it in the space. You are trying to fit in the space that in good faith it could be very difficult to try and respond. But you’re saying, “Just respond however you can, and leave it to the Department Head to assimilate.”

Licari: I think—I think for reporting purposes that the report is not the real outcome we’re looking for. The report is good teaching in the classroom—sorry, the outcome that we’re looking for is good teaching in the classroom. And so what we didn’t want was a seeming need to roll hours and hours and hours for—by each faculty member into this.

Swan: And so for one last thing just for now without that. So it sounds like what we’re saying the way to conceptualize it, it really is the Department Head who is going to have to spend the time putting the things together for that which he or she is responsible.

Licari: Right.

Swan: Ok, so that will be very clearly expressed.

MacLin: I’ll be very quick. I don’t mind, for one, documenting what I do. I’m in the first wave, since I teach Intro to Psych, and I went to one of Donna [Vinton]’s training sessions on this. I think what makes me and others queasy is the assumption that we weren’t doing it already. [voices agreeing] And I know that you—my understanding is that you both communicated that and the other Provosts did as well, is that I just don’t like being told like, “Do this.” And I’m like, I feel like a little kid, with “But I am!” [said in childish whine] You know. [voices agreeing] And then also when they can point out, I can go, “Look, we made them do this.” It’s like “We were!” You know, that’s the part

that really bakes me, is that I just feel like, “Of course, we’re doing this!” And so I don’t mind documenting it. I want you guys to be able to say, “See, see, see all they’re doing!” but I want it always the mantra to be, is we were already doing it anyway. We’re held—we’re doing the bean counting because you asked us to, but we were already doing it anyway.

Gibson: The Provosts expressed that numerous times.

Smith: Senator **Cutter**.

Cutter: So, yeah, I found your comments, Associate Provost **Licari**, helpful in—to clarifying the flexibility of this, but I think it’s important to understand that—I mean, this—our faculty saw a copy of this at a meeting recently, and people were very concerned because they just see this at a meeting, and when they looked at it quickly it seemed like it might not—all these categories might not fit our discipline very well, and how many methods did you have to check, and all those kinds of things. And this is what the reaction, I think, is going to be in a lot of Departments unless this kind of clarification is embedded, you know, maybe in the cover letter, that it’s ok to not have 5 out of 7 methods, that, you know, be it methods appropriate. And also that if maybe we could get some kind of formalized change process. Like, it’s great that you want change, but I think that Departments would like to have some—you know, it’d be good to have Departments have like a formal input for revising this for the future.

Licari: Oh, I see, changing the document? [many voices agreeing]

Cutter: Yeah. Yeah, because I think there are some Departments who would feel more comfortable with some of these methods and others who would feel like maybe only one or two fit their discipline as well.

Licari: Yeah, I mean, yeah, we

Cutter: But I think people just need to be sort of told that and not wonder about those kinds of things.

Licari: Uhm,

Smith: Yes, go ahead.

Licari: Ok. That's absolutely appropriate, you know, as faculty in the various Departments around campus work on this or begin filling these out at the end of the semester, if we have certain Departments that have faculty pretty much always checking "other" and then having to describe what it is, clearly we've missed something then. So, we'll be able to generate some information that way and then, of course, if we want to develop a more formal kind of feedback process about the mechanism itself, we can always do that as well. That's a good idea.

Gibson: And are you also suggesting that another communication go out to faculty that explains a little bit more in detail? I mean, is that

Cutter: Well, yeah, I do think so, because first I'm not—I just saw this at a Department meeting. I had not received a copy of it until today, so the cover letter—I mean, should it have gone out to all faculty?

Licari: Uh, no.

Cutter: [light laughter around] I don't mean to get anybody in trouble here.

Peters: No, you. You emailed it, Gloria [Provost **Gibson**],

Gibson: Yeah.

Peters: You emailed it to all faculty back in August. [many voices commenting] Everybody should have gotten it then.

Gibson: I thought it went to all faculty. [many voices agreeing]

Cutter: Oh, ok, I'm sorry. I missed that. I missed that because I was out of town, all right? So I

Licari: But only those faculty who are teaching

Gibson: That's right.

Licari: a course in

Cutter: Oh, so that's why I didn't get it. Ok, it was given to our whole Department so a number of people had not yet seen it because they weren't teaching these classes, people who might be affected next year or the year after, and they were—also another concern, I think you do need another communication, because another concern was, "Would this be able to be part of the evaluation file", which I know it says here, "They're not performance evaluations," but I think I might kind of say a little more about that and reiterate that, because that was another thing a number of people wondered about.

Licari: No, and that was part of the letter that, you know, it says that—that paragraph towards the end of the letter [see Addendum 3, page 1]—that these are not performance evaluations and will not be used like that. And when I shared this with Dr. **Gorton** [President of United Faculty] I made it clear that these would not find their way into evaluations or personnel files. And, in fact, these items would be shredded on use by the Department Heads. So, in that regard, you know, they're—they are a completely different system and so that they would not be used for evaluation or personnel decisions.

Terlip: Only the Summary Report goes to the Provost.

Cutter: Yeah, so I think the area of confusion was with faculty members who did not get this because they are not—don't have those courses.

Licari: We can follow-up with another letter. That would be fine.

Smith: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: So, is this done every semester and continuous? Once it's started, it's every semester to whenever he gets out of the Legislature?

Gibson: Yeah, I mean, it's—yes. I mean, it will—this year it will 300 students. Next year 200. And the following year 100.

Dolgener: Students.

Gibson: So, yes. It's an annual report.

Dolgener: Does it ever drop below 100?

Licari: The legislation specifies that 100 is the floor basically.

Smith: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Could I suggest that since this is the first time and there's a lot of trepidation about this going through that we have a similar session maybe in February or March so that we can revisit this after everybody's been through it once, so that the faculty also see they'll have a public opportunity to come back and discuss what you learned and what they felt having done it? [heads nodding]

Gibson: Sure.

