

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
10/22/12 (3:32 p.m. – 5:18 p.m.)
Mtg. #1722

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

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

Provost **Gibson** offered no comments today.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** had no comments except to remind everyone of the State Auditor's presentation Wednesday evening in the University Room of Maucker Union.

Chair **Peters** also reminded everyone of the State Auditor's presentation and gave special thanks to NISG for arranging that and bringing the State Auditor to campus. The Faculty Senate, he stated, will provide funds to video record that event. It will be put up on the website so that faculty members can review the material made at the presentation. The video recording will serve as a semi-permanent to permanent reference for seeing basic information about the University Budget. **Peters** will meet tomorrow with VP **Hager** about the Budget timeline for FY 14, and based on that conversation, they will sketch out a series of discussions in the Spring so that faculty can be more involved in advising the Administration about Budget priorities for the next fiscal year.

Chair **Peters** also recognized the new senators: Jennifer **Cooley** from the Department of Languages and Literatures; Mitch **Strauss** from the School of Applied and Human Sciences; Michael **Walter** from the Department of

Biology; and Melissa **Heston** from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. **Peters** thanked them for their willingness to serve the Faculty Senate, and he looks forward to their contributions.

Lastly, Chair **Peters** reminded Senators that the next meeting will be in 3 weeks and will be in the University Room across the hall. The topic will be Athletics, and information will be uploaded to the Faculty Senate website attached to the petition (1164/1060) at least a week prior to that meeting with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen** on November 12, 2012.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for October 08, 2012, were considered approved after noting no additions/deletions/corrections were offered prior to today or today.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1164 1060 Consultative session with Athletic Director Troy **Dannen** (head of docket, Nov. 12) (**Edginton/Dolgener**)

1165 1061 Selection of additional members to Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel (head of docket, Oct. 22) (**Bruess/Terlip**)

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1165 1061 Selection of additional members to Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel (head of docket, Oct. 22) (**Bruess/Terlip**)

Motion to select two new members and add them to the Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel (Degnin/Gallagher**). Passed.

1160 1056 Consultative session on Biennial Faculty Activities Report for Board of Regents, 10/8/12 (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Discussion completed with Associate Provost Michael **Licari.

1152 1048 Consultative session with Associate Provost Craig **Klafter** Regarding International Programs (**Kirmani/Bruess**)

**Discussion completed.

5:01 p.m.

Motion to extend meeting by 15 minutes (Degnin/Neuhaus**). Passed.

1153 1049 International Travel Safety Policy—Faculty and Staff,
immediately following 1152/1048 on 10/22/12
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to refer Faculty/Staff Travel Policy to EPC (East/Terlip**). Passed.

1154 1050 International Travel Safety Policy—Students, 10/22/12,
immediately following 1153/1049 on 10/22/12
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to refer Student Travel Policy to EPC (Terlip/Degnin**). Passed.

1156 1052 Request for Emeritus Status, James **Maltas**, regular order
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to endorse request (East/Terlip**). Passed.

1157 1053 Request for Emeritus Status, Charles R. **May**, regular order
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to endorse request (Strauss/Edginton**). Passed.

1158 1054 Request for Emeritus Status, Jacqueline J. **Smith**, regular order
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to endorse request (Bruess/Dolgener**). Passed.

1159 1055 Request for Emeritus Status, Penny L. **Beed**, regular order
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to endorse request (Neuhaus/Bruess**). Passed.

1161 1057 Request for Emeritus Status, Michele (Michael) William **Roth**,
regular order (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Motion to endorse request (Kidd/Gallagher**). Passed.

1162 1058 Request for Emeritus Status, Michael **Janopoulos**, regular order (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

****Motion to endorse request (Strauss/Hakes). Passed.**

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

****No action yet**

5. Adjournment

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

Time: 5:18 p.m.

Next special meeting:

11/5/12

Center for Multicultural Education, Maucker Union

3:15 p.m.

Next regular meeting:

11/12/12

University Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of 57 pages, including 3 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 22, 2012
Mtg. 1722**

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

Absent: Betty **DeBerg**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters:** Ok. Well, let's come to order. We do—as I emailed you all last week, we do have kind of a full slate today. I do—

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: I guess I need to start by asking for press identification. I see Blake. Are you here as a member of the press? Ok. Blake **Findley** from the Northern Iowan. Any other members of the press? (none identified) Ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson, do you have any comments for us today?

Gibson: Not today.

Peters: None today.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**?

Funderburk: I have none in particular, except to remind everybody about the State Auditor's presentation, which I think you will do as well. It's Wednesday night at 6:00 p.m. across the hall [University Room of Maucker Union].

Peters: Thank you.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: Thank you, and I was also going to remind people about that and special thanks to NISG for arranging that and bringing the State Auditor to campus. We are going to provide funds to video tape that, to video record that. We'll put it up on the website so that faculty members can review it. It will be there as a permanent, or at least semi-permanent, reference for people to look at basic information about the University Budget. I will be meeting tomorrow with Vice President **Hager** to talk about the Budget timeline for Fiscal Year 14, and based on that conversation, we'll try to sketch out a series of discussions in the Spring so that we can be a little bit more involved in advising the Administration about Budget priorities for the next fiscal year. So that will be a big help toward that end.

I also want to recognize our new senators: Jennifer **Cooley**, from Languages and Literatures; Mitch **Strauss**, from the School of Oz, as we call it [laughter around] in Social and Behavioral Sciences, Applied Human Sciences; Michael **Walter**, from Biology; and Melissa **Heston** from Curriculum and Instruction. So, thank you all for being willing to do that, and I look forward to all your contributions to the Senate.

And then finally just a reminder that our next meeting, which is not for 3 weeks, will be in the University Room across the hall. It will be—pending docketing at least, the topic will be Athletics, and we'll be uploading a fair amount of information to the petition, attached to the petition, over the coming couple of weeks. Hopefully, we'll have all that information up there for people at least a week before the meeting with [Athletic Director] Troy **Dannen**.

Any questions about anything before we move along?

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

October 8, 2012

Peters: Seeing none, I did not receive any additions or corrections to the Minutes. Neither did Sherry **Nuss** [transcriptionist]. Are there any additions or corrections to the Minutes for October 8th? I see none, so we will consider those approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1164 for Docket #1060, Consultative session with AD Troy **Dannen** (head of docket, Nov. 22)

Peters: We have two items for docketing today. The consultative session with Athletic Director **Dannen**, and then one thing that I would ask you to docket at the head of the docket today and that's the selection of two additional members to serve on the Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel. So can I get a motion to docket the Consultative session with Athletic Director **Dannen** for the head of the docket on the 12th?

Edginton: So move.

Peters: Thank you, Secretary **Edginton**. Second?

Dolgener: Second.

Peters: Second by Senator **Dolgener**. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Any opposed, say, “No.” [none heard] The motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1165 for Docket #1061, Selection of additional members to Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel (head of docket, Oct. 22)

Peters: And so if I could get a motion to docket the Faculty Academic Misconduct Panel Selection for the head of the docket today?

Bruess: Move.

Peters: Senator **Bruess**. Thank you. Any second? Senator **Terlip**. [joking among a few of the pronunciation of “Bruess”] So, it’s been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of docketing this at the head of the docket today, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] Ok.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1061, SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO FACULTY ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PANEL (Bruess/Terlip)

Peters: So, on that matter of business, it should be a fairly quick item, I think. You’ll recall that when we talked about this on September 10th we did ask the College of Humanities, Arts, and Sciences to give us 2 names of people from the Fine Arts. They were able to give one person, and that is Ronald **Johnson**. And then Sue **Etscheidt** was also interested from the

College of Ed. She was also interested in doing this, but her name got to me late, too late to get onto the docket for September 10th. So we would need a motion to select these two and add these two to the panel. Senator **Degnin** [who indicated].

Gallagher: I'll second it.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Gallagher**. Any discussion? Seeing no discussion, we'll proceed to a vote. All in favor of adding Sue **Etscheidt** and Ronald **Johnson** to the panel for Faculty Academic Misconduct, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Any opposed say, "Nay?" [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1056, CONSULTATIVE SESSION ON BIENNIAL FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT FOR BOARD OF REGENTS, DELAYED FROM OCT. 8
(**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Peters: And that brings us to one item of leftover business from last time. We couldn't quite get to it because the Smarter Balanced consult went a little longer than anticipated, and for this we'll turn things over to Associate Provost **Licari**.

Licari: Thanks, Scott, and thanks everybody for letting me take just a little bit of your time just to give you an update and really a reminder. I think this came to the Senate last year with some information about changes to the Biennial Faculty Activities Report that the 3 Regents' Universities have to send in to the Board. The old report, if you'll recall if you ever filled it out, was to take a week of your time and basically identify where you were working. Did you travel to a conference? How many hours of the week did you spend in your office? How many hours of the week did you spend at home? How many hours of the week were you in the classroom? It was really a survey of where you were doing your job, which always was strange every time I filled it out because I always wondered why anybody cared where I was doing the job as opposed to what I was doing.

So, the new survey instrument that we are going to be using for this, as I just passed around [see Addendum 1], is a survey about what you're doing rather than where you're doing it. And you can see that we've broken it into "instruction," and "advising," "scholarship/research/creative activities," "clinical work," "community outreach," "administration/service," and then other reasons why you might be spending your time "illness or vacation" time. And then it just asks you for the week "How long did you spend teaching?" [or] "How long did you spend in some kind of creative work?" rather than where you're working. So it's a survey of what you're doing. We intend to pilot this yet this Fall and then actually implement the survey in the Spring semester to begin the new way of reporting faculty activities to the Board. What this will ultimately do is provide the public, really, with a better sense of what faculty do, and I think that's useful for them to know because we're doing a lot of different things, and it's good to have that itemized for the public to know.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Are you folks still taking any ideas for this, or is it pretty much set now?

Licari: The categories are pretty much set. Any kind of layout issues we would love to hear feedback on, so if you think maybe the layout of the report is structured confusingly, or if you just know that certain categories are going to be confusing to people, alert us to that, and we can maybe provide some definitions for what would fall into what category. That kind of feedback would be really, really....in fact, it's some of the reason why we're doing the pilot, too, but if you just know something isn't going to work based on what you see here, just let me know.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Does that mean like—I was confused and when I looked at things that I didn't know if we were supposed to double count any?

Licari: No. No double counting.

Terlip: Ok.

Licari: And, in fact, yeah, we had a discussion about that. We ideally would have it laid out so that the total in each column couldn't be more than 24 hours. Obviously, you shouldn't work 24 hours in the first place [laughter all around], but, I mean, you could because you could legit—sometimes people think, “Well, that's both, you know, ser

Terlip: Well, I was looking at the “teaching” and “delivering online courses” under “engagement,” so where does my online class go?

Licari: Right. It has to be—that—those minutes have to be counted once somewhere, and we'll provide some definitions for you, but it will be up to your best judgment as to where those minutes go. You know, so if it's “teaching an online class,” and it was a 50-minute class, that's probably 50 minutes of teaching, and, yes, it's spread around the State, but that's not extension outreach. That's teaching. [someone commented quietly] What's that? [nothing repeated]

Peters: Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: Although you said that you didn't want to change the format, I would like to offer a slight modification. If you look under the category of “Community Engagement, Outreach, or Extension,” and, you know, under the category “Working on public or private partnership projects,” those could be funded or non-funded projects, and, for example, in the School of HPELS, we have many contract research activities that involve service, and so you might want to differentiate between those that are funded and those that are not funded, because it makes a difference. Just have two categories, one for non-funded or non-sponsored and one for sponsored.

Peters: Other questions? Senator **East**.

East: I used to participate in a discussion group, perhaps a book study group about teaching and learning, and I didn't see how I could categorize that on your list. But spending 2 hours week working with

Licari: I would say that would be "Participating in instructional development activities."

East: Ok. We didn't develop instruction.

Licari: But it was about teaching, is that what he said? [someone responded "yeah"]

East: Talking about our practice and stuff like that.

Licari: Right. I would call that "instructional development activities." [some low level conversation with light laughter among a few senators]

Peters: Are there others? Senator **Degnin**?

Degnin: When you are referring to "Delivering clinical services," are you referring only to on-campus type instruction? Because I deliver clinical services in a hospital. Would that be part of service?

Licari: The survey doesn't restrict where you do this work, so if you're—if part of your job entails delivering clinical services, and you're in an office or a location that happens to be off-campus, those are minutes spent doing your job, they just happen to be in one of the local hospitals.

Degnin: Ok.

Peters: Senator **East**.

East: I heard the word "professional development" mentioned in response to what I was saying, and, again, I don't see any place on here for professional development. It seems like a professional ought to have some

time and ought to be able to especially say, “Oh, I was working on professional development.”

Breitbach: It’s there under “Community Engagement.”

East: Under what?

Breitbach: “Attending professional development activities (workshops, conferences, online seminars)” under “Community Engagement.”

Licari: Well, we might move that then somewhere else.

Peters: Or maybe you could have something like that in each category. That might be an option. Now this has been piloted at the University of Iowa already?

Licari: Yep. Yep.

Peters: And they had, what was it? An 80% response rate?

Licari: No, near perfect. What they—it was a small group of people that they targeted, 100 or so, and from their perspective, it went well, and this was the instrument they used, so—I mean, I can talk to my colleagues there kind of on some of these issues that just came up and see what kind of wrinkles that they came up with, but, you know, some of these, I’m sure will come out in our pilot as well. But, in the meantime, if you’ve got other comments, rather than taking up Senate time picking through this, it might be just most effective for you to just shoot them to me, and we can make some adjustments.

Peters: And just to be clear, we are required by the Regents for all 3 institutions to use the same instrument for it?

Licari: Yes, we are.

Peters: So, it has to be broad enough so that it can work with all three institutions. Any other questions? Ok, thank you.

DOCKET #1048, CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH ASSOCIATE PROVOST CRAIG **KLAFTER** REGARDING INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS (**Kirmani/Bruess**)

Peters: And that brings us to our main event today, so to speak. Associate Provost **Klafter** from International Programs is here to talk to us today about some of the things they've been doing and to take questions about—take questions from you and discuss issues with International Programs. So thank you very much for joining us, and I'll just turn things over to you.

Klafter: Thank you, Chairman **Peters**, Vice-Chair **Smith**, and Senators for inviting me here. The Office of International Programs in short is responsible for internationalizing UNI, and oversees the Culture and Intensive English Program (CIEP), the Study Abroad Center (SAC), and the recently renamed International Students and Scholars Office, abbreviated "ISSO." There are a total of 30 employees in the portfolio – 3 in OIP, 7 in SAC, and 20 in CIEP. The budget for the portfolio is: \$532,000 for the Office of International Programs; \$161,000, I'm rounding here, for the International Students and Scholars Office; \$1,043,000 for CIEP, but none of that is General Fund money; that is all soft money supported, that is, it generates its own income, generates a margin which supports the academic mission of the University; and \$646,240 for the Study Abroad Center. These amounts include, but are not limited to salaries and scholarship funds. The Study Abroad Center only receives general funds to cover core salaries.

Over the past year, there have been many accomplishments. Funding was secured from the Taiwanese Ministry of Education to support a new Instructor of Chinese Language and Literature. The UNI Diplomat Series was launched and brought to speak at UNI US Ambassador Ronald K. McMullen, Austrian Counsel General Thomas Schnoll, and Taiwanese Director General Baushuan Ger. With the support and cooperation of UNI's academic departments, a record twenty-four visiting scholars and

professors joined UNI to teach and undertake research. A record three UNI faculty members were named Fulbright Scholars. And, partnerships were developed with the Universidade de São Paulo for which I have Secretary **Edginton** to thank for his assistance (Brazil's top ranked university) and Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg (one of Germany's leading universities for the humanities and social sciences).

CIEP secured accreditation from the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation, which puts it in a league of only 111 of the more than 500 US intensive English programs. The Study Abroad Center expanded its short-term program offerings to include every continent in the world with the exception of Antarctica, and was ranked fourth in the nation for the quality of its academic programs by Abroad101. The Study Abroad Center also went through a restructuring this year, that I initiated with the cooperation of the Provost and the Academic Affairs Council, that saved the University more than \$400,000 in scholarship funding annually going forward. The International Students and Scholars Office, as I noted, was renamed from the International Service Office to reflect its broader responsibilities and to bring it in line with the name commonly used at other US universities. Those broader responsibilities include now assisting UNI faculty, staff, and students with securing visas for foreign travel on UNI business or programs, and advises on travel safety.

There have also been challenges this year. Prior to my arrival at UNI, a determination was made that the Study Abroad Center was not properly compensating faculty members for teaching on short-term summer study abroad programs. In summer 2011, this determination cost the Provost office more than \$60,000. When news of the budget cuts were announced, I was informed that that continued funding could not be counted on. This resulted in an exploration of other options. And there were 4 that we came up with. Cease running the summer programs was one option. Pass the cost to students, but in exploring that further we found that it would've effectively killed off most of the programs just because of price elasticity. There was a suggestion that we recruit only less costly junior faculty to lead programs, which was determined to violate the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Age Discrimination Act. And what we finally implemented, to

require faculty members to cover their own personal expenses out of their increased salaries. And at the same time to redistribute margin generated by some programs to subsidize programs where faculty members' salaries were insufficient to cover expenses and to allow them to maintain at least the minimum adjunct rate. I for one would like to go back to the old system, but I was told that that really is a matter for UNI faculty to bring up in collective bargaining.

CIEP has struggled with a substantial increase in the number of students conditionally-admitted to UNI with no English language proficiency whatsoever. Of such students, only 12.9% have successfully completed CIEP. Working with the Academic Affairs Council and with the strong support of the Provost, the Admissions Office was persuaded to establish a minimum TOEFL score of 375 for conditional admission beginning next fall. CIEP is dealing with a 40% decline this fall in the number of students – all of which were from the conditionally-admitted category. It also accepts direct admits that are just studying English only. CIEP has also been wrestling with the recurring problem of having a limited diversity of students. That is, we have a large number from two countries, not a healthy thing from a business point of view, not a healthy thing for diversifying the University.

ISSO has been facing the challenge of not having the staff or budget to provide high quality international student support services and programming. One of the changes I am in the process of making will result in the transfer of my assistant director position to head ISSO and a graduate assistant to provide advising in ISSO. We instituted an International Student Merchants Fair to provide a service to students and to generate income to support programming for students. I also found that domestic students were subsidizing the international student orientation rather significantly. So, I secured Board approval for an International Student Orientation Supplement which will allow international students to fund their own costs of the orientation. We've also supported the efforts by the Student Health Center to institute a new International Student Health Insurance requirement which will provide better safeguards to international students and the broader university community.

With that, I'm happy to take any questions that you have.

Gibson: Could you talk just a little about the recruiters that will be hired?

Klafter: I have been given authority come—will do so in the Spring to hire two international student recruiters. They will effectively run in competition with the Admissions Office, the current international student recruitment operation which does not report to me. And I look forward to doing that.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Craig, is the recruiting just for CIEP, or will it be recruiting all across the board?

Klafter: Those two student recruiters will be for recruiting across the board, both undergraduate and graduate students to the University. It will not be focusing on CIEP.

Neuhaus: If I could just follow up.....is there a plan to do something with recruitment on CIEP right now?

Klafter: There is, and, in fact, I've been working with CIEP. We've developed a International Student Recruitment Strategic Plan for CIEP. Now, CIEP only has responsibility for recruiting direct admits; that is, students who only want to do English-only. They do not have any authority to recruit conditionally-admitted students. So, we are going to be focusing on direct admits. I should also note, based on statistical analysis, direct admits, turns out, have—a higher percentage of them end up graduating from UNI; that is, after they complete their program, they decide to apply for admission to the University. They gain admission. Those students actually graduate at a higher rate than students who are conditionally admitted; that is, with the initial intention of enrolling in academic programs. So we have—are just really putting some final touches on developing that plan. Part of that includes the idea of hiring a recruiter for CIEP direct admits only, but other strategies as well.

Peters: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: Last year there was some confusion, particularly among the Chinese students, on health insurance. There was a—I think—it's been a while since I've talked with my students about it, but I think it was a situation where there was an opt—they had to specifically opt out of the UNI plan, if they had another plan. But many of them didn't know that, and there was a lot of confusion, so they were being double charged. And I know that you got that corrected. Has the system been fixed so that things are more easily clear?

Klafter: Well, we've put in a further change because we—and really the Student Health Center found out—that many of the students who had been going out and purchasing their own insurance were purchasing sub-standard insurance or not even really fully understanding what it was that they were purchasing, and specifically, here, high deductibles, high co-payments, limits on coverage. And, indeed, we had some instances, I was told by the Student Health Center, of international students who ended up having to go to hospital where their insurance did not cover them. They were expected to come up with tens of thousands of dollars in payments, and pressure was being put on the Student Health Center to pick up those costs.

I've dealt with this issue at other universities where I've worked, and instead I supported the effort by the Student Health Center to get a new policy adopted which is now in place which requires all international students with a few exceptions to get the SHIP policy; that is, the University's policy. It is a superb policy. I wish I can get it myself. And I think all of you would wish you could get it yourselves. The premium's about \$150 a month. Compare that to what we're paying, and it's superb coverage. Notice went out to all students last Spring by multiple means: publication on websites; e-mail notification to students; it was put in the international student handbook. There were still some students claiming they didn't see it, but, in fact, I think we did make every effort that we could to notify them of it. As I said, there are a few exceptions in the plan

for foreign government-sponsored insurance programs. Saudi students have insurance provided to them by the Saudi Mission, which is actually through The Hartford, and it's a superb, Rolls Royce insurance policy. We also have international students who are either children or spouses of John Deere employees who get insurance through John Deere. Again, very good insurance policy. And we have other provisions for corporate policies where students can actually have that recognized in lieu.

Degnin: Good. Thank you.

Peters: Senator **Cooley**.

Cooley: Have you selected locations that you will target for the international recruiting.

Klafter: Yes. I am going to be focusing on 2 regions of the world: South America and the Middle East. And those have been chosen based on a lot of research that I've done in terms of those markets and what I think are actually good fits for UNI. South America, and I'm generalizing here, students that do come to the United States tend to prefer liberal arts programs. They like smaller institutions. Transportation links now are actually very good. South America, since American Airlines has taken over the link to O'Hare—and, in fact, as I learned yesterday—is looking to put in a link between Waterloo and Dallas/Fort Worth as well. So, it will really facilitate transportation links. Brazil, of course, is the largest and wealthiest economy in South America. It, in fact, has a faster growth rate this year than China and is a very good source for international students. But also Peru, Columbia, Ecuador, there are some strong markets indeed.

Middle East, we've had some strength, as we can see from the Saudi students, and what I've found really interesting about our Saudi population that you may not be aware, they are all Shia Muslim, which is interesting because that's the minority population in Saudi Arabia. And they are attracted here, and I've had conversations with many of them, because of the safety of our community, because there's a critical mass of other Shia Muslim students. So, one of the things we are going to be doing is actually

targeting other Shia populations in the region, and building on the critical mass that we already have, I think that's also a very good market for the University.

A couple of other places outside of that, one is actually Nigeria which—and I did visit earlier this year. Nigeria is in an interesting situation right now. Traditionally, they've sent a large number of students to the UK, but the UK this year has significantly increased their tuition for foreign students as well as for domestic students, which went up about 300%. I have a godson that's grappling with that this year. So, for many Nigerian students, they're now starting to think about other places, and indeed I think there are some real opportunities there. I visited the two American International Schools. I've had some very good meetings there, so that's another market that we're going to be looking at and hopefully bring some additional diversity to our campus.

Peters: Secretary **Edginton**, did you have a question?

Edginton: Do your recruitment plans call for interfacing your recruiters and your overall strategy with the faculty as a whole? Because, like, you know, so often when we're out there that that recruitment process starts. That's the first question I have. And then the second question is, do you—have your plans called for incenting academic programs for recruiting international students in, and, if so, is that likely to occur in the near future?

Klafter: Well, let me deal with the first question. The strategy that I'm going to be employing involves mostly having students visit International Schools, also some indigenous schools, and this is a contrast to what has in the past been done at UNI. And part of the rationale here is—I like to provide the analogy of, "Are you going to be more effective selling goods at a flea market or going to a company that purchases a large number of your products?" Schools, particularly American Schools are producing large numbers of students that are looking to come to the United States. There are students who are paying tuitions at those schools far in excess of what we charge for out-of-state fee, and in that sense I think in many respects

they are a good fit. Also, many of those schools teach in English. So you can avoid the English language issue.

The best use of faculty in my experience are in yield activities, and to that extent the plan does include, and I will be calling on, faculty to assist in yield activities. Now that will take different forms in different places. Where we have a critical mass of students who have been offered admission to the University in a certain location, I will be approaching a faculty member, “Will you go down to that location?” And what we want to do is a yield event where we invite those students and their parents and to speak to them. Speak to them about your research, your work, your experience in the University, and help turn those offers of admission into acceptances. That’s something I’ve found in the past to be very effective use, where you have enough critical mass. It’s not worth it to send down if it’s only 1 student. But if you have 20 that have been offered admission in a location, absolutely worthwhile.

Also, engage with faculty in terms of contacting particularly the best of those students—email, Skype—to talk to them about what you have to offer in your own programs. You know, there’s been a lot of interesting research done on who international students trust the most in talking about a prospective university and who they trust least. Who do they trust least? Recruiters. [light laughter around] Who do they trust most? Actually, international students from their own country who are already studying at that institution; #2 faculty members. So the more contact that we can develop between faculty and a student—in terms of doing yield events, persuading them to accept offers—the better. So, those are the two principal areas. There are a few other areas where I’m also going to be looking to work and certainly one of the things once I hire recruiters, part of their orientation to the University is to have them go around and meet with every department to learn about the department and learn about the programs and learn about what you’re looking for, what you really define as an excellent student, so that they can help—really do match-making and recruit students who are going to fulfill your needs the best.

To your second question, my plan did include a provision for cost sharing. This is something that I talked about when I was interviewing at UNI, when I was recruited to UNI. The simple fact is that as faculty members, right now you actually have a disincentive to see more international students, because it's just more students to teach. And what I proposed was what—a model where the differential between in-state and out-of-state tuition that international students would pay would be shared with the Colleges and Academic Departments, so that you would have a financial incentive. Unfortunately, I've been told that that decision on that has been deferred, and that is not being put into place as of yet.

Edginton: I'd like to see that back on the table. [laughter around]

Klafter: So would I.

Peters: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: You mentioned in your opening comments a restructuring that had saved \$400,000 in scholarship money. I wondered if you could tell us a bit more about how that was accomplished.

Klafter: UNI was handling Study Abroad in a way that may be unique in the world—I'd certainly never seen it before—where essentially the tuition that outgoing exchange students paid was being used to fund the office. And a large scholarship budget had been created to pay for incoming students who were charged out-of-state tuition. Now, the way other universities do it—including every other one in Iowa, I should note—is that outgoing students paid tuition into a pot, and that is used to pay for incoming students who are charged in-state tuition. And so long as you keep the numbers balanced, it's a wash. So, with the Provost's support, and I'm very grateful for it, what we did was we put the core positions of the Study Abroad Center on General Fund. We are now charging incoming exchange students in-state tuition, and we were able to eliminate the need for most of it [the scholarships previously used]. We did retain \$50,000 to make some strategic offers, to jump start some programs, to promote diversity,

but the bulk of that savings was being then able to eliminate the need for that money.

Smith: So, the \$400,000 that was saved was previously going where?

Klafter: The \$400,000 that was—was previously going back into the General Fund.

Smith: Which is good.

Klafter: Which is good, but it was also distorting some things because we had set-aside being taken out of set-aside being taken out of set-aside. Every time it was processed, there was another percentage being taken out of it. So it was really distorting the situation. So now that money is being retained for scholarships, I think as it should be done. It's also, I think, eliminating some distortions in the Study Abroad Center where it was focusing on things that I think were not really that it should have been focusing on in an effort to just generate more revenue in the form of outgoing student income. And one of those, I think, distortions was a great focus on short-term programs in the Summer at the very significant expense of semester-long programs. And one of the immediate impacts we've seen this year is an increase in semester-long programs, which I'm quite pleased to see, and I'm hoping to grow those, in large part because I think they provide a much richer experience for students.

Smith: Thank you.

Peters: Senator **Kirmani**.

Kirmani: It's not really for Craig, but maybe the Provost would be glad to or elect to comment on that. This just that Craig has proposed here, these are good steps, but the problem is deeper. UNI's record of recruiting international students is really dismal, very, very poor particularly as compared to the other two schools, and it needs stronger attention. Now the Student Services people, they have their International Recruiting Fair. Will they cooperate with them? I mean, how are you going to—I guess it's

not only you, but how should that office be shaken up, because it—I mean, I’m looking at the school as a whole. It doesn’t matter that it is not under you. I know that’s a different Vice President, but after all it’s the same school, so that the two offices have to collaborate on it, otherwise one will blame the other.

Gibson: [pause] Um, yes. [loud laughter] I—I—I have to—you know, I have to be careful about how I answer that question. I’m sure you understand that. I have, and Craig also, we’ve both had meetings with Student Affairs, with Admissions Office, and we’ve tried to come up with strategies by which we can work more effectively together. The Admissions Office and their recruiter for international students, they have their way of recruiting. And it’s not a method that Craig feels is effective, highly effective, nor do I. And so we did discuss geographic areas so that there’s not overlap in what they’re doing and what we’re doing. President **Allen** felt that that was very important. In fact, President **Allen** wanted to make sure before he allocated the funds for the recruiters that we did have a plan as to how they would go forward. And so that was the plan that you heard Craig discuss. I think that there is certainly opportunity for us to work together more effectively, but I must say the other thing that’s exciting to me is the fact that a number of Departments are reaching out, working with Craig, and some may not be, but working on their own recruitment, international recruitment plans. And the one that comes to mind immediately is Physics. They have developed a very exciting video. They have, you know, an outreach program that they’ve developed, and so I think we have a number of strategies. So I think it’s ok to have more than one strategy as long as we all are sort of aware of the big picture and what each other is doing. I think previously that was not happening. So we have Admissions, we have International Programs, and we have Academic Departments. And I would say that there is some interface among the 3. Perhaps we’re not where we need to be, but I think we’re going down the right road. Thank you.

Peters: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: In the beginning of the year, Craig, the number of administrators at faculty fora and general introductions had talked about it was time to bring the greater focus to shared governance. And this is an issue that I have raised many, many times regarding Study Abroad Center in that it would be wonderful to have a Faculty Advisory Committee. You raised that when you came to campus in your talk. I'm not going to reveal anything by saying that the other two candidates also revealed this, and it was all agreed to be a wonderful idea. Yet, last year you told me that, no, we didn't do that. We've decided to go with the AAC and that Deans can make the decision about what kind of programs are suitable for Study Abroad. And that seems to be passing the buck. I still would love to see a Faculty Oversight Committee, primarily because your office is not academic in the sense that it is a service division and the people in your office are not in any way—what's the word?—I guess, “trained,” or even educated to make a decision about what are appropriate Study Abroad courses.

You alluded to it with the practices that are still going on in which certain programs could easily be taught at UNI, and there's no value-added aspect to them once they go abroad, absolutely none. And yet good courses have been pushed out. In my College, Phil **Mauceri**, the former Dean, boasted that we had the largest number of Study Abroad faculty-led programs in the Summer. We had 6. Know how many there are this year? One. I'm it. I'm the dummy. Right? And I don't know if it's a morale issue? I'm sure a lot of it has to do with compensation. I couldn't believe that nobody here dropped their jaws or popped their eyes when they heard that we pay our own expenses abroad. You all get paid in the Summer, and you get full pay, right? I go abroad. I have to pay for my airfare—this year \$1,700. I had to pay internal travel, so when the students travel by bus someplace or where we take a ferry, I have to pay that out of my own pocket. And this issue of compensation, you just can't brush it aside because I know it's affecting these programs.

But whom it doesn't affect are people who are going on vacation. And you over there in SAC have expanded the faculty-led Study Abroads—and I hope you are reining it in—to people who have no expertise in the culture, who do not speak the language, who have never been there themselves,

and yet they are leading programs to these sites. And, of course, it's a vacation. I overheard one faculty member leave the meeting last year, when you were telling us how we're all going to get this more money but we're not going to get our expenses covered, he says, "I'm still doing it, because it's a vacation." He has no expertise in this realm. He's a biologist. And this is very troubling. And I know why they do it, because I'm looking at my fees: application fee for a student \$65. Study Abroad fee, did it go up this year? I think it's \$150 yet, what students pay individually, right?

And then we asked you last year, "How about Study Abroad Program Support Fee?" So we're all going to take the cut on compensation, but you guys still kept the \$1500. So my program gets charged \$1500, I'm not really certain why. I think I know why. It's to finance the budget for the SAC staff, and as you know our program has been going on since 1999, 1999! We didn't have your staff making—and they still don't—make reservations for us. They still don't—recruitment, their support is minimal. And I'm just wanting to know where this money is going.

So, I have those two components. The shared governance I think is very important. I don't know of another school—I've seen programs run badly. My son went to Emory. That program is run horribly. So the fact that's a tier-one school doesn't make the difference, but they do have faculty oversight. They have a committee that sits down and says, "This isn't worth going abroad for." You can take Environment, Technology, and Society right here on campus. You don't need to go to Paris. You don't need to go to Scotland for that. And then once you go there, what's the value? I don't see any value in that. So that is a very important component, and then the morale that you guys have just destroyed with this compensation program is patently obvious, and if you're going on vacation, it's not a problem. As the faculty member said, "It's a great way for me to go over, teach someplace, get compensated." I don't know what he does when students get sick. I don't know what he does when they go out late at night and party. I don't know any of those things. But I know we do those things 24/7. And yet the University can't even come up and cover our travel expenses. When you talk about sending these faculty members down to South America or to the Middle East and do yields, are they going to pay

their own travel expenses? You know, do you pay your own travel expenses?

Klafter: Yes, actually sometimes I do; part of it I do pay myself. [both talking at the same time for a bit] First of all, you've actually mischaracterized the approval process, because one of the changes that I put in this year was that the Study Abroad Center does not have the authority to approve or disapprove any courses with one exception—if it is not financially viable. All proposals now have to be approved by Academic Department Heads and Deans, and basically the determination was that they should be the gatekeepers of what makes academic sense in a program. The reason why it was determined that that would be better than setting up a single committee is because we could not get the expertise in a single committee of a half a dozen faculty members to cover all the disciplines in the University. Where course leaders have to go to the appropriate Academic Department Head to secure approval from them for the course, that's where we have the expertise, and we've left it open to Department Heads. If they want to deal with this at a departmental meeting, they are free to do so. So, that is the system that we have in place. Study Abroad Center, I agree with you, and the reason why I set up this system, does not have the academic expertise to determine what program makes sense or doesn't make sense. But I'd like to think that our Academic Departments do have that judgment to make that determination, so that is how that is being done at this time. And I have to say I think there is evidence that it is working. I mentioned in my remarks that we were ranked, and really you were ranked, those that use the programs, as the 4th best Study Abroad Center for the quality of academic programs in the United States. And I think that's a credit to the faculty who have been leading this program, to the fact that I think that Department Heads and Deans have been taking their responsibility seriously in terms of ensuring the quality of these programs.

You've asked about the funding, and, yes, there are a number of fees that have been approved by the Board of Regents that are used to cover the overhead of the office, because it gets no central funding to cover expenditures, cover the paper in the office, telephones, those types of

things. In terms of the value that they add, they do add a great deal of value in terms of helping to recruit students, ensure that they receive proper orientations for Study Abroad. One of the things I got them to do this year was to actually put programs out, on the overseas costs, on bidding to lower the costs to students. I know in your program alone we managed to lower the cost by \$1304 per student.

Bruess: No, we did that on our own. We were on the phone calling Greece. They didn't do anything.

Klafter: Well, I asked that there be competitive bidding on it. That was one of the results that came about. Now, I've been working to find greater efficiencies in the operation. I'm very grateful to the President for funding the purchase of StudioAbroad software that we're going to be implementing this year which will allow us to mechanize many of the processes in the office.

One of the areas that I'm really looking to cut down on is the number of student employees that are used by the office. And I think once we have StudioAbroad software up and running, we'll be able to make some savings there. And one of the aims I have, certainly, if we can cut down fees that are charged, I'd very much like to do so simply because we have a price elasticity issue with students in terms of what they can afford and where they can go.

One of the things that's hanging over the whole University, but Study Abroad in particular, is the plans or discussions over set-aside, and I've been told that the scholarship money that we have for outgoing students is not defined as need-based aid. So, if set-aside is abolished, there's a big question as to where will scholarship money come from, if it will come at all, to help support needy students who want to study abroad. That could have a very chilling effect on Study Abroad at this University, if there are no funds available to support outgoing students and helping them with that.

The funding model that was put in I said I don't like it either. I'd much prefer to go back to the old system. I think most people would, and I

encourage you, please, raise it with your Union. I don't think they are going to get any opposition from the Administration, but given that the collective bargaining agreement was interpreted that way, the only choice that we have is to change the language through collective bargaining. And I would be happy, delighted, to go back to the old system. I've actually proposed language that would allow for that.

Peters: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: That Abroad 101 thing. That was self-reporting. It was not some external agency came in and ranked us to Stanford and Emory and NYU and so on.

Klafter: It's not self-reporting in the sense

Bruess: Yes, it is, Craig. That was self-reporting.

Klafter: No. The way that it works, and I've looked at the methodology of it, students do assessments of programs. Those are submitted directly to Abroad 101 from all the programs that are covered under the umbrella, so it is based on student assessment of programs. It is also based on a review of the course proposals, which are also submitted for all programs.

Bruess: But it's still self

Klafter: And—and they use a panel of faculty from member universities around the country that actually goes through and reviews those proposals. They then look at those student assessments and reduce them to statistics for their ranking, so there is both the qualitative and the quantitative assessment of programs. You know, it's self-reporting only in the sense that the participating universities have that material go directly. But it does go directly from the students to Abroad 101.

Bruess: It wasn't some independent organization that selected schools at random and said, "We're going to study your program."

Klafter: Well, there are some

Bruess: Yana obviously contacted Abroad 101, and then she had our students—when they came back, they were required—they didn't do it this year, right? I don't know if there was any—did we do 101's this year?
[voices answering] It was required.

Klafter: Well, it's required that they submit the reviews, but that's not self-reporting. [many voices agreeing and disagreeing] Your suggestion was that the Study Abroad Center is doing it.

Bruess: No, no, no.

Klafter: Students, yes, they're self-reporting it. Absolutely. And they—UNI was one of 280 some odd institutions that was reviewed in that competition. Abroad 101 is an external body. It's not something that we have any part of, have any relationship with, other than that we send this material to them and also use it as a means of—for the reports that we get back for benchmarking against other universities and other programs. Is it a perfect system? No. But it's the best one—really the only one that's out there.

Peters: Senator **Edginton**, and then **MacLin**, and then **Terlip** in the queue.

Edginton: I want—this is a question for both you and the Provost, but as I understood what you were saying that international students coming in here are paying in-state tuition because it's being balanced off?

Klafter: These are only students coming on exchange. I want to be very careful to note that. So, when we send students to a partner university, they send us equal number of students back. The tuition generated by the outgoing student pays for the incoming student. It's a wash.

Edginton: Ok. I don't have any other questions right now.

Peters: Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: I guess I would just like to raise a few things. _____
_____ [another's coughing covers words] hearing you speak today, and I thank my colleague Greg [Bruess] and Jerry [Smith] for bringing up questions that I had. My number one question was about the scholarships. It always seems like a strange thing to take scholarships away from students, and my second remark was about faculty having to pay their own expenses to go do their job. But I also think that you may have misinterpreted—the idea of the Faculty Advisory Board would not be that there were 6 faculty who had every level of expertise about various programs, but rather a group of faculty who have a faculty mentality to bring to the discussion. And it's a mentality that I find strikingly lacking in your presentation, if nothing else due to some of your terms that you use, referring to places as having strong markets, these yield events. Those are terms that make me fundamentally uncomfortable when we're talking about students, bringing them here for an educational learning experience and providing our students diversity and richness in community. Now granted, it's the world that you're in, and you're thinking in that language, but a Faculty Advisory Board I don't think would ever encourage—or at least would provide a different viewpoint of referring to students as “strong markets” and “yield events.” I just find that strange terminology, even if it is appropriate in your discipline.

One other remark I had was that I've actually seen some research that shows that if you evaluate outcome data from students who have been abroad, they—the students who have gone to the more traditional university—I think you referred to it as indigenous universities within the country—report a much greater and richer experience than students who go to International American Universities. They find they end up just like hanging out with all the other people that came from their country, and they don't get that richness experience. I also found uncomfortable your phrase “that avoids the English language issue.” I think that, at least for some students, going abroad is about immersing themselves in language. And so none of these are a question, none of these you necessarily have to respond to, but as a faculty member, I think it's important that you

recognize that I think there's a big disconnect in what you're saying and what I'm hearing.

And the only time I heard you refer to faculty was at the very end point, which was to "use" us for recruitment. "You go ahead and call this student, so that we can see if we can get them here." And I can tell you right now a lot of faculty are uncomfortable with how they are being approached by Department Heads and Deans to say, "Hey, make phone calls." And instead of being involved much earlier in the process about what programs make sense, what expertise do we have here on this campus to go to very specific parts of the world, instead of these broader-based decisions that maybe don't get faculty input until way later.

Klafter: Yes, let me address something, because I think in part you are confusing two different things here. First of all, the suggestion of a Faculty Advisory Board was for the Study Abroad Center.

MacLin: Ok.

Klafter: The Study Abroad Center is different than International Student Recruitment, so when I talk about "markets," when I talk about "yield," that's for recruiting international students. When I talk about "avoiding the problem of English language admission standard" because you're recruiting students who already speak English, I'm talking about the recruitment of international students. This is not about Study Abroad experience. I absolutely agree with you, and, in fact, we—I'm trying to think if we have any left; I don't believe we have any left of partner institutions that are not indigenous universities.

MacLin: Ok, I misunderstood you then. I thought that you specifically said that you were targeting international _____ [another's coughing covers words] to send students to.

Klafter: No, that's what I—you're getting confused here between recruitment and Study Abroad.

MacLin: Well, you can talk about my confusion or you can just clarify.

Klafter: Yeah, so for recruiting students to UNI, I'm talking about going to American International Schools. These are high schools, also some indigenous schools, to recruit students to the University. For where we send students on Study Abroad, semester programs, all of our partners are indigenous universities.

MacLin: Good. I'm glad to hear that.

Klafter: And, in fact, I would very much like to see more of our students going and actually studying in the language of those institutions. We have some challenges on that front. But Study Abroad, absolutely—I think I'm in absolute agreement with you. The language of international student recruitment that I use—first of all, I'm also a faculty member and have been all my career, but I think the reality is if this University really wants to up its game, which I think it desperately needs to do, you have to think of it as a business. And that's really what the recruitment of students is.

Now, what faculty should be doing is setting standards for the admission of those students to the University. But let people who effectively are sales people—that's what recruiters are, they're selling you; they're selling your Departments, your programs, the institution—go out into markets, places where there are large numbers of students that are looking to study in the United States, to persuade them to apply. That's what the game is. And any university that has been successful in international student recruitment talks in these terms. I think it has to. That's the simple reality of it.

Now, I understand, and I've also heard faculty that don't like having to make the phone calls, don't like having to help. And I understand that. That's one of the reasons I want to see an incentive system. And even before that I also accept that it's not the right thing for all faculty members. But some people, I think, are well suited to it, enjoy doing it, want to do it. Hopefully, the system will allow for that flexibility so faculty that do see

value and want to participate and help in the recruitment of international students will do so.

So it's important to keep the distinction of the two different things. I said Study Abroad programs—you know, I said I'd like to see more semester-long programs, because I think they're a much better means of students immersing themselves in varied cultures and languages. I've met some extraordinary UNI students who have really taken advantage of the opportunities and have had phenomenal results from their experiences. I was in Vienna early in the year visiting a partner university, and I met with a UNI student studying abroad. She actually went there for the Fall semester to do some German language top up study, take some classes. She did so well in German that she actually scored very highly on the State German Exam and decided to spend an extra semester and was taking classes in German at the University of Vienna. Justin told me that she had just been invited to a Viennese ball; I was very jealous. But a really truly wonderful student who had immersed herself in the culture, was taking advantage really of the best educational opportunities that existed there, and was really becoming a poster child for Study Abroad and what you can get out of it. And there are many examples of that.

But, again, I want to be very clear here that the Study Abroad Center is no longer making any academic judgments on programs. I've taken that responsibility from them, and I absolutely agree with what senators said. All of the determinations as to what programs run are now being made at the departmental level, and then finally at the decanal level. And I think, as I said, I'm open to suggestions to the different ways, you know, to do that. But in the discussions that we had the sense was that those were the best places to determine the academic quality of programs; after all, it's those Departments, their course numbers, that go on these courses. It's really just putting in place in the location where approvals are already taking place for all other courses and really normalizing how we handle Study Abroad course approvals.

Peters: I've got 4 people in the queue already. Our time is starting to run a little bit short, if we also want to talk to Associate Provost **Klafter** about the

policies he's produced. So just keep that in mind. We've got Senator **Terlip**, Chair **Funderburk**, Senator **Degnin**, Senator **East**.

Terlip: I guess I'm sort of sticking with some of the issues that Senator **MacLin** and Senator **Bruess** raised in terms of the faculty's stewardship of the curriculum. And while you shifted things to Department Heads and Administrators, that still doesn't give us faculty oversight. And I hear you talk a lot about the front end and what's there, and maybe I'm just ignorant of this, is there any kind of outcomes assessment or program assessment from, besides this agency you talked about, where you bring that information to us? We review General Education programs. Why don't we review Study Abroad programs at the Senate level? Or maybe we do, and I just somehow missed it. So that's one thing I'd like you to speak to a little bit. The 2nd issue is that we all know that it's very difficult to retain international students, and, again, I would like you to talk a little bit more about your assessment of why we're not retaining international students other than talking about their English language skills, because that's a very small part of why students leave many times.

Klafter: We do employ a number of outcomes assessment measures for our Study Abroad programs. In addition to Abroad 101, we have all students take a standardized test of global awareness before they go on the program and again after they return from the program. So, that is an assessment. There is, as I said, student appraisals of those courses that is shared back with the Department Heads and Deans. Again, I want to note there is no reason why, and I believe some Department Heads are actually considering these proposals at departmental meetings, and I see no problem with that.

Terlip: Well, I guess I'm looking more at learning outcomes. I mean, Greg [**Bruess**] asked a very important question about the add-on. How are we measuring learning outcomes once those programs are in place?

Klafter: I said, there are some measures that are there. I'm not going to say that there isn't merit in having additional measures, and I certainly would have no objection to having Study Abroad courses normalize, and we

go under the same review that regular courses go through. I see no reason why it should be any different. So, in that sense, I absolutely agree with you. And, you know, part of the reason I put in the changes was because I was deeply concerned about the academic quality of some of these programs. And that's why we put in the system, again, where Departments have to approve, the Dean has to approve. If your Department is not one where the Department Head is sharing that responsibility, I'd urge you to go talk to the Department Head. I certainly have no objection to it.

Retention issue—let me opine here for a moment and also provide some data. We did do some number crunching as to why international students leave UNI before earning their degree, and now I have to start by saying that the data pool was not complete because the system has been at UNI that when an international student chooses to leave the University they're asked if they will fill out a short questionnaire explaining why, but they don't have to respond. And a significant number don't respond.

But given the pool that we had, which comprised approximately 40% of those students who left, [we found] some very interesting things, particularly as we did comparison to domestic students. So, for example, domestic students—the majority of domestic students who leave have GPAs below 3.0. International students, the majority of students who leave before earning their degree have GPAs in excess of 3.0. We're losing the better international students. A large percentage said that they were transferring to another university. Unfortunately, we don't ask, or haven't in the past, asked, "Where are you transferring to?" But I would venture to guess that they are transferring to a university that they perceive to be of higher reputation. Whether that is true or not, I think they are perceiving that to be the case, and that is a motivation. Some have talked about poor quality of Student Support Services, and that's one of the reasons why I'm making changes in ISSO to really bolster that area and, I should note, at my own expense. I'm losing an assistant director. It's not going to be replaced. I'm moving that position—losing—you know, reassigning a graduate assistant from International Programs to International Students Scholars Office to really bolster the work that we put in terms of international

student support services, international student advising, because I think that is an area where we have been falling down.

Some other areas that have been cited, which actually I think fortunately are improving in the community—one of the areas that was cited was difficulty in finding comfort foods. Well, we're starting to see an increase in ethnic restaurants in the area, and I think that's a positive effect, just by chance, but nevertheless it's happening. One thing that interestingly we saw up until last year, although when I looked at the results over the Summer they were not there, but there were previously complaints about difficulty of air transportation. That seems to have faded away now with the direct link to O'Hare from Waterloo, and I should note that of our international students who joined us this Fall, all but 6 flew into Waterloo. Actually, 5 went into Cedar Rapids, and 1 went into Des Moines. So that's helped quite a bit. Language is an issue, although not finding it as much of an issue for retention, because I've said it's actually the best students, international students, who are leaving. It's not the weakest. But it's certainly—there are some international students—fortunately it's a smaller number, who do end up enrolling, making it to matriculation and don't make it through for academic reasons, and English language—and, you know, you teach them, you know, is a factor in that process. And hopefully the changes that we are putting in place will ensure that a higher percentage of students that do come into CIEP—and not all international students come through CIEP; not all international students are conditionally admitted—but actually get the English language instruction and cultural training that they need to success at the University. So that's another area. But those are the key areas based on what we've seen.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk.**

Funderburk: A couple of things. I haven't dealt with your office in years. I found it incredibly hard to deal with every time I did it and tended to have a habit of going on its own without discussing things, I think, with faculty. So the faculty governance issue concerns me quite a bit of having some sort of a method for input, advice, and discussion, as opposed to randomly assigning a bunch of students in a country, "Let's go get them." Maybe

talking about where individual departments and things feel like they have a strength in recruiting. I've got a number of international students through the years. I remember when we became a all Russia or nothing approach, which lets shut the door on a whole series of Asian students I've had coming through the years, where there is, in fact, good numbers there. So I think that it needs to be revisited on some method to have a faculty oversight advisory committee working with you. Whether it's deal with the details of individual classes, I don't so much care as much as the philosophy of what's going on.

One of the things I found silly was the inability of CIEP students coming in to be able to do any work with faculty, because often if, for example in my case, if they came specifically to study with me and they needed to get their English up, they're not going to sit there for a year or two doing English and not allowed to work with me anyway. I think we could have done some creative things along the way to increase their numbers, increase the viability of the program, and target populations that were already here.

The other issue I have is with the characterization in the compensation. Administration decides whatever expenses are paid on these things. I understand that you did have to pay more for faculty, but the decision not to cover expenses has nothing to do with how much it paid. I mean, it has to do with your internal budget. So you could have done it another way, so to characterize it that the only way you can fix the pay issue is to get back to the bargaining table is just not true. So, those are the two things that struck me that I needed to say something about. I have nothing more.

Peters: Senator **Degnin**.

Degnin: You guys have already dealt with most of what I want to deal with. The one thing I wanted to reinforce, though, is in response to Kim [**MacLin**]. You focused primarily on the fact that some faculty aren't—probably aren't appropriate to make phone calls, but Kim, I think, raised also a point that the reason some faculty don't want to make phone calls is they feel like they are just being tagged onto the end of the process instead of being kind

of included in the whole process. And that's not specific to you, but the more inclusive I think the faculty feel, the more committed they are going to be to help carry out and help you with the process.

Klafter: I take that point.

Peters: Senator **East**, did you still have something for us?

East: Yes, I'm largely ignorant of international programs, but—and I think I'm—you've suggested sort of that recruiting foreign students versus Study Abroad, but Study Abroad you characterized as our students going to universities in other countries. What I heard—much of the discussion seems to be about a different set of categories, either foreign students coming here taking our courses or our students going somewhere else and taking somebody else's courses, but our courses being taught—or courses being taught for credit at UNI, offered at UNI, being taught or being offered by UNI faculty being taught and that has to do with what seems to me was the support for getting students overseas and our faculty overseeing them, it has to do with faculty oversight of those courses, and so that part seems to me to be something that's very important that faculty have oversight of. And I'd like to say, again, I think that Department Heads aren't considered faculty here. And so they have no power to ok curriculum, at least as I perceive it, as I think our shared governance perceives it. Faculty have the power of the curriculum. Department Heads can't ok it, not ok it, anything. Now, they can assign people to teach the course, but the course has to be what the course is. And so I'm—is it true that there is this sort of third category that's not at other universities? That is the case, right?

Klafter: Well, the number of short-term Study Abroad programs, and these are faculty led, and not always faculty, by the way. There are also some that are led by P&S staff, which generally run 2-3 weeks. There's a few that are 4 weeks. Now, the courses that are being taught are courses that are approved through the normal curriculum process. So, there are no specially-designed courses that are run abroad led by our University employees, faculty or P&S staff, that are just done for Study Abroad. They don't go through that process. Now, that leaves open the question if

somebody takes a course and course description out of the catalog and say they want to teach this overseas, is it a rigorous course? Is it justifiable to offer it overseas? What is the added value? I absolutely agree with Senator **Bruess**.

Now, as I said, when we set up the system to have approval at the departmental level, it does not—you know, in the end the Department has to sign off on it, but no way did we say that that should not be a departmental decision. And I see no reason why it should not be a departmental decision, no reason at all. It's not a timing issue. It can be, and I would actually encourage that. I want to see the highest quality programs possible. And I want to see that the faculty who lead, or the P&S staff who lead, programs are, in fact, qualified to do that. And I agree with what was said before. I do not believe that the Study Abroad Center is the right place to make that determination. And that's why I have taken it out of their responsibility. It's really as simple as that.

Now, the number of short-term Study Abroad programs at this University compared to others, yes, we have a higher proportion than at other universities. It's something I've inherited. It's been explained to me as UNI students prefer to travel in groups. They prefer those types of programs. I don't know, and I've been pushing semester programs as much as I possibly can, in large part because I think they offer a much richer experience for our students.

Let me also just clarify something in terms of the different categories that we're talking about here. So we have students that go out on semester programs, on exchange. We have students that go out on short-term Summer programs led by faculty or led by P&S staff. We have students who go out and actually pay a foreign university to take classes and actually pay tuition to that foreign institution. We also, and something I've been trying to increase on the recruitment end, we've started to recruit Iowa students at private colleges and universities in the State to come on our short-term programs. They can save a lot of money, if they are Iowa residents. And we're starting to have some success in increasing those numbers. So that's another category.

Incoming we have fee-paying international students, undergraduate and graduate. We have exchange students who come in and don't pay fees to us. It's strictly exchange. We also have one-way students, a few of them, who come in and pay tuition as transient students, just to take classes with us. And we have a few students who are actually funded by scholarships from their country or from their university to study at UNI. I made reference before to Senator **Edginton**, who was very helpful in helping to negotiate with the University of São Paulo where actually HPELS is getting a student from the University of São Paulo this Spring who is funded by the University of São Paulo, paying our tuition at out-of-state rates. So that's another category of students that we're talking about.

East: I have a follow-up there. I just think it's important to note that just because—that when you allow Department Head approval to count for faculty representation that's encouraging Department Head approval to count for faculty approval, and so you're encouraging non-faculty approval of these things.

Peters: Senator **Bruess**, was your point quick?

Bruess: Yes, just very quick clarification. We do have on campus only one category that goes through a rather more rigorous approval process, and those are the Capstones. That's because Capstones are deter—that's LAC, and if they say their Capstone is Study Abroad in Greece or Study Abroad in Italy, LAC will hold them to it. The difference is—and this is maybe perhaps where Senator **East** is confused is that the way you have it set up now, you can go into any Department and say, "Oh," and I'll do it for Mike [**Walter**], Introduction to Biochemistry or some microbiological things that's on the books. So what Mike can do, he can go to his Department Head and say, "Hey, I want to teach this. I've never been to South Africa. I'm going to teach that in South Africa."

Walter: I'm going to go to Athens.

Bruess: You can go to Athens. No, you can't do that. [laughter around] So, that's the difference. All right, so when a Dean or a Department Head is giving an approval for a course, they're not making any determination as to whether that course should be appropriately taught—is there any value to teach microbiology in a foreign setting? But there is no contextualization, there is no cultural contextualization or cultural intensification. That's the difference. And so, the Capstones, yes, because LAC has done their job. But we cannot count on Department Heads and Deans to make that kind of determination. So that's the Faculty Oversight Committee.

Peters: Senator **Edginton**, and I think this will be our last word.

Edginton: I have a question to ask, and then I want to make a statement. I'm not understanding why the support for faculty for their travel or per diem was removed, especially for study tours where people are going for a shorter period of time. Wouldn't that, the expense, be covered in the fee charge to the student?

Klafter: Because of the increase in salary that that reinterpretation of the collective bargaining agreement mandated did not have the money to cover it, so in the first year before I joined the University, the Provost came up with the money. And it was a lot of money. So, as I said, I looked at "Could we just add the charge on to students?" And we did price elasticity analysis. Our review was that we would have essentially killed off short-term programs, that it would have just been too expensive for our students to take advantage of, so we couldn't do that. And there was no other source for the money. As I said, I would love to go back to the old system, and I really hope that we can get there as soon as possible, because I think it was a much better system all around.

Terlip: Well, is the reason we have more short-term programs in the past because faculty were so cheap? I mean, I think we should be paid what our colleagues are at other institutions.

Klafter: Well, actually, we did look at other institutions in terms of Summer programs, and the standard is that for Study Abroad programs, they would

be paid at an adjunct rate, which was the old system, and be reimbursed expenses.

Peters: Senator **Edginton** still has the floor.

Edginton: Since I have the last word, I want you to know I had opportunity to work with Provost **Klafter** on multiple, multiple occasions. There hasn't been one time that I've called him and said, "I've got someone here visiting from another country. I need you." even short-term. I've also had him push against me for programs, and I've said, "It's not going to work." And he's said, "Ok, your needs are more important." So he's been responsive in all the cases that I've worked with him. And I just would encourage you, Senator **Bruess**, to continue to push back, continue to have the dialogue. I've always found him to be open to have conversation. So, continue that conversation.

Peters: Thank you. We are right up against our 5:00 o'clock ending time. I did indicate in an e-mail to you that I expected us to go a little bit long. Could I get a motion to extend for 15 minutes? Senator **Degnin** [who indicated]. Second? Seconded by Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Any discussion about this? All in favor, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed? [nothing heard] Motion passes.

DOCKET #1049, INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL SAFETY POLICY—FACULTY AND STAFF, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING 1152/1048 ON 10/22/12 (**East/Terlip**)

DOCKET #1050, INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL SAFETY POLICY—STUDENTS, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING 1153/1049 ON 10/22/12 (**Terlip/Degnin**)

Peters: We have a few minutes. I expect that we will refer these on to the EPC, but Associate Provost **Klafter** did want us to—did want to refer these to us for our action. Travel Safety Policies—Faculty and Staff and then a separate one for Students. I don't know if you can briefly just kind of summarize these for us.

Klafter: Absolutely. One of the things that surprised me when I joined UNI was that there were no travel safety policies, and travel safety is really very important in internationalization. Now, I have drafted two—one covering faculty and staff and one covering students. Let me talk about the faculty and staff one first. I've drafted these things for several universities, and there is always a balancing test that one has to find between, on the one hand, the academic freedom of faculty to pursue research, pursue projects, anywhere their interests may lie, and on the other hand the interests of the university in limiting liability should something happen. Now, I have drafted this where the pendulum is very much in favor of the academic freedom of faculty so that basically as you read this it is mostly advisory. Where it has teeth, and the only places that it has teeth, is if a faculty member wants to go to a country that's on the U.S. State Department Travel Warning List. They have to do a risk assessment plan, give that to their Department Head, and they either have to find funding for war exclusion insurance, if it is a country where it is characterized as a war zone. If you have a research grant, you can actually expense that on a research grant. Or sign a waiver of liability. But most of this is advisory. But I will tell you there are some in the University—and I've been shopping this around—who believe that the pendulum is way too far over. They want to have systems that require faculty to have to get approval every time they want to go overseas. I'm really trying to resist that, and I'm hoping that I find some commonality here in efforts to resist that.

Students, of course, are a different category, because we have both an *in loco parentis* responsibility with regard to many of our students. We have increased liability with regard to students because they're going on our programs. So for the student policy what I've said is, by the way that it's drafted, if—I needed a bright line—so if the country is on or if part of the country is on U.S. State Department Travel Warning, students can't go. Now, there is a provision for exceptions and where students can apply for an exception because there are circumstances, and they've come up in my career, where there are strong academic reasons for students going into even a war zone. If they can make that case, if they can take the steps to mitigate the risks, we have a system where they can apply for that and gain approval for that. But absent that, there is a brighter line in terms of

student groups. With that, I'd be very grateful for Faculty Senate's input on this, thoughts on it? Any questions that you have?

Peters: And especially any initial reservations or issues that we might want on the Minutes, assuming that we are now referring it to the Educational Policies Commission to work on, you know, any particular things that they should pay attention to or anything like that. They tend to find that helpful.

Terlip: I just have a question.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Who else would have to approve this besides the Senate? I mean, it seems to me the University Attorney and some other folks need to be in the mix, so what other bodies would

Peters: It would go through the whole policy process, so it would be recommended by us and then it would go up the chain from there after we acted on it, if we passed it.

Klafter: But it's in part, because as I said, I know there are people that have differing views. I think it's really critical to have Faculty Senate weigh in on these issues.

Terlip: I guess my question was we're at the beginning of the process? Ok.

Peters: Senator **East** and then Senator **Breitbach**.

East: I think current policy suggests that you could have taken this to the policy review committee straight without any faculty input at all, so thank you very much for coming and asking for ours.

Peters: Senator **Breitbach**.

Breitbach: It would be nice to see a student who has been abroad and a faculty member who has also some experience with international travel

serve perhaps in addition to the current membership of that committee, if they don't already have somebody in that capacity.

Peters: Any other comments on these draft policies before referring? Provost **Gibson**?

Gibson: Not on the policies. Did you [to Senator **East**] want to make another comment?

East: Yeah, I was just going to suggest that, if you haven't, you might at least run the student policy by student government?

Klafter: I have already done that.

East: Ok.

Gibson: Just two comments. I do want to publically thank Craig [**Klafter**] for the work that he has done in the two years he's spent here.

Klafter: One year.

Gibson: One year. [laughter around] One year and starting his second year. You know, he did come in and there was a lot of work to be done, and he's tried to tackle that, and so I appreciate what he's done. We've got a ways to go. I would like to explore the idea of this Faculty Oversight Committee, because personally I'm disturbed if faculty are—I mean, I would never think that faculty would be using Study Abroad as a means by which to take a vacation. I mean, I just—I wouldn't think that. So if a Faculty Oversight Committee or some kind of faculty committee could help in some way to assure that that does not happen, I think that that's a good thing. In my mind, I did think that because we discussed at AAC, Department Heads and Deans, ensuring that academic integrity. I understand what you're saying, Phil [**East**], that that may not always happen, and so again that's something that I hadn't thought about. So I understand that perspective. So I think we can work, and Craig and I have

worked to make sure that some of these things can happen. So I appreciate the discussion.

Peters: NISG President [Jordan] **Bancroft-Smithe** had a question.

Bancroft-Smithe: Senator, what was your question about NISG?

East: If he [**Klafter**] had asked the student government to comment on the policy or review the policy.

Peters: On the travel policy.

Klafter: Last year, we did.

Bancroft-Smithe: Ok. I was going to say I've never heard of this policy before today.

Klafter: Yeah. Your predecessor definitely reviewed it.

Peters: Senator **MaLin**.

MaLin: Just a quick remark. The policy to have faculty pay their own expenses may inadvertently encourage the vacation mentality.

Peters: Any other comments on the policies? Well, it seems to me that the appropriate thing to do with the policies is probably refer it to EPC, so they are separate—they were docketed separately as separate items, so I'll need a motion for each one. Is there a motion to docket the faculty and staff travel policy, or rather to refer it to the EPC? Senator **East**.

East: I move we refer the Faculty Travel Policy to the EPC.

Peters: Second?

Terlip: I second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Terlip**. Any discussion about this at all? All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say “No.” [none heard]. The motion carries. It will be referred to the EPC. And then also the—we’ll need a motion to refer the Student Travel Policy to the EPC.

Terlip: So moved.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**. Second by Senator **Degnin** [who indicated]. Any discussion?

MacLin: Just that I’d like the current [student] government to be able to get some input on this as well, from NISG.

Peters: Other discussion?

Bancroft-Smithe: I’m on the Committee, so I’ll show that to them.

Peters: Thank you. All in favor of referring this to EPC, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard]. Ok.

DOCKET #1052, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JAMES **MALTAS**,
REGULAR ORDER (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Peters: And if you’ll bear with me, if we can try to get a few emeritus requests done. There are some people who have been waiting for a long time between Colleges—between the lag time for College Senate meetings and our meetings. We start with Docket #1052, Request for Emeritus Status for James **Maltas**. Can I get a motion to endorse Professor **Maltas**’ emeritus request?

East: So move.

Peters: Moved by Senator **East**. Seconded by Senator **Terlip** [who indicated]. I do have a brief letter of support for Professor **Maltas** [see Addendum 2] that we will append to the Minutes talking about his role in

developing partnership between the Math Department and the U.S. Department of Defense, his involvement in various professional associations, work with the National Science Foundation, and other things. Anyone else? Any further discussion about Professor **Maltas'** application? Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I know that in his work in the Lab School he taught both my children math and actually got them to do their homework [laughter around], and I know that he was asked to be the commencement speaker several times, and that he—it's difficult, I think, many times to get math noticed, but to get kids who don't want to do math to really like a math teacher, he did that very well.

Peters: Any further discussion? All in favor of endorsing Professor **Maltas'** application for emeritus status, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, say "No." [none heard]. The motion carries.

DOCKET #1053, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, CHARLES R. **MAY**,
REGULAR ORDER (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Peters: Docket #1053, Request for Emeritus Status for Professor Charles **May**. We need a motion to endorse that request.

Strauss: So move.

Peters: Who was that? Ah, Senator **Strauss**, thank you.

Strauss: The junior senator. [laughter around]

Peters: Motion by Senator **Strauss**. Do I have a second?

Edginton: Second.

Peters: Second by Secretary **Edginton**. Any discussion for Professor **May's** application for emeritus status? Yes, Senator.

Heston: Professor **May** worked in the Early Childhood Department for many years following the—he came here as the Department Head for Curriculum and Instruction and led a lot of efforts to expand our offerings, our Master’s Degree program around the State, which was very successful. He provided a lot of leadership for a long time for the early childhood faculty.

Peters: Any other comments? All in favor of endorsing Charles **May**’s request for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard]. The motion carries.

DOCKET #1054, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, JACQUELINE J. **SMITH**,
REGULAR ORDER (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Peters: Docket item 1054, Request for Emeritus Status for Jacqueline **Smith**. Could I get a motion to endorse that request?

Bruess: Move.

Peters: Senator **Bruess** moves to endorse. Is there a second?

Dolgener: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Dolgener**. Any discussion? All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] All opposed, please say, “No.” [none heard]. The motion carries.

DOCKET #1055, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, PENNY L. **BEED**, REGULAR
ORDER (**Neuhaus/Bruess**)

Peters: Docket item 1055, Request for Emeritus Status for Penny **Beed**. Can I get a motion to endorse that request?

Neuhaus: I move to endorse.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**. Seconded by Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. I will take the prerogative here to say that I have a connection to Professor **Beed** that I think no one in this room does and that's that I bought her house [laughter around]. And we have happily lived there for 3 years now, and they were very kind in introducing us to all the neighbors and making us feel quite at home in our new neighborhood, so

Strauss: Does the basement leak?

Peters: What?

Strauss: Does the basement leak?

Peters: It does, but we knew it when we bought it. [laughter around] Any other discussion about Professor **Beed**'s request? ? All in favor of endorsing Professor **Beed**'s request for emeritus status, please say, "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say "No." [none heard]. The motion carries.

DOCKET #1057, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, MICHELE (MICHAEL) WILLIAM **ROTH**, REGULAR ORDER (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

Peters: Does anyone object if we just go right on through these last two, even though we're at 5:15? ["No's" heard around] Ok, Docket # 1057 Request for Emeritus Status for Michael **Roth**. We need a motion to endorse. Senator **Kidd** [who indicated]. Seconded by Senator **Dolgener**. And I do [loud laughter all around]—Sorry, why did I even say that? Sorry. Seconded by Senator **Gallagher**. Sorry. And I do have a nice e-mail here from Cliff **Chancey**, of course, the Department Head in Physics, who spells out Professor **Roth**'s excellent record at UNI [see Addendum 3], winning the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence in 2011, Class of 1943 Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence in 2010. It concludes, "Mike **Roth**'s service included multiple years as Physics Club advisor, professional service on

several regional organizations, and his very recent service on the Faculty Senate. UNI should be thankful for his service and honored to call him Professor of Physics Emeritus.” Any other?

Edginton: I think he conducted himself with great civility during this last go round of budget reductions and spoke very well on behalf of the Department of Physics during those conversations.

Peters: Thank you, Secretary Edginton. Other comments?

Terlip: I was on the Awards Committee both times he won those awards, and his—I mean, it was like a career all of us aspire to, and he should definitely be acknowledged for all his work in teaching, research, and service. He truly, I think, modeled—emulated that model for all of us.

Peters: Other comments?

Neuhaus: Sure.

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Well, most of us would go to Panera just to, you know, kick back and enjoy something, but I notice every time I go to Panera, there’s Mike doing Physics with other students. I’m sure he’s enjoying the calories, but the job never stopped with him. He was always on.

Peters: All in favor of endorsing Professor **Roth**’s application for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, please say “No.” [none heard]. The motion carries.

DOCKET #1058, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, MICHAEL **JANOPOULOS**,
REGULAR ORDER (**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

Peters: And one last one, Docket item 1058, Request for Emeritus Status by Michael **Janopoulos**. I need a motion to endorse.

Strauss: So move.

Peters: Senator **Strauss**. Seconded by Senator **Hakes** [who indicated]. Any discussion? All in favor of—sorry. Sorry, Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Real quick. I just wanted to publically thank Mike. He’s participated in the Cornerstone in the last 2 years. It’s hard to find faculty who are willing to take that challenge up, or so we found, and Mike has done a really good job of that last year, and he signed up again for this year. So we’re really grateful that he did that.

Peters: Thank you. Any other comments? All in favor of endorsing Professor **Janopoulos’** application for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No.” [none heard]. The motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: And does anyone want to give us our favorite motion of the day?

Edginton: I move for adjournment. [laughter around]

Peters: Senator **Edginton**. Ok. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] And I’ll see you all in 3 weeks in the University Room.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss, Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:

Date: 11/12/12

University Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Follows are 3 addenda to these Minutes.

**BOARD OF REGENTS EDUCATION AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE 9
STATE OF IOWA SEPTEMBER 12, 2012**

dg/h/aa/edu/sept12/ESAC9.doc
9/3/2012 11:14:58 AM

Contact: Diana Gonzalez

**UPDATE ON BIENNIAL FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT COLLABORATIVE
PROJECT**

Actions Requested: Receive the update report regarding the changes implemented for the biennial faculty activities report.

Executive Summary: The Biennial Faculty Activities Report is an important tool for accountability and communication among the Board of Regents, the Regent universities, and the public. It provides an overview of faculty responsibilities at the three Regent universities, describes the distribution of time spent on those responsibilities, and illustrates how the universities monitor the accomplishment of their diverse missions. Therefore, it is critical to undertake the data collection process in a uniform and systematic manner as well as to collect the key indicators of faculty activities. Following the Biennial Faculty Activities Report in August 2011, an inter-institutional team which included Diana Gonzalez (Board Office), Tom Rice (SUI), Dawn Bratsch-Prince (ISU), and Ginny Arthur (UNI) undertook a collaborative in-depth analysis of the data collection process, including the survey instrument and the data collection methodology to prepare for the Biennial Faculty Activities Report in 2013.

The update that will be provided includes discussion about the new survey template (Attachment A) and how it will provide greater detail about faculty activities and the changes in data collection methodology that will be implemented during the 2012-2013 data collection period.

BOARD

Are you a department chair? Yes No							
Faculty Activity Categories	Minutes per day						
	Sun.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.	Sat.
Student Instruction							
Classroom teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation							
Clinical teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation							
Non-classroom teaching and instruction (independent studies, thesis work, internships, student productions)							
Mentoring student research							
Consulting with students outside the classroom (in person, by telephone, by email, etc.)							
Developing new courses, updating existing courses							
Participating in instructional development activities (workshops, conferences, online seminars, etc.)							
Online teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation							
Student Advising (meeting with students to review academic progress/plans, writing letters of recommendation, participating in student orientations and training events, etc.)							
Scholarship/Research/Creative Work							
Conducting sponsored (grant-supported) scholarship/research/creative work							
Non-sponsored (non-grant supported) scholarship/research/creative work							
Attending conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.							
Writing/preparing grants							
Clinical Work							
Delivering clinical services							
Working on administrative tasks related to clinical work							
Community Engagement, Outreach, or Extension							
Working on public or private partnership projects							
Delivering presentations, workshops, seminars, performances, exhibits							
Delivering online/webinar based programming							
Attending professional development activities (workshops, conferences, online seminars, etc.)							
Providing technical assistance							
Preparing, presenting and evaluating programming for stakeholders							
Consulting (in person, by telephone, by email, etc.)							
Developing new programs, updating existing programs (presentations, publications, etc.)							
Administration/Service							
Serving the institution (department, college, university committees and meetings, task forces, faculty governance, etc.)							
Serving the profession							
Administering centers/institutes, department/college/university programs, research operations							
Mentoring faculty							
Assisting student organizations							
Illness/vacation							
Sick leave							
Vacation							

An e-mail from Megan **Balong**, Field Experience Coordinator, Mathematics
Scott,

Here is the support letter for Jim Maltus's Emeritus status.

Jim Maltas was a tenured member of the College of Education teaching mathematics at Price Laboratory School for twenty-one years. He was on the forefront of implementing the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Association's (NCTM) Discrete Mathematics Initiative in Iowa through National Science Foundation (NSF) funding and all of the Iowa's Area Education Agencies. He was also a leader for many years in mathematics professional development in the partnership between the UNI Mathematics Department and the U.S. Department of Defense Education Activity. Through this project he traveled to military bases in South Korea, Japan, Germany, Italy and other countries to coach and mentor mathematics teachers as well as host numerous workshops here at UNI during the summers. In addition to his professional development work, Jim was active in the curriculum development cycle. He served as a pilot and field-test teacher for NSF funded NCTM standards-based curriculum materials. This was cyclical work over the course of more than ten years as new material was developed, tested, revise, tested, revised and published. Jim was a known teacher leader on implementing problem-based integrated mathematics and provided professional development and consultation to state departments and school districts across the country.

Jim Maltas was a devoted member to the UNI community as well serving as a volunteer at meets for UNI's track team and serving on numerous committees and the college and university level.

An e-mail from Cliff **Chancey**, Department Head, Physics Department

Scott:

Here is the paragraph that I would like read into the minutes for Mike Roth's emeritus motion follows.

Thanks, Cliff

Mike Roth, during his years at UNI, was both an outstanding teacher and an outstanding researcher. His philosophy of service was simple: do your part as a colleague and remember to help others. His awards show his value as a teacher and scholar: Regent's Award for Faculty Excellence (in 2011); Class of 1943 Faculty Award for Teaching Excellence (in 2010); CNS Dean's Award for Superior Achievement in Research (in 2008). Mike's commitment to mentoring undergraduate research students was exceptional and very effective: ten national research prizes and awards were earned by his students since 2006. Mike Roth's service included multiple years as Physics Club advisor, professional service on several regional organizations, and his very recent service on the Faculty Senate--to name just a few instances. UNI should be thankful for his service and honored to call him Professor of Physics Emeritus.