

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
11/14/11 (3:18 p.m. – 4:37 p.m.)
Mtg. #1702

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

No press present.

Provost **Gibson** encouraged everyone to attend the Town Hall meeting tomorrow (Tuesday, November 15th) in the Commons Ballroom to hear President **Allen** make a short presentation and then take questions. She also noted discussions on campus that will be widened regarding the current Penn State circumstances so that UNI personnel will be prepared as to process and procedure if something similar were to be witnessed here.

Faculty Chair **Jurgenson** offered no comments.

Chair **Funderburk**'s comments included thanks to the Faculty Senate Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee for its continued work, noting that a report will be forthcoming as to their progress and results. He also noted progress on the Archival Project of past minutes and agendas taking place at the Library, saying he was very pleased that it was ahead of schedule. He then asked if Senators wanted to rethink the final two Faculty Senate meetings this semester (November 28 and December 12, the first day of Finals Week). Those will remain as scheduled. And lastly, he reported that a committee has been formed for the Fifth-Year Review of President **Allen**, which he will Chair (this falling under New Business but discussed here).

Vice-Chair **Breitbach** reported that the Bylaws Committee has made great progress in round one of their work, housekeeping changes to the Bylaws and Constitution. Round two will be a report jointly with the Committee on Committees on some recommendations. And there may also be a third

round of recommendations. Vice-Chair **Breitbach** also met with the Educational Policies Commission.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript for 10/24/11 were approved by acclamation with no corrections offered.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

1096 994 EPC recommendation to accept petition (1082/980) by Russ Campbell to change the mid-semester designation for the spring semester to after the 8th week of class, regular order (**East/Kirmani**). Passed.

1097 995 Review of LAC Category IV, Natural Science and Technology, regular order (**Smith/Kirmani**). Passed.

1098 996 Emeritus Status Request, Carol Phillips, HPELS, effective May 2011, regular order (**Dolgener/Boody**). Passed

1099 997 Emeritus Status Request, Cynthia Herndon, HPELS, effective July 1, 2011, regular order (**Neuhaus/Dolgener**). Passed.

1100 998 Emeritus Status Request, Dennis Cryer, HPELS, effective July 29, 2011, regular order (**Roberts-Dobie/Boody**). Passed.

1101 999 Emeritus Status Request, Nancy Hamilton, HPELS, effective June 30, 2011, regular order (**Dolgener/Roberts-Dobie**). Passed.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1086 984 Consultative Session with the Director of the UNI Museum on its current status and planning for the future, a report, docketed for 3:45 p.m. on 11/14/11 (**DeBerg/Swan**). Presentation heard, information discussed and report received.

5. New Business/Old Business

Review of President Allen discussed under Senate Faculty Chair **Funderburk's** remarks earlier.

Consultative session with Vice-President **Hogan** regarding UNI enrollment issues, 4:15 p.m. Presentation heard and information discussed.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 4:37 p.m. (**Neuhaus/Roth**). Passed.

Next meeting:

November 28, 2011

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:15 p.m.

**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 14, 2011
Mtg. 1702**

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

Absent: Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Laura **Terlip**, Marilyn **Shaw**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Funderburk** (3:18 p.m.): I'd like to call the meeting to order. We have a quorum. Welcome. Thanks for joining us.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Funderburk: Call for press identification. I don't believe we have any press today.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Funderburk: Comments from Provost Gibson?

Provost **Gibson:** Just to encourage everyone to come to the Town Hall meeting on Tuesday, tomorrow, 3:30. The first half hour, I believe, will be a presentation by the President, followed by Q&A. I think there is a—I think you can submit questions in advance, or you can just ask questions there. So I want to encourage everyone to do that. And I guess the 2nd thing is just this morning we had a discussion at Cabinet about the Penn State situation, and so I think we all should be vigilant and think about other things that we

may need to do better. Are there question marks that maybe some people have about what they should do under certain circumstances? But we all should be clear and on the same page about process and procedures. And so I thought we had a very good discussion, and we hope to find a forum to continue that discussion University-wide.

Dolgener: Where is the Town Hall?

Licari: It is in the Commons Ballroom.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JAMES JURGENSON

Funderburk: Ok. Chair **Jurgenson**?

Faculty Chair James **Jurgenson:** No comments.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: Ok, no comments. I believe Vice-Chair **Breitbach** will be here. I haven't heard or had an e-mail otherwise, so we'll reserve her time. I do have a few comments today. First, Faculty Senate Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee, something we are all wondering about. I want to publically thank the members of the Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee who have been meeting regularly and are making good progress on our operating documents. I have seen a late-stage draft of proposed "mechanical" corrections that should be before us soon for approval.

That will then be followed by more substantive changes recommended to our operating methods and procedures. The members who have been working on this are Chair Jesse **Swan**, Karen **Breitbach**, Chris **Neuhaus**, and Scott **Peters**. So, if you have concerns or interest--and especially thank them for all their work—sounds like a lot of Friday afternoons and things that have been going into this. So I really appreciate that work.

Our archival project, the Minutes and Agendas through the Library, that we have been archiving through the Library, that has been moving amazingly

well. Thanks to hard work of library student workers, I think they hired 10 on this project, under the direction of William Maravetz and Cynthia Coulter, we now, as of today, have 10 years of Minutes and Agendas digitized to searchable pdf documents. The goal of getting the most recent 10 years completed this year having already been met, they will complete another 2 years of documents before Thanksgiving. This will complete the digitization of the items I have been able to locate in the Faculty Senate Office in terms of these infamous notebooks that we have had in past years, and also all supplemental materials, including all curriculum packages and everything of that sort, are included in this digitization. After reviewing the status of the budget, with any remaining money, I have asked that they proceed to try to get additional years' materials from the Library's archives digitized for our use. We are hoping this could mean having Minutes and Agendas available for the current period back through the 1990s. I have begun talks with Brandon Neil at the Production House to try to determine how these documents will be made available on the website in a format that allows for them to be easily accessed and searched. So that's a huge accomplishment in much less than half the timeframe we thought we were going to need to get this done. So, thanks to them. Apparently the students like zoning out with their iPod on (light laughter around). They've got a rhythm going, and it's pretty slick to watch actually.

Ok, some questions have been raised regarding our meeting—one of our meetings. We currently have 2 remaining Senate meetings this Semester that are scheduled Nov. 28 and Dec. 12. The December date is the first day of exam week and several have raised questions as to whether or not we will meet that day or not. We do have business that should be before us including perhaps some of the first items of curriculum, as I have been begging our Chair of that to maybe send some of the simpler packages earlier than the rest so that we might get through those. That said, since the issue has been raised to the Chair, I believe it appropriate to solicit your input on whether we should meet that day or cancel the December meeting due to exam conflicts. Comments? Questions? Opinions? (pause) Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Well, I think we should meet, particularly if we can get some of the curriculum things done. So I would endorse it. (pause)

Funderburk: Hearing overwhelming silence, I assume that they will remain as they are. (light laughter around) Ok. We can proceed, or I'm going to move one thing ahead, if we can, just to buy **Kent** a little more time in case he can get here, if that's ok, which will only take just a second—which was under New Business. You may have noticed that there's a listing for the Review of—Fifth-Year Review of President **Allen**, so I thought I'd go ahead and make a few comments about that and see if there are questions.

Based upon a process approved by the UNI Faculty Senate in October of 1976, upper administrators are regularly reviewed each 5th year of service at UNI. If you are interested to read the original documents from 1976, those can be found on our website under the tab 'Resources for Faculty.' In accordance with this process, I have initiated the review of President Allen. I have met both with Provost Gibson and President Allen to notify them of this process. Because the composition of the committee has remained virtually the same in each of the most recent reviews and is based on elected faculty positions, after consultation with several senior faculty members, I decided to maintain that structure for this review. Members of the committee include: Faculty Chair, James **Jurgenson**; Faculty Senate Chair, myself; Chair of the Graduate Faculty, currently Lauren **Nelson**; Chair of the Graduate Council, Maureen **Clayton**; and as an ex-officio, Gene **Lutz**, Director of the Center for Social and Behavioral Research. **Gene's** role on the committee will be to assist in making sure that the survey instrument is as valid as we can make it and also assist with the actual data collection. His past experience on review committees is also a great asset to the committee.

The survey will be done electronically this time through MyUNiverse. The Committee met on Friday (Nov. 11) to discuss the process and chart an initial course for implementation. It was decided that the survey instrument used for the 2005 Review of President **Koob** would serve as the basis of the current instrument with some minor edits. In addition to the survey, as part of the process, there will be a series of interviews conducted by the

Presidential Review Committee with other senior administrators. In keeping with past practice, the Committee will be meeting with President **Allen** to get his input before beginning the process. It is the committee's desire that the survey will be completed prior to Spring Break in order that ample time remain to collate the data and be prepared to present a report to the Senate by the end of the Spring 2012 semester. Are there any questions or comments at this time about that? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So, from your report, I take it that this year the Chair of the Senate is chairing this committee and not the Chair of the Faculty. Is that right?

Funderburk: At the committee meeting Friday, I was elected to Chair the committee.

Swan: Ok.

Funderburk: Sadly, unopposed. But I'm still going to have a recall election. (light laughter around).

Swan: Just 'cause the process, of course, is that the Chair of the Faculty will do it, but you collectively decided that that's not the best thing this year. The best thing is for the Chair of the Senate to do it. Ok.

Funderburk: And in the last 2 reviews, one was chaired by the Faculty Senate Chair. One was chaired by the Faculty Chair. So there's precedent. Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: What happens to the evaluation after it happens?

Funderburk: Essentially.....that's not very clear, and the reason I'm hesitating, is because when I went back 3 or 4 of them, multiple—there are multiple correct answers to this question, ranging from “the report is given here and never seen or heard from again” to “the report is then delivered to the archives.” However, (various voices mumbling and light laughter)—yeah, kind of the same thing actually, but it is given to the reviewee in advance, and there is a presentation here. And it's just a short synopsis of

the review. Most of the actual reports have only been 2 or 3 pages long, after collating the data. And I don't see that it's very well specified. I mean, technically this is an action of the Senate. It could--the process could be modified at this point or canceled by majority vote. Senator **Swan**.

Swan: I thought that the process was after 3 years all the documents were destroyed.

Funderburk: That would be a reasonable process.

Swan: Well, I thought that was enunciated in the original process.

Funderburk: There are a number of

Swan: There was a lot of big, you know, debates about that, and that that was settled that we wouldn't maintain

Funderburk: It appeared that there were intentions in the 1976 Minutes that have not been maintained, but there are holes along the way where I can't tell if those were modified officially, or they just kind of went another direction. Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Is there any reason why in the past or in this particular instance our report shouldn't be provided to the Regents who are in, you know, in essence the President's evaluators/boss. Why—normally if you did something like this in the business world, that's what would happen.

Funderburk: I should state that that also has been provided to the Board of Regents as a point of information.

Smith: Ok

Funderburk: But not formalized, and whether they ever even read it, we don't know. But it does go forward to them as well. Any other questions? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: Have you decided what's going to happen this time since you report on some variety? "We intend to archive the report." "We intend to send it to the Board." ?

Funderburk: I think we are going to need to talk about that in the committee, but we haven't gotten that far yet. We have—I have—if I was to answer now, I would only be giving my personal opinion which might be a minority. At this time, with regard to the process, I would say that it will be in keeping with the structure that has happened in the past. It won't be a great change from there. And I will say that one of the things (review reports) that was missing we did manage to finally track now, and it now does exist in the archives from a previous report. So it took some digging, but we have found some of the ones—one at least that was lost before.

Swan: Well, because they were destroyed, some of them, by procedure.

Funderburk: Well, according to the Minutes they were destroyed, but the fact I could find them (laughter around) states otherwise. Yes, the only thing that apparently was destroyed was the questions that would be helpful for the interviews, and (laughter around) the process that was followed. That was all successfully destroyed. Very good questions.

Smith: But you are saying this—there will be a report back to this Body at a minimum.

Funderburk: There will be a report back. That has been consistently done, and generally it seems to have happened at the last meeting in April to come in and meet with the committee and then the report was delivered. And actually as it turned out with the missing report, the assumption had been that the report would be automatically attached to the Minutes, and it didn't automatically attach.

Boody: Was Richard **Nixon** in charge of destroying the documents?
(laughter around)

Funderburk: There is no evidence to suggest.....(more laughter and quiet voices about that history with **Nixon** and his secretary Rose Mary **Woods**) Ok. Anything else? We still don't have a Vice-Chair. Since our next item on our Agenda actually.....(to Senator **Breitbach** who was just now entering the room) or we can let you catch your breath. (to the Museum Director, Sue **Grosboll**) I guess you can start moving to the table and see if our struggling Vice-Chair has any comments today.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION FROM VICE-CHAIR BREITBACH

(many voices, laughter, joking about the hurried entrance)

Breitbach: Is it my turn? (more joking by others) I am happy to report--and **Jesse** could have made this report in my absence or **Scott** or **Chris**, they are all here; they are not late—that the Bylaws Committee has made great progress. We have met with the Committee on Committees, and we look forward to bringing to the Senate the, what we consider to be just the housekeeping changes to the Bylaws, so that the Bylaws are in keeping with current practice, and the changes to the Constitution. That's the first round. The second round will be some other recommendations that are coming forth from—jointly from the Bylaws Committee and the Committee on Committees. There may be a round three. So, I don't believe I have—oh, the Educational Policies Committee? Is anybody here from the Committee?

Funderburk: Commission, as we have been corrected.

Breitbach: Commission, excuse me. That's what happens when you are all hot and sweaty. The Commission—the Committee is chaired by Gayle **Dunn-Rhineberger** or is it **Rhineberger-Dunn**? (several offer the correct version) I ALWAYS get that mixed up! I'm tell you, that Professor **Dunn** does an amazing job of running that Committee and running that meeting, and they have done a nice job, so they will be bringing forth a couple of those policies for our consideration. I can only sit on—they alter their meeting time, so I can only go to half their meetings, but she runs a nice

meeting and does some nice work, and so we will have that for you in December as well. Ok. Did I miss the cookies and punch?

Funderburk: Yep. It's all done. (light laughter).

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Funderburk: Ok, so I think now we are ready for the Minutes—approval of the Minutes from October 24. As I understand there were no corrections offered after that was sent out. Are there any corrections from the floor? Hearing none, we assume the Minutes are accepted by acclamation.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1096 for Docket #994, EPC recommendation to accept petition (1082/980) by Russ Campbell to change the mid-semester designation for the spring semester to after the 8th week of class

Funderburk: Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing. 1096, EPC recommendation to accept petition by Russ Campbell. Do we have a motion to docket?

East: So move, regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **East**, motion to move in regular order—or to docket in regular order. Second?

Kirmani: Second.

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Kirmani**. Discussion? (none heard) All those in favor, “aye.” (ayes heard all around) All opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1097 for Docket #995, Review of LAC Category IV, Natural Science and Technology

Funderburk: Calendar Item 1097, Review of LAC Category IV, Natural Science and Technology. Motion to docket?

Smith: I'll move to docket in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith** docket in regular order. Second?

Kirmani: Second.

Funderburk: Second, Senator **Kirmani**. Discussion?

Swan: I have a question.

Funderburk: Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So it may be up there now or somewhere, is there a response to the response to this report? So if there is a report, the review, and then the committee provides a memo dated Fall 2011. And I'm curious if there is a response from the faculty or no?

Funderburk: I don't see one there. Perhaps....Senator **Smith**?

Smith: It has not been—historically, at least, it has not been the practice of the LACC to do that. It's just—it would forward the original report by the review committee plus the LACC's reaction to that. That's the normal practice, and that's what we're doing in this case.

Funderburk: Additional comments? Questions? Concerns? Motion to docket on the floor. All those in favor of docketing in regular order, "aye." (ayes all around). All those opposed? One "no." Abstentions? None. Motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1098 for Docket #996, Emeritus Status Request, Carol **Phillips**, HPELS, effective May, 2011

Funderburk: Calendar 1098, Emeritus Status Request for Carol **Phillips**, HPELS. Motion to docket?

Dolgener: Move in regular order.

Funderburk: Senator **Dolgener**.

Boody: Second

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Boody**. Discussion? Questions? All those in favor of docketing in regular order, "aye." (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1099 for Docket #997, Emeritus Status Request, Cynthia **Herndon**, HPELS, effective July 1, 2011

Funderburk: 1099, Emeritus Status Request, Cynthia **Herndon**. Motion to docket?

Neuhaus: Move.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**, regular order.

Dolgener: Second.

Breitbach: Second from **Dolgener**

Funderburk: Second from Senator **Dolgener**. Questions? Comments? All those in favor of docketing in regular order? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. Which of the 20 emeritus do we have today..... Next. (light laughter around)

Consideration of Calendar Item 1100 for Docket #998, Emeritus Status Request, Dennis **Cryer**, HPELS, effective July 29, 2011

Funderburk: Calendar 1100—I got 3 more in the mail today—Calendar 1100—it’s kind of like rats on a ship. I don’t know. (laughter around) Emeritus Status Request for Dennis **Cryer**. I’m assuming that’s a motion from Senator **Roberts-Dobie**.

Roberts-Dobie: That’s a motion.

Funderburk: In regular order. Do we have a second? Second from Senator **Boody**. Questions? Comments? All those in favor of docketing, “aye.” (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries.

Consideration of Calendar Item 1101 for Docket #999, Emeritus Status Request, Nancy **Hamilton**, HPELS, effective June 30, 2011

Funderburk: Last of our docketed items, 1101, Emeritus Status Request from Nancy **Hamilton**, also HPELS. Motion? **Dolgener** for the first. And Senator **Roberts-Dobie** for the second, regular order. Questions? Discussion? All those in favor? (ayes all around) All those opposed? (none heard) Abstentions? (none heard) Motion carries. Whew! Now to the business.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

#984 CONSULTATIVE SESSION WITH THE DIRECTOR OF THE UNI MUSEUM ON ITS CURRENT STATUS AND PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE, A REPORT, DOCKETED FOR 3:45 P.M. ON 11/14/11 (**DEBERG/SWAN**).

Funderburk: I want to thank Director **Grosboll** for—both for being willing to come at all and then for agreeing to come a little early today since it is pretty clear we would have not had something to do for about 10 or 15

minutes before her time. So, this is our consultative session regarding the Museum, the status of the Museum. It is unfortunate that Senator **DeBerg** is not here, since I know she was particularly interested in this discussion. I will now turn it over to you (Director **Grosboll**).

Grosboll: All right. Thank you. And thank you all for the invitation to speak with you about this and give you some idea of what's happening with the museums. I first want to identify and let you know that the museums have a Faculty Advisory Committee, and 3 members of that committee are here: Tyler **O'Brien**, from Anthropology; Carol **Colburn**, from Theater; and Darrell **Taylor**, who is the Chair of the committee, from the Gallery.

I thought it might be helpful to just go back and do a timeline kind of from when all these recent circumstances started. I'll then talk about some concerns that I have and explain the document that was just handed to you now and some of the challenges that I think we have. To begin a timeline, I'm afraid I must have precipitated this because in July of 2010 I asked for phased retirement and put in a proposal, and that seems to have started the ball rolling on something. This was not what I intended to start. But in January of this year I was asked to meet with the President and Provost **Gibson** and Kent **Johnson** who will be here soon, who I report to at Continuing Ed. And at that time, the President and Provost said that they were very concerned about the building that the Museum is in. I think we all know that for many years it's been in terrible condition, and that it was felt that to protect the collection, which is probably worth about \$5 million at the very least, it was time to move it out of that building and start thinking towards something else.

The President and the Provost had already met with some museums in the community to ask them about possibly storing the collection, moving it off campus and storing it. The possibility of the Grout was put forward. I was concerned at that time that that would not be as workable as we would like, mainly because it would take the collection away from faculty and students and make it very hard to get at and to use in the way that we have throughout the past.

The other thing that the President put forward—he felt that there should be some downsizing of the collection, and, as it turned out, this was a process we'd actually started a number of years ago, to weed out things. Just to remind you, the collection is about a hundred and ten years old. Actually, next year we are going to celebrate our 120th anniversary, the Museum is. And any museum that has been collecting for 120 years—just think of your closets (laughter around). You've got things that maybe you kind of wish you didn't have. And things change. Some objects deteriorate. Some don't fit the curriculum anymore, etc. But there are reasons to downsize. So I had already started a process of giving away non-relevant objects or getting rid of things that, frankly, were a danger, like taxidermy specimens that were full of arsenic and mercury. We didn't want those. So that's a process we had already started. But the President was suggesting that we accelerate that process.

And, of course, I think the Provost then met with you subsequent to that meeting that perhaps may have even been the same day in January and discussed that. There is a support group called the Friends of the UNI Museums. This is an organization that's existed for 25 years, and people in the community, emeritus faculty, a whole range of people from the broad community raise money for us as well as find volunteers. And they were concerned about what was going on and so made an invitation in June to meet with the Provost, and the President and the Provost was nice enough to meet with that group of people and to have a discussion. The Provost provided information to the group. The Friends were interested in working with the Administration and particularly in raising money for the museums, because they realized that that's a concern.

During the summer, I began meetings with faculty in Biology, Earth Science, Applied Human Sciences, Anthropology, and History, and that was to discuss the downsizing of actually more radically cutting the collection than we had even intended, because of the problem of space and moving out of the building we are in and finding space elsewhere. So those meetings have taken place. I can tell you that there—we have agreement as to, between myself and the faculty representatives in those Departments, of how we can go about that process and retain the best in the collection and

get rid of things that no longer apply and have found different ways of what we call “deaccessioning” of objects. And there’s a variety of methods that you can do that--but the most ethical way to do it.

In August, the President called a meeting that was the President, the Provost, myself, Kent **Johnson**, Tom **Schellhardt**, and Morris **Mikkelsen**. And the President again outlined what he felt were his priorities: closure of the current building due to its poor condition; preservation of the collection with the substantial trimming of holdings; identification of spaces on campus for storage and exhibition, hence that’s why Morris **Mikkelsen** and Tom **Schellhardt** were in the meeting; greater outreach into the community; and he’d like to see, and I know the Provost would, too, collaboration with community museums. And I should say that we do that already. I think they are probably thinking of more long-term and more in-depth kinds of collaborations, hopefully with dollar savings. That’s something we’d all like. The President also said he’d like to make sure the museums retain what we do best, and that included in his mind support of regional educators, and obviously creating more generated income because of the budget crunch that we all know we are going through. So, he wanted to see a plan of attack by the end of this semester, and that’s something that Kent **Johnson** and I are working on, and we are in the process of meeting with local museum directors to get ideas of where they would see productive collaborations that we might do. We’ve left that wide open, so it could be any variety of things.

Let me move on now--that’s the timeline up to now--move on to some of the concerns I have. I think I would say first I’ve found in all of the discussions since January there is sometimes confusion in people’s minds as to the difference between a collection and a museum. Some people will say “collection” and think that’s the museum. To a museum person, that’s not it. That’s the core of what you start with. But a museum is actually what you do with the collection. You have an educational component, so it’s not just to store objects or put them on display. It’s to do educational programming with them in a whole variety of ways. So that, to us, is the essence of what a museum is and what it has to be particularly for an

academic museum. That's absolutely essential that there's a capability of doing educational programming with that collection.

I'm concerned about finding space to keep all the activities that we do, particularly for academic programs, faculty, and students. Particularly, I think it's going to be a challenge to find exhibition space on campus, but we are looking at this. I have to say my colleagues—we have been working—the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Museum trying to find space around campus and have offered some in various Departments. But the problem is trying to keep a cohesive and an efficient program. If you are split up and separated around campus and piecemealed into odd little corners, it does not make it very efficient in use of time, and it makes it much more difficult to help faculty and students to support their programs.

One of the things I particularly do not want to lose is accreditation. We are nationally accredited, the museums are. And we are extremely proud of that. There are only 10% of the museums in this country that are accredited because the standards are so high. We've been accredited since the 1970s, and I do not want to lose that. It's that accreditation that helps us raise money. At the same time, it's that accreditation that helped us bring in exhibits like the T-Rex Named Sue, the Race exhibit that we're getting in the spring, a variety of exhibits that we've brought from major museums around the country. It does a tremendous amount for us. And I should say that 10% is all the museums in the U.S. If you look at academic museums, that statistic is even lower, because many academic museums are eccentric and don't necessarily want to follow the rules. But we have achieved those high standards and are very proud of it. So we don't want to lose it.

Another concern is how in all this process we can honor the wishes of donors. And do mean donors, not just of financial support but perhaps, more importantly, of objects to the collection. When people give objects to a museum, it is a little bit like marriage. It is a long-term commitment. People give up things they love or have lovingly collected, in the case of faculty. And so we make a commitment that we are going to keep those collections into perpetuity and use them. This is particularly important to

people who give to academic museums, because they intentionally want to make sure that students are using those collections. I had a donor who called me after January who was extremely concerned because he said, “I gave them to an academic museum because I want students to see these objects from Africa. I want them to be able to study them and enjoy them and learn from them. I don’t want to see them shut away in a closet.” So we need to honor that long-term commitment to people who have donated money as well as objects to the museum and continue to use the objects in a way that the donor—it meets the donor wishes. Of course, this—I don’t think I need to tell you it has ramifications, not just for the museum but for the whole campus because many of these donors also give to other programs on campus. And so if they are unhappy, they are usually unhappy with the whole University, so we want to make sure that we do retain and fulfill our commitment to these donors.

Another concern that I have is retaining the director position for the museum. I’m retiring. It’s time for someone new to come in. And I would like to see that that—the director position--be maintained. There’s been a suggestion that my position not be filled, and you could not keep accreditation; you couldn’t continue to get donations to the collection or financial donations; you couldn’t get the exhibits in, get many of the things we have done, unless you have got someone who has academic standing and professional museum training in that position. So I think it is essential that that position remain after I am gone.

I think you can see why I am concerned, and I think especially if you look at the handout that I gave you. I wanted to give you at least a few statistics to give you an idea of what we do for academic programs, because not all of you may receive our annual reports and know exactly what we do. We have approximately 2,000 students who come through every year—60 classes, 21 academic departments, usually that’s 4 different Colleges on campus. Of course, that statistic has now changed because our number of Colleges has changed.

We have an equal number of students who come in on their own. This was something frankly we didn’t know until a few years ago when we started

keeping a count, because I thought most students were coming in because some faculty member had said, “You have to come in.” And we found out those students were bringing in their friends, so we have almost an equal number of students who are coming in just on their own just to look at the exhibits or come to our programs, which I found heartening.

Each year we have 25 UNI students that are guided by staff through these many hours of experiential learning internships. For some departments, these are independent study; some are internships; they are called different things, but we run them as internships. It’s usually juniors, seniors, and graduate students and very tightly tied to their academic programs so that it’s something that they can put on their resume. I don’t want you to have the impression that this is us using students to stand at the Xerox and make copies of things. That’s not how we do it. We want to make sure it’s tightly tied to the academic program, and with some Colleges and some faculty, we actually do contracts that the faculty member signs off on, we sign off, and the student signs off on. So they are definitely tied into the academic programs.

We have over 1,000 students that are using our traveling trunks. I don’t know if you are aware of what these are, but we have a whole array of these on natural history, anthropology, cultural diversity, a variety of subjects. We had created these for area teachers to use, that they can check out, that have curriculum binders in and objects that we put in there that they can use in the classroom. UNI Students found out about them and love them, and so we have almost more students checking these out now to use in their classes, particularly education students, but not just them. So, over 1,000 of those students using those materials.

We have more and more faculty who are doing curatorships and creating collect—exhibits, excuse me, exhibits to highlights their research. And **Tyler** is an excellent example of that, because he did an exhibit on forensic anthropology, 3 years ago?

O’Brien: About that.

Grosboll: Yeah. So we are doing that more and more, and I have had more and more faculty coming to me and saying, “I want to highlight my research.” And it’s a great way to get information out to the public, and to even involve students, their students, in creating that exhibit. And then, of course, our collection itself, just for our class use and study. And we’ve made some important additions to that collection over the last few years. One is the African objects that I mentioned to you worth about \$2 million, and also a collection of materials, official administrative materials related to rural education in Iowa for the 1850s to the 1960s. And this is a treasure trove, and people around the country are very excited about this because we are the first State that has ever developed this and saved these documents. So it’s a coup for this campus to get that collection, and we are building a very fine, fine collection of things related to early Iowa education.

Below [on the 2-page handout], and I don’t expect you to read all of this, but I wanted you to have an idea of how we fit into the UNI Strategic Plan. You can see that the lectures, the tours, the exhibitions, the programs, the Introduction to Museum Studies course that I teach, student internships, faculty curatorships, educational materials, all of these fit in with the campus Strategic Plan, and I’ve just highlighted a few of the different goals that the Museum meets in all of that.

So you can see that we’re doing a lot with our changing exhibits. A link to the curriculum--I should mention our changing exhibits, when we did a survey of faculty a few years ago, that was one of the most important things they wanted for their classes was a series of changing exhibits, and probably more so than our permanent exhibits, which is more fun for us, more work but more fun. But we always try and do that on the semester system, and we try and link it with classes. The Summer exhibit less so, but certainly the Fall and the Spring is always fit with the curriculum. And we try to make that multidisciplinary so it reaches different academic departments.

We are supporting a wide variety of academic departments on campus, as you can tell by the statistic of giving lectures and tours to 21 different

academic departments. Some of those include Public History, Anthropology, Humanics, Natural History Interpretation and Earth Science, Biology and Curriculum & Instruction, English, Religion and Philosophy, Marketing, Public Relations—it goes on and on. Even the Museum Studies course that I teach has probably got 10 different disciplines, students from 10 different disciplines that come into that, which I have to say makes it much more fun for me teaching that class, because it is fascinating interaction to get students from different disciplines talking to one another and exchanging ideas.

The surveys that we did—and there was a faculty survey we did in 2009, but we have done others with the general public, with area teachers, all sorts of people. The things that they highlighted that they want us to keep, and this is what I'm going by, not what I want to keep in the Museum, but meeting the President's criteria of retaining what is most important that we do, the survey—I'm going by the surveys, and changing exhibits, as I mentioned, were most important and the associated programs that we do along with that, public programs; student internships for experiential learning that are directly tied to their academic programs; collecting related to early Iowa education, and, of course, that's why we set up with the College of Education and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. We did a collaboration to create the Center for the History of Rural Iowa Education and Cultures, and we are pleased to say that all of those new documents that we have related to early Iowa education we just received a national grant of \$150,000 to catalogue those materials. People wanted us to keep doing outreach to the community and the State through exhibits, educational programs, and PreK-12 resources, and, of course, continue to make the collection available and to do the lectures and tours that we do.

So we have a number of challenges. We've got to do—make do with less, less space and less money. We have to pare down the collection to just the very best that we have and our basic areas of collecting that we have in the Museum, and we have to find alternative spaces on campus for storage, exhibitions, staff, and for programming. And we want to make that, if possible, as convenient to UNI students as possible and to the public, because, remember, the public is a funding source for us, which we hope it

will be for all of us as budgets diminish. So we want to keep a good rapport with the public that has been so generous with us.

Do you have questions of me? Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I'd just like to know something about budget and particularly how much revenue you generate yourself internally, What are your expenses, and what's the bottom line, roughly, bottom line cost to the University on an annual basis of having the Museum?

Grosboll: Probably about—to answer the last question, probably about \$400,000 is the total budget. There are 6 staff members, 4 of which now are part-time; 2 are full-time.

Smith: And roughly, how much do you generate in terms of revenue during a typical year?

Grosboll: It varies, but I'm going to say about \$50,000, sometimes more, sometimes less.

Smith: And that's usually people coming—and that's admission-type revenue? Or is it other

Grosboll: No, we haven't charged admission. And I'll tell you 2 reasons why. One is because we are a State institution. People get upset. They say, "We pay taxes. We shouldn't have to pay at the door to come in your Museum. This is a State institution." So we have hesitated on that. We've also found—and I've talked to my other colleagues around the country about this who are academic museums and have admission charges--they found that if they had admission charges, they had fewer visitors and less money. If they take the admission charge off and made it donation, they got more money in. So, part of it is donations. A lot of that extra money that we bring in is through grants, and so all of the special exhibits that we bring in, the programming that we do bringing in speakers or whatever it

might be, that's all done through grants. That's not through University money, generally.

Funderburk: So then I'll ask you to clarify that further. I'm assuming then that that means the bulk of the \$400,000 is personnel costs.

Grosboll: Yes, as it is with most Departments, yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith** then Senator **Neuhaus**.

Smith: You mentioned that you were being encouraged to try to generate additional income, and I was wondering what realistic opportunities you felt there were in that vein?

Grosboll: Well, actually our Friends group is working on that. They want to put together a business plan and generate more. My hope was that we can create more through endowments, ok? And we are a part of Imagine the Impact Campaign. The problem with that is that we don't have a development officer, so that it is much harder for the Museum to go out and generate endowments because, you know, it's a little part of my time. I'm not a full-time development officer. So that would be one way of doing it. Revenue through the Museum store. We could do that. If we hosted another big exhibit like the T. Rex Named Sue. We generated a good amount of money off of that exhibit. And we are still using it today for some things. It's going into the Race exhibit. We are going to use some of that money in that case. So there are a variety of ways that we could do it. Even taking some of our exhibits that we've created internally and making them into traveling exhibits and charging other museums to use those exhibits. And that, for many museums, is an income generator.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: To follow up just a little bit on what **Jerry** said there. Is there any possibility of ramping up the Museum store? You know, some of the really big museums out there have quite a web presence, and you get them

towards holidays when folks tend to shop, even if they've never visited that museum, they become aware. Is that a possibility?

Grosboll: Yes. And I have wanted to do that for a number of years. I should explain that our store is run by our volunteers, our Friends group, and so it varies depending on how much—how computer savvy they are and how comfortable they are with it. We had a group of students a few years ago try to create an interface for us that we could use on our website that people could buy from the store, but we have some volunteers who hesitate, so we are now getting more people on the Friends group who are a little more comfortable with those interfaces and web design and what not. So we are hoping to ramp up that presence, yeah.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: Was there any thought given to a new building? Building a new building?

Grosboll: Well, I've been thinking about it for years. (laughter around) I would like to. There's never been a serious attempt to fundraise for a new building. I have been trying to encourage various Administrations to put that within the Development Office's list of things to generate money for, but, as I say, that's difficult when we don't have a development officer. We were kind of looking around. We've had any number of people suggest that the HyVee building actually be converted. And I think there was some hope that that might be donated to the University so that the Museum could go in there. There's pros and cons to doing that, obviously, because it would cost money to do it, and it's away from campus, but it's in an area where the public can easily get to us, and most students go over to College Square. So they are more likely to go there than they are to some other locations. But I think in the budget times—and the Provost can speak to this better than I—that trying to come up with a new building would be a difficult thing. So that's why we are trying to look on campus. But I think that should be the long-term goal, and that's certainly what the Friends group would like to do.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah, I think you mentioned working more closely with some other museums in the region. I'm thinking in particular the Grout Museum. Now, how do they feel—how would they feel about—are they interested in taking over some of the collection? Or is that something that, you know, that you would oppose because it takes it off campus? What are—I mean, how do these other museums feel about collaborating with you and on—are the terms that would be considered ones that would be—that you think would be good for the University?

Grosboll: I think almost all of them are interested in collaborating, because we do it already. We work together. We don't compete with one another. We never have. So collaboration would be easy. We are looking for long-term things, like buying together. We all buy supplies, but if we bought in bulk, it would be cheaper for all of us. Or if we can share, say, a marketing staff that could market for all of us, it would be a savings for each of us. Those are the kinds of things we are kind of looking at. And, yes, there is interest with most of the other museums to do that. And so we are just preliminarily starting those discussions to what might be. Now, giving the collection over, too? I don't think that's the intent, ok? And you have to understand that just as we don't have a whole lot of space in our current building, none of them have space either. And you wouldn't want to ask another museum to store a collection, even if it was stored temporarily, because they would charge the University rent for it. So that's going to be an expense. We're trying to avoid that expense, if possible. And having a collection held in another museum or even used by another museum is awkward, because each museum has its own mission and what they focus on. It might be art. It might be, in the Grout's case you mentioned, they are more focused on veterans' history and Waterloo history, all right? So our collection, which is related to world cultures and natural history, doesn't fit at all. And so they wouldn't have the expertise. I should just offhand say that one of the things that kind of surprised me amongst my colleagues, as Kent **Johnson** and I have been talking with them, they are very interested in us training students because their—since I teach Museum Studies, I've been training a lot of their staff. I have former

students all over the State who have taken a course with me and done internships at our Museum because it preps them. Our staff is probably better qualified than that at any other museum in the community. They have fine staffs, but ours is of higher caliber. And they will even admit to that, and they said they would hate to see anything happen that would stop that stream of training that's going out, because it's going community- and State-wide.

Funderburk: Well, I'll put myself in line again and ask, I know that as Daryl Smith (Director of the UNI Art Museum) and I