Funderburk: Could you schedule that?

Smith: [nodding] Senator **Heston**.

Heston: This is a hypothetical question, but is there any reason to be concerned that Department Heads when they get back these reports may feel that they have to exert certain kinds of pressure on their faculty to make them do more of these things if they are not getting the kind of report or data that they might want or that might make us proud when we give it to you and you summarize it all and it becomes public?

Gibson: [pause] Well,

Heston: You can decline—you can decline to answer. I'm ok with that. It's a hypothetical question.

Gibson: I certainly will—I, I mean, I had a meeting with Department Heads, and so we don't want any embellishment. We just want the facts of what faculty are doing to improve their courses. And so I—I mean, I feel that once we go through the Department Heads and then the Deans and we get up to the Provost level, I feel we're going to have adequate information, and I would hope that Department Heads would not—would not be putting undue pressure on faculty. But, if that is the case, I think the—if—whenever we have this review in February or March that would be a time to bring that forward.

Smith: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: A sort of reiteration, I suppose, Associate Provost **Licari**, so it's the—mostly the Department Heads' onus to produce the real basic report that goes to the Dean and then to you. She or he is not restricted to information from this. She or he can use all the information at her command, or is she restricted to just information she gets from this? It does not make any sense to restrict the Department Head, I will say, that she should have access to all the information at her command and to draw on this perhaps primarily, meaning first, but everything else as well.

Licari: I think that's probably the best way to look at it then. The Department Head ought to draw upon these reports

Swan: First.

Licari: primarily. If there is other information that she might be aware of and wishes to introduce that into the report, that's fine, of course.

Swan: And to use it as documentation etcetera for how we continuously improve these courses, very good.

Smith: Senator **Peters**.

Peters: One quick comment and then a question. I know that this is not a project that anyone at the Board Office or any of the Provosts of any of the institutions planned on or necessarily wanted to devote hours and hours of

work to, but I did want to say, you know, “Thank you to the work you’ve done, and thank you, all of you, for the efforts you’ve made to try to make this the least onerous reporting requirement possible on faculty.” [heads nodding] I did have one question, though, about the idea that it’s not linked to individual faculty members. Do we have any courses where all of the students are taught in one huge class with only one faculty member as teaching, and do we have any—is there any way to handle that.

Funderburk: Yes.

Licari: We do have classes like that at least at—for sure at the 2 and 100-level enrollments, so next—I think next year it will start to become an issue. It may be something perhaps with Marching Band this year. I think they enroll at least 300 students.

Funderburk: No, 280.

Female voice: 280

Licari: 280, so John [**Vallentine**, Director, School of Music] is going to keep it at 299? [laughter all around]

Funderburk: Right. I noticed that the Iowa State one specifically mentions the Marching Band. It will be a difficult

Licari: You know, Senator **Peters**, that’s a good question. You know, these reports are supposed to be on the information requested only. They are not to enter into a personnel file or an evaluation file. They are supposed to be destroyed. I’m not sure what the answer is quite yet about what to do with courses that are taught by a single sec—you know even perhaps multiple sections, but taught by a single faculty. So I, right at this point, I guess I don’t have a good answer.

Smith: Are there any other questions or comments? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I just have a question. Do you guys have any sense that whether the Senator at the legislative level is going to look to do anything like

benchmark things? Or is this just strictly information? [pause] That's why I'm concerned. I mean, I could see—if you guys have done a wonderful job trying to make it really simple but, you know, if he collects this, and he goes “Oh, you were at the national standards here. Oh, this time you're lower than the national standards.” What—I mean, are we going to have to show improvement every time, or do you have any sense of how it's going to be used?

Peters: I think it's fair—I'm sorry.

Smith: Go ahead.

Peters: I think it's fair to say we don't know.

Licari: Honestly, we—we just don't.

MacLin: And there is some indication that the Legislature may not even know either, that they're going to get all this new data, and they're going to be like “Whoa!” And it's—some of it's going to be not at all what they're expecting to see based on the disciplinary area this Iowa Senator is from.

Licari: These kinds of questions—we're not going to know those answers until the Committee hearing at Des Moines.

MacLin: He's going to be expecting very quantitative data. When he doesn't get it

Terlip: I think, yeah, they love numbers, and they love test scores and those kinds of things, so that's typically what they're going to go to. I mean, they have in the past.

Smith: Any other comments or questions? [none heard] Thank you, Provost **Gibson**, and Associate Provost **Licari**. This was quite informative, and I'm sure we're all _____ [fairly worried ???] about this. [laughter around] We are running out of time, and I would hope to get one more item of business done today.

DOCKET 1095, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JOHN W. **SWOPE** (regular order) (**STRAUSS/NELSON**)

Smith: As you may recall, I got your approval to switch the order of Calendar Items and, in fact, to move now to Calendar Item 1199, Docket #1095 which is a Request for Emeritus Status for John W. **Swope**. Will someone please move to approve this request?

Cooley: So move.

Smith: By Jennifer **Cooley**. And seconded by—was that Senator **Heston**?

Heston: That was me, yeah.

Smith: And at this point, discussion, comments, statement on behalf of Professor **Swope**?

Swan: Did you get something, and will it be entered

Smith: I have it. It will be.

Swan: And will you enter it into the Minutes?

Smith: I will say it right now.

Swan: Oh, ok.

Smith: Ok. [reading] “The Department of Languages and Literatures nominates Dr. John **Swope** for emeritus status. John began his career as a high school English teacher and always has enjoyed a warm rapport with students at all levels. As his colleagues can attest, he often met with students in his office to discuss their writing drafts and to help them to shape their own personal narratives, and he became mentors to many young teachers. When he first came to UNI, he focused on English Education courses, offering the Teaching of English and the Teaching of Writing. His recent research is focused on young adult novels of the early 20th Century, specifically the Tom

Swift adventure novels. Most recently he has taught Personal Essay, Critical Writing About Literature, and Literary Non-fiction, in addition to redesigning and reinvigorating Modern English Grammar and Usage. He has consistently offered students personal one-on-one attention to their writing, and his enthusiasm for UNI and student learning will be greatly missed.” Any other comments on behalf of this nomination? [none heard] Then we’re prepared to take a vote. All in favor, say “Aye,” [ayes heard all around]. And opposed, “No.” [none heard] So it is approved, endorsed, whatever we do with these.

Now, we had another item on our docket. It was an extensive item that requires us to go into committee—quasi-committee of the whole. I don’t think we’ve got time to do that, unless you want to extend for half an hour, and I don’t think you want to extend for half an hour. So, we’re not going to do that. But we’re going to have to probably buck up and do an extra meeting somewhere down the road, because we got a lot of this heavy business that’s kind of sitting there for us, and we’re going to have to do it. So we’ll hold off. We won’t be doing that shortly. But, I mean, we’re only scheduled one meeting in November. We’re probably going to have to go back up to 2 and maybe 2 in December as well.

ADJOURNMENT (5:00 p.m.)

Smith: Thank you. Move to adjourn? [several voices saying “So move” and “Second”] Ok. Acclamation. Thank you all.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss, Administrative Assistant
and Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next special meeting:
Monday, October 7, 2013 (executive session)
Presidential Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Next regular meeting:
Monday, October 14, 2013
Center for Multicultural Education 109AB, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 3 addenda to these Minutes.

MINUTES OF FALL FACULTY MEETING, 9/16/13

University of Northern Iowa
Faculty Meeting
September 16, 2013

Faculty Chair Jeff Funderburk called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

Chair Funderburk expressed best wishes on behalf of the faculty to Cliff Chancey, Head of the Department of Physics, who is currently battling ALS.

Chair Funderburk introduced the faculty officers for the year: Cate Palczewski (Parliamentarian) and Scott Peters (Secretary).

Katie Mullholland, President Pro Tem of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, who delivered remarks praising UNI accomplishments and outlining the Board's priorities (see Appendix A).

President Bill Ruud welcomed faculty to campus, talked about his first three months in office, and described his goals for the year (see Appendix B).

Provost Gloria Gibson conveyed her appreciation for the dedication and hard work of faculty. She reported on the results of the state-mandated faculty activity reports, which showed that UNI tenure and tenure-track faculty average: 32.4 hours of student instruction and 11 hours of scholarship every week. Overall, faculty averaged over 54 hours/week of work. She praised faculty for fostering student success in graduate school and employment and for producing excellent research. She laid out several ways in which the Provost's Office will continue to support faculty endeavors: Seed funding, the re-creation of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, the creation of the Center for Transformational Education (funded by the Carver Trust), and changes in the Library. She also discussed her plans to support the hiring of new faculty in high impact areas.

United Faculty President Joe Gorton delivered remarks thanking UF leaders for their work, outlining UF's goals for the year and announcing recent arrangements to meet & confer with the administration over several issues (see Appendix C).

Chair of the Faculty Senate Jerry Smith spoke about changes in the environment of higher education, arguing that in order to compete in this competitive environment UNI faculty must move from "good to great." He challenged faculty to overcome a bias toward inertia and develop ideas for change within their departments and at the university level (see Appendix D).

Chair Funderburk urged faculty to support the annual budget request for UNI and suggested ways that they can make people aware of the strengths of UNI and advocate for the university (see Appendix E).

Provost Gibson presented faculty awards:

Class of 1943 Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching: Martie Reinecke

Ross A. Nielsen Professional Service Award: Ripley Marston

James Lubker Faculty Research Award: Angelita Floyd

Regents Award for Faculty Excellence: Helen Harton, Carl Thurman, Grant Tracey, Paul Siddens, Jennifer Waldron, Catherine Zeman

Excellence in Liberal Arts Core Teaching: April Chatham-Carpenter, Kyle Gray

MWOne UNIque Academic Advising Award: Lisa Jepsen

Associate Provost Nancy Lippens introduced new faculty members.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Appendix A
Remarks by Regent Katie Mulholland
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, September 16, 2013

Good afternoon. I would like to thank Jeff Funderburk for the invitation to meet with you today. I am honored to have this opportunity to speak with the UNI Faculty.

I was appointed to the Board of Regents in 2011 and I currently serve as President Pro Tem. One of the many benefits of serving on the Board of Regents is that it brings me closer to the University of Northern Iowa, which is my alma mater.

I am very proud to say that I have three degrees from UNI – a B.A. in art, a master’s degree in special education, and a doctorate in educational administration.

I have spent my career in education and educational administration and I have always felt a great deal of pride and placed a high value on my UNI degrees in preparing me for my career goals.

I have been serving as Superintendent of Schools for the Linn-Mar Community School District in Marion since 2003. I must apologize that I can only stay with you for a short period of time today as I am due back for a Linn-Mar Board policy meeting later this afternoon. However, I did not want my schedule to keep me from meeting with you today to show my support for the UNI Faculty Senate.

In addition to bringing me closer to UNI, my service on the Board of Regents, which includes chairing the Board’s Academic and Student Affairs Committee, also

brings me closer to the academic issues of Iowa's public universities, which, of course, are of particular interest to me.

One recent example of an important academic issue, from last week's Board of Regents meeting held here at UNI, was the presentation of the Biennial Faculty Activities Report. As you may know, this report provides the Board with an overview of faculty responsibilities at each of the three universities, and the distribution of faculty time spent on those responsibilities. I am very impressed to see the nearly 10% increase over the past two years in the number of student credit hours taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty at UNI. I am delighted that an increasing number of UNI students are learning directly from our tenured faculty. This is one of the greatest measures of educational quality and excellence, particularly from the perspective of our students, and I thank you for your dedication and passion for teaching.

The Faculty Activities Report also highlighted recent accomplishments for UNI, all of which cover a variety of areas of importance to the Board, and a few of which I would like to mention:

- *U.S. News and World Report* continues to rank the University of Northern Iowa 2nd among Midwest regional public universities;
- UNI was recognized by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as a "Top Producer" of U.S. Fulbright scholars;

- UNI's College of Education has a 98% placement rate, and graduate programs in the College of Education rank among the best in the nation according to *U.S. News and World Report*;
- UNI's College of Business Administration has the highest accreditation, from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, which is a distinction earned by fewer than 5% of business schools in the world, and the pass rate on the CPA exam for UNI Accounting students is more than 5 times higher than the national average;
- UNI's Physics Teacher Education program was cited as one of 11 outstanding programs in the nation in a national report by the American Physical Society;
- UNI's four-year graduation rate in 2012 increased one percentage point to 37.8%, more than double the national rate for public comprehensive universities, and UNI's six-year graduation rate was 66.3%, compared to 50% for peer institution;
- The first-year retention rate for minority students increased to 84.3%, and the time-to degree for all students dropped to 4.47 years, the lowest rate recorded;
- Approximately 25% of all teachers in Iowa have a degree from UNI, and 33% of Iowa's superintendents and principals are UNI graduates;
- UNI is home to the Northeast Iowa STEM Hub, a statewide initiative of the Governor;

- UNI's Admissions Partnership Program with all 15 community colleges helps ensure students can transfer seamlessly into any degree program at UNI; and
- UNI's Economic Development Outreach extends to all 99 Iowa counties and aids more than 200 start-up businesses.

Also at last week's Board meeting, we heard an exciting presentation led by Becky Hawbaker, Coordinator in the Office of Student Field Experiences. She spoke with the Board on the restructuring of field experiences in the teacher education program, and expansion of professional development school partnerships with area schools, following the closure of Price Laboratory School. Ms. Hawbaker was joined by Curt Nielsen, a UNI Field Experience Coordinator; representatives of the Waterloo and Cedar Falls School Districts; and three students who are teaching majors in the College of Education.

In this presentation, the Board learned how the new teacher education model has been successful in providing multiple field experiences that have increased in number and variety, and improved in quality, through collaboration with school leadership teams. In addition, we saw how the new model is driving change and leading innovation in teaching, in both the schools and at UNI. Finally, we witnessed firsthand the enthusiasm of the students who are benefitting from the new teacher education experiences. I thank all of you who have played a role in this important transition for UNI and its teacher education program, and I thank you for contributing to its exciting future.

Of course, another recent highlight of the work of the Board of Regents was the selection of your new president, Bill Ruud, in February of this year. The Board is excited to have him leading UNI, and he is off to a great start as he is pursuing a number of innovative ideas to strengthen UNI, not only for the benefit of its faculty and students, but also in the university's contributions to the state of Iowa. Bill, we look forward to your leadership of this great university.

Finally, I would like to discuss briefly one of the Board's current priorities. As you may know, Board of Regents President Bruce Rastetter spoke last week at the meetings of the Board and the Legislative Fiscal Committee of the ongoing Partnership for Student Affordability. Essentially, this partnership is based on the premise that an affordable education is a shared responsibility, with the Board's responsibility to keep tuition at a reasonable level. Thanks to the state support we received for the current academic year from Governor Branstad and the legislature, the Board was able to freeze undergraduate resident tuition. We are grateful to the Governor and legislature for their support.

The Board would like to continue this partnership. In doing so, the Board is requesting a 4% funding increase for Iowa's public universities in FY 2015. In addition to supporting important priorities, the proposed funding increase would allow the Board to freeze tuition for Iowa undergraduates for a second year. If this is realized, it would mark the first time since 1975 that tuition was held steady for two years in a row. We are hopeful that we can support our students by making a tuition freeze a reality for a second year.

In closing, I would like to say that it has been a pleasure to be back on the UNI campus and to be with you this afternoon. Thank you for all you do to make UNI an outstanding university!

Appendix B
Remarks -----President Bill Ruud
September 16, 2013 --- 3:30 – Lang Auditorium

Good afternoon everyone. Judy and I are thrilled to be here at UNI. We are thoroughly enjoying getting to meet each and every one of you – and we are enjoying the Cedar Valley.

We look forward to attending as many cultural and fine arts events on-campus as possible, hosting you for a dinner or reception, attending faculty and student performances, lectures, as well as other great events. I am just very excited about having the opportunity to personally get to know each of you. It is an honor to be here, to serve you and work with you at THE only regional comprehensive university in this state.

Already, in my 109 calendar days of being at UNI – I have witnessed your impressive work. You keep teaching and learning at the core of your work - and you continue to complete intensive research and discovery as well and service and engagement. I hear from students often – that their work with the faculty in the classrooms, labs, performance studios, and the lessons and coaching they receive on teams is outstanding. The students have decisively stated – faculty make a difference in their success.

Clearly – you must also be making an impact in a student’s time to degree – their completion rate.

Because as you probably read just last week in US News and World Report –we retained our #2 ranking among Public Regional Midwest Universities, and our ranking in the category of the combined Private and Public Regional Midwest Universities improved from #22 to #13.

One reason for this improved ranking - is due to a new calculation comparing actual vs. expected graduation rate.

For example, with our student profile we were expected to have a 54% six year graduation rate. However, we actually had a 66% six year graduation rate!

This ranking is great news, and we will continue our efforts to ensure students persist and graduate in a timely manner.

I think it’s important I share with you my four main goals for this year. They are:

- Recruitment Efforts and Focus
- Quality, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Accountability
- Accessibility, Affordability, and Student Success
- Relationships with Key Stakeholders

The goal of recruitment and retention of students will be our top priority given our enrollment challenges over the past two years. This year – we have a total enrollment of 12,159. Yes, this enrollment is less than last fall by 114 students –

but there are so many positive numbers to report. This exceeds our budgeted enrollment projection of 11,800 by 359 students.

We also experienced:

- An increase of 3.3% in new students
- An increase of 1.1% in new students direct from high school
- An increase of 20.8% in new graduate students
- An increase of 11.4% in new international students
- And, total minority enrollment held steady at 8.1% – but we will work diligently to address this. I firmly believe that we will increase our minority student enrollment as we move forward.

In addition, we also experienced an improvement in our student retention rate. The rate of students returning for a second year this fall is 82.9%, which is an increase of 1.6% from last year, and it is the highest retention rate at UNI since 2007. Comparatively, the national average for retention at institutions similar to UNI is 71.7%.

Our students continue to graduate sooner and with less debt, as we had nearly an Eight percent Drop (8%) in student indebtedness during the last (2012-13) academic year. And each of you play a key role in these efforts. Research has proven that often times, in fact, most times, as we at UNI puts Students First, it is the relationship a faculty member has with a student – that makes a difference in a student's decision to challenge themselves, complete research, and in some cases, - even stay enrolled.

And, we know from a recruitment perspective, that if a student connects with a faculty member – whether it be at an open house event, or a scholarship competition, - the student is more likely to apply and enroll. Students are impressionable and wise – to know and understand the importance of having the opportunity to work closely with a faculty member. And let me take the opportunity right now, to thank you, for your commitment and for your future efforts, to help with the recruitment and retention of students.....Especially at our three Fall Open Houses on September 28th, October 19th, and November 9th.

We also need to continue to increase the diversity of both domestic and international students at UNI.

Increasing efforts will be given to our enrollment management structure and processes to include even more robust and effective out-of-state recruitment and retention; especially in those states that border Iowa with the potential for initiating an alternative tuition program. In our student recruitment efforts, we will engage alumni both inside and outside of Iowa as well as our current students with their hometown high schools. We will also expand and strengthen our partnerships with Iowa Community Colleges.

Now, from a BUDGET perspective – what impact does this enrollment number have? As I have said, we budgeted for 11,800 students, so starting with 12,159 students is excellent. We knew we had a \$590,000 deficit to address this fall – and every 100 full-time student’s nets approximately \$550,000 in tuition revenue.

However, we need to also analyze the mix of students enrolled, full-time, part-time, and out-of-state– all variables that have an impact on tuition revenue. At this time, we can be assured we have addressed our current year budget deficit; and soon we will know more regarding any additional revenue that can be allocated strategically. If there are some additional funds, we need to look at our high demand academic areas – that need additional funds to grow.

1. Quality, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Accountability:

The quality of our academic and non-academic programs must be maintained and enhanced. Any new and reallocated resources will have to be intentionally distributed to strategic areas of demand and emerging importance.

There is a clear and distinct need for a new budget model for distributing state appropriations. To address this – the Board of Regents has appointed a Task Force; led by former Regent, David Miles that is reviewing a new budget model.

We are hopeful they are considering a new model - based partially on our current incremental model of funding a base amount, and including some incentive-based funding to promote innovation and growth. This new model must also be transparent, inclusive and strategic.

2. Accessibility, Affordability, and Student Success:

We will implement strategic efforts to increase student access and student success. Awarding financial aid assistance based on a student’s demonstrated financial need and recruiting high-quality students will remain a priority. We will also work on our marketing efforts to support and positively impact enrollment and brand recognition of UNI. Scott Kettleon is our new Director of University Relations, and we look forward to his leadership – to lead us in some new marketing, branding, and strategic communications efforts.

To address Affordability and Accessibility for students – the Board of Regents – approved last Wednesday, September 11th, a proposal to put forth to the Legislature – that includes:

- Freezing tuition for undergraduate resident students for the 2nd consecutive year, provided the General Assembly approves an additional 4% for inflation of \$3.7 M
- We are seeking our current base appropriation of \$83.2 M
- And funds to address our fiscal stabilization (disparate impact) of \$10 M. This is one-time money for this year – and we need to make these funds a permanent part of our base appropriations. The result is that we would have a FY 2015 General Fund base budget of \$96.9 M. Again, this is proposed.

The Governor and the Legislature will weigh in and decide on this request next spring.

We are also seeking funds for:

Strategic Initiatives:

- Bachelor of Applied Science \$ 3.0 M (over two years)
- Entrepreneur Outreach Program \$ 1.5 M
- (Business Concierge, Network Iowa, AppsLab, Local Foods Entrepreneurship Support, UNI MarketPlace)
Governor's STEM Advisory Council Initiative \$ 5.2 M

3. Relationships with Key Stakeholders:

I will work to continue to strengthen the relationships with and among faculty, staff, and students. In addition, the external relationships among alumni, donors, state legislators, the Governor, other elected officials and friends of the university must be second to none.

And, we will continue our ambitious external fundraising and friend raising. Currently we have successfully raised nearly \$11M toward a \$40M scholarship fundraising goal. As we begin to craft our 2015-2020 University Strategic Plan, we must also examine the next two fundraising timeframes: 2015-2019 and 2019-2026. (2026 is UNI's 150th anniversary and the 100th anniversary of the Campanile.)

As you can see from my last goal – it is important to me to be inclusive and collaborate. You may have noticed I will send out messages to campus more frequently and I want to share information.

Information is powerful, and sharing information is even more powerful. It is important that I keep all of you informed and engage you in the process and our strategic goals.

I am optimistic and excited for this year. We have made some structural organizational changes. We have a 43 member Cabinet group that includes all the academic deans, other administrators, the faculty senate chair, the united faculty president, representatives of all our staff organizations.....Professional & Scientific, Supervisory & Confidential, and Merit/AFSCME; and our students will have their voice heard on cabinet as well. I am committed to working with everyone, faculty, staff and students for the betterment of this great university. And we will move forward.

I wish you all a great 2013-14 year and thank you for all you do for UNI!!!!

Appendix C

Remarks by Joe Gorton, President of United Faculty to the 2013 UNI Fall Faculty Meeting

September 16, 2013

Thank you Professor Funderburk.

Regent Mulholland, President Ruud, Provost Gibson, award recipients, fellow members of the faculty, and guests.

I've always felt that this meeting is intended to be a celebration of our faculty. So with that in mind I would like bring to your attention some of the folks who I hope you will join me in celebrating today. They are faculty leaders who have helped our chapter of the American Association of University Professors to be such a stalwart and effective advocate for AAUP principles and for improving faculty salaries, benefits, and conditions of work.

First, I would like to acknowledge the current members of our Executive Board. If you do not mind, please stand as I call your name. Vice President Lyn Countryman, Secretary Betty Deberg , Treasurer Jeff Elbert, Past President Dan Power, and our at large members Barbara Cutter, Gerald Smith and Katherine van Wormer. Please joining me is showing our appreciation with a round of applause.

Next, I would like to acknowledge the members our Central Committee. This committee is legislative and policy making authority for United Faculty. Once again, if you do not mind, please stand as I call your name. Cate Palczewski, Steve

Taft, John Diesz, Kim Maclin, Frank Thompson, Doug Shaw, Brian Roberts, Francis Degnin, Susan Moore, Becky Hawbaker, Keith Crew, Michael Prah, Michael Fanelli, and Aricia Beckman.

Over the years, many other folks have made important contributions to United Faculty. Please stand as I call your name. Hans Isakson, Melissa Beall, Jim O'Loughlin, Laura Terlip, Cathy Desoto, Reeza Lahroodi, Timothy Kidd, Bob Dise, Jesse Swan, Jennifer Waldron, Paul Siddens, Adam Butler, and Bill Koch.

I wish I had time today to describe for you today all of the amazing work these United Faculty leaders have done, and continue to do on our behalf. United Faculty and UNI is so very fortunate to have such a talented, hard-working, and committed group of faculty who devote themselves to the work of our union.

And the work of our union has never been more important. Why is this? Well President Rudd mentioned there are the crucial fiscal issues related to state appropriations. Obviously, these matters are going to be very important to the well-being of our university. But in some ways, they are but a manifestation of a larger more complex set of arrangements that will directly influence the work of United Faculty going forward. For in addition to the very real fiscal concerns, there are many of us who believe that what is truly at stake for UNI is the very definition of what it means to be a comprehensive university in Iowa during the early 21st Century.

UNI is not the only university to face such issues. That is why it is a major concern for the AAUP as a national organization, and specifically for United Faculty, that our

approach to these challenges not be allowed to compromise the role of tenure and the academic freedom it helps to protect.

Now I am not going to belabor how events in our recent past jeopardized those principles at UNI. The national AAUP has investigated those issues and with the support of United Faculty recommended that a vote to censure UNI be delayed until our national meeting the summer of 2014. What I will say, is that United Faculty is willing, able, and eager to work with President Ruud and the Board of Regents to help UNI avoid an AAUP censure. Let me be perfectly clear. United Faculty is going to do everything we can to help UNI avoid censure. But at the end of the day, that outcome will be based on concrete actions that we do not control.

Moving forward, United Faculty will also be focused on reversing the real decline in faculty salaries and benefits. As I said in my statement last week to the Board of Regents, “There is no escaping the reality that the past two or three years of conflict have created deep wounds within UNI’s faculty culture. Add to this that our *real inflation adjusted* salaries are in decline and our contributions to our health insurance are increasing. I cannot overstate the strain this is placing on our faculty and their families.”

I make no apologies to anyone for being a strong advocate for significant improvements in faculty salary and benefits. Neither should you. I happen to believe that the single most important part of a university or college is its faculty.

After all things are considered, the overwhelming number of students and their families choose a university because of the quality of education they hope it will

deliver. They do not make that choice based on the success of an athletic program or the number of flat screen televisions mounted on walls. They do not choose to graduate from here because of high tech bells and whistles, a large administrative bureaucracy or Madison Avenue style advertising campaigns. They do so because of you, because of us.

Lately, I have been reminding folks that it is in the nature of our particular type of organization that presidents, provosts, regents, and students come and go. But it is the faculty who are here for decades. We are the ones who carry forward the enduring values of the academy. We are the ones who day in and day out, year after year, and decade after decade walk into those classrooms to educate and inspire new generations of university students.

So as we look forward to the future of this university and its mission, I say this: anyone who sincerely wants to grow UNI into one of the best comprehensive universities in the nation would be well served to do everything possible to provide real and concrete support for our faculty and their families.

During the past few weeks, a lot of folks including colleagues, the media, and regents have ask me what I think of President Ruud. Generally what I have said is, “what a nice guy!” I have said that he is gregarious, friendly, and very excited about taking on the challenges and opportunities in our future. But beyond that I’ve also said that we will have to wait and see what type of president he will actually be.

Well today, I am happy to report that United Faculty and President Ruud have

reached a couple of agreements that represent concrete actions toward improving the relationship between United Faculty and the administration.

First, and I think many of you have been waiting a long time to hear something like this, we agreed to a Fall 2014 moratorium on 4/4 active scholar teaching assignments.

Second, we agreed to meet and confer on the following topics:

A review of the 4/4 active scholar teaching assignments

Faculty health insurance plans

Academic program definition for the purpose of implementing Article Five of the Master Agreement

Now I want you to know that it was not all that easy for us to reach agreement on the 4/4 moratorium. I've learned that President Ruud can be a little stubborn. But that is OK because United Faculty can be a little stubborn too. That said, with these agreements I believe we have real evidence that United Faculty and President Ruud can work together to achieve concrete goals that will benefit the faculty, our families, and the university as a whole.

In closing, let me say that for United Faculty to be effective in this process we will need your help. So from the bottom of my heart I am asking today that if you are not yet a member of United Faculty, please join. We need you. All of us and our families stand to benefit from a strong United Faculty and therefore all of us should be members. We have a table in the lobby where after this meeting anyone who is

not yet a member can join. Our dues are minimal, but the challenges ahead are huge.

Congratulations to all of those receiving an award today and on behalf of United Faculty thank all of you in the faculty, administration, and staff for your service to our university.

Appendix D

Comments by Faculty Senate Chair Jerry Smith

Fall Faculty Meeting

September 16, 2013

Thank you , Jeff. As many of you know, Jeff chaired the Faculty Senate two years ago. Last year the Senate was chaired by Scott Peters. Where are you, Scott? This year it's my turn. Now, has anyone noticed a pattern here? Yes, it's male pattern baldness, indeed white male pattern baldness. So it is with mixed emotions that I introduce the Senate's new vice-chair and chair-elect, the person who will be standing up here next year, Tim Kidd of the Physics Department. Stand up, Tim. He's a big guy, but if you got to the top, you'd see the same hair deficit that we've experienced in this position for the past three years. Will this disturbing pattern be broken? Come back next year and find out.

The UNI Faculty Senate meets regularly from 3:30 to 5 PM on the second and fourth Mondays of each month during the academic year. Meeting locations and agendas can be found on the Senate website. Most of our meetings this semester will be held in the CME Conference Room, but next semester we will be back, for the most part, in our accustomed home in Maucker Union's Oak Room.

The Senate hopes to accomplish a great deal this year. In addition to handling curriculum proposals and various policy changes, we want to avail ourselves of President Ruud's commitment to joint governance by enhancing mechanisms for providing budgetary input to the President and Provost, and by upgrading university-level structures for faculty management of the curriculum. I personally have a larger goal for the Senate that I'll explain during the remainder of my comments.

Not too many years ago, UNI installed a new president, Ben Allen, a good, capable man who challenged us to go from good to great, to make the good university we had into a truly great one. Things happened, some of our own doing, others beyond our control. I don't think anyone could argue that this university has achieved greatness. In some respects UNI has improved during the past five years, in other respects things have gotten worse.

One thing that has changed is the higher education environment. Declining middle class incomes and reduced state support for higher education have made public institutions like UNI less affordable, resulting in enrollment declines. We also face intensified competition for students from for-profit universities, on-line education, and our sister institutions in Ames and Iowa City. Our current enrollment challenges are, I fear, only the first manifestation of a distressing new world in

which higher education institutions compete ever more aggressively for a shrinking pool of students. In such an environment, being good may not be good enough.

UNI may have to be great to survive. But, of course, we should aspire to and strive for greatness in any event, for its own sake.

So what must we do to move from good to great? The most important change, in my opinion, can be understood in terms of something I teach in “Organizational Management.” This course is required for all business majors and, indeed, for some majors outside the business school. The course is about management, a concept that can be partially explained in terms of two related notions, administration and leadership. Most texts for the course identify “administrator” as the term used to refer to managers in public and not-for-profit organizations, like UNI. Administrative work tends to be routine—there are forms to fill out, meetings to attend, reports to prepare, and so forth—maintenance-oriented activities that are needed to keep the organizational ship afloat. In every organization, managers must perform certain administrative tasks, but as I explain to my students, the best managers try to minimize the time they spend on such tasks so they can devote more of their time and efforts to something else that is much more important, that being leadership. If administration has slightly negative connotations, leadership has strong positive connotations: It’s about having a vision, setting audacious goals, and inspiring people to achieve them. It’s about progress and change and organizational greatness.

We certainly hope that our new president will be a leader and not just an administrator, but we should recognize something else: When universities are jointly governed by their faculty and administration, then the faculty also bear the responsibility of leadership. We too must be moving this organization forward. Has that been the case in the recent past here at UNI? Have the faculty acted as leaders? I’ve been on the Faculty Senate for many years and until recently, the Senate has done little other than administrative tasks like approving emeritus requests. It’s hard for me to think of a major, university-level change proposal that was initiated by the faculty, and proposals initiated by the administration have rarely been successful, often because of faculty resistance. There may be substantive faculty leadership in certain departments and colleges, but you rarely see much for the university as a whole.

Why not? What has kept the faculty from making this university great? A huge impediment, I believe, has been an organizational culture, quite common in academia, that favors stability over change, “leave-me-alone” decentralization over collective responsibility, a culture that accepts interminable conversations and consultations as substitutes for action. “In Search of Excellence,” an influential business book from the 1980s, argued that excellent organizations have a “bias for action:” Analyses are made, discussions are held, but they almost always result in action. Here at UNI, on the other hand, we seem to have a bias for inertia. For UNI to move from good to great, we the faculty need to be more willing to change, more willing to lead and to be led.

We, the faculty, cannot afford to wait several years, developing trust in our new president, before we are willing to lead this institution. We certainly can't afford to waste more time complaining about troubles past. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I am asking each of you to help. If you have ideas for university-level faculty initiatives that can improve UNI, explain them to your Senate representative or bring them to my attention. When such initiatives are being discussed in your colleges and departments, lean towards change, not inertia. Give well-argued proposals for change the benefit of the doubt.

I'll conclude with the rallying cry with which my colleague, Joe Gorton, closes his e-mails: Forward! We need to move UNI forward! Thank you.

Appendix E

Remarks of Faculty Chair Jeff Funderburk

Two years ago I served as Chair of the Faculty Senate and this is now my second term as Chair of the Faculty

I am certain that I need not remind you that the past few years have been particularly challenging for UNI in terms of finances and shared governance. Many among us have been deeply affected professionally and personally. Last year saw some issues resolved and efforts were begun to resolve others. I am very pleased with the energetic approach that President Ruud has taken in trying to improve communications and restore a sense of common mission for all of us at UNI.

The coming few years are going to be critically important for UNI and will require all of us to work together. While we are thankful to the Iowa Legislature for providing UNI with a much needed influx of \$10 million, that is one time money that will only tide us over for 2 years. If we are unable to secure this funding going forward, we will be facing another large budget shortfall in two years that may be more severe than the one that caused our troubles of two years ago.

That said, I am encouraged that the Regents, the Governor and most members of the Iowa Legislature seem to have recognized the unique role that the University of Northern Iowa plays within the state of Iowa.

Historically, we have not been good at publicizing our activities and accomplishments. It is time for that to change. There are tremendous things going on at this university and we need to make Iowans aware...as well as everyone else we can reach. If we work together, we can enhance the prestige of UNI as The Comprehensive University of Iowa and in so doing improve our financial picture.

So, what can you do as a faculty member to help?

- Take every opportunity to have to share the story of what is going on here at UNI.

- Tell someone about your research.

- Share a great accomplishment by one of your students.

- Reach out to your elected leaders and help them understand why UNI is deserving of more stable financial support.

- Spend time with your students and encourage them to tell others about their experiences.

Say yes when you are approached about doing service, especially where your unique skills can be particularly valuable. We need everyone involved.

And most importantly, continue to do what you do, deliver first class education to our students!

With that, thank you for your time and for the opportunity to serve as your Faculty Chair.

Before going forward, I also need to announce to new faculty that there has been a change of plans with regards to introductions. Because by the end of last week, the numbers of new folks to be introduced shot up to over 60, we have had to forego the plan of having self-introductions. Instead, our new Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, Dr. Nancy Lippens will read the names and we ask that you stand to be recognized.

But before that, I would like to welcome Provost Gibson back to the podium for the presentation of faculty awards.

Continuous Improvement Legislation

Iowa Senate File 2284, p. 14

DIVISION VII

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS PROVISIONS

Sec. 27. Section 262.9, Code Supplement 2011, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

NEW SUBSECTION. 36. Implement continuous improvement in every undergraduate program offered by an institution of higher education governed by the board.

a. A continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented built upon the results of the institution's student outcomes assessment program using the following phase-in timeline:

(1) For each course with typical annual enrollment of three hundred or more, whether in one or multiple sections, a continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented beginning in the fall semester of 2013.

(2) For each course with typical annual enrollment of two hundred or more but less than three hundred, whether in one or multiple sections, a continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented beginning in the fall semester of 2014.

(3) For each course with a typical annual enrollment of one hundred or more but less than two hundred, whether in one or multiple sections, a continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented beginning in the fall semester of 2015.

b. For each undergraduate course the institution shall collect and use the results of formative and summative assessments in its continuous improvement plan. The board shall annually evaluate the effectiveness of the plans and shall submit an executive summary of its findings and recommendations in its annual strategic plan progress report, a state board pursuant to section 256.7, subsection 32.

UNI Letter & UNI Continuous Improvement Report Form

August 22, 2013

Dear Colleagues,

As you know, in May 2012, Senate File 2284 was passed by the state legislature and signed into law by Governor Branstad. This law requires the University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Northern Iowa to report to the Board of Regents on continuous improvement plans for many of the courses taught on the three campuses.

This legislation takes effect starting in the fall semester of 2013 for each course with an annual enrollment of at least 300 students. It will take effect in fall 2014 for courses enrolling 200 to 300 students per year. Finally, it will take effect in fall 2015 for courses enrolling between 100 and 200 students per year. A list of courses with an annual enrollment of at least 300 students is attached. More information will be provided this week to faculty who are teaching courses this fall that are on this list.

Since faculty already give much thought to whether their classes are successful, we are implementing these new requirements in a way to minimize the time faculty have to devote to these reports. Indeed, faculty will not have to change anything they are currently doing in the classroom, or even what they do to review the effectiveness of their classes.

These are not performance evaluations, and will not be used as such. Reporting to the deans and the provost, for eventual transmission to the Board of Regents, will be by course, and not by individual faculty member.

We all take pride in the quality of teaching at UNI, and we are sure our commitment to excellence will be reflected in the information we provide to the Board of Regents.

If you have questions, please contact Mike Licari, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs at michael.licari@uni.edu or 3-2518.

Sincerely,

Gloria J. Gibson
Executive Vice President and Provost

Jerry Smith
Chair, University Faculty Senate

Course-Level Continuous Quality Improvement Report

1. The course for which this report is being completed.

Semester and Year	
Course Name and Number	
Section(s)	

2. Method(s) used to generate information for this report. (Use space provided on the next page to provide details related to the method or methods used.)

Method	✓
Faculty/instructors meet at the end of each semester and/or periodically during the semester to discuss strengths and weaknesses in students' performance related to course outcomes, identify key factors related to student performance, and develop action plans for maintaining and improving the level of student performance in future offerings of the course.	✓
Course syllabi are reviewed/discussed to connect course outcomes to course assignments and/or other course requirements from the syllabi	
National and/or state standards for professional competency are used to review student performance, course activities, assignments, and grading strategies applied in the course.	
Standardized tests are administered to connect student performance in knowledge and/or skill areas pertaining to the course outcomes to aid in making decisions related to assignments, resources and student support in affected courses.	
Locally-developed/instructor-developed tests are administered to gather information on student performance related to course outcomes; this information is used for discussion of student performance and course design and delivery.	
Information on student performance is collected using selected questions from unit tests conducted over the semester; faculty meet to discuss student performance and related action steps for future iterations of the course.	
Faculty across sections of a course use an agreed-upon rubric for evaluating student performance on a major or culminating assignment for the course and examine aggregated results from use of the rubric to determine areas of students' strengths and weaknesses in application of course knowledge and skills, in order to identify assignments, activities and/or readings to enhance student performance in the future.	
An end-of-course survey is used for gathering student feedback related to their achievement of course outcomes and to factors in the course that affect their achievement of course outcomes.	
Other (please describe)	

3. In the space below, please provide specific details describing the method you used to gather information.

4. What did you learn from your examination of student performance in the course, whatever method you used? Please provide a specific description.

5. What change(s) will be made to the course in response to what you learned from your examination of student performance?

6. Name and e-mail address of a contact person for this report (optional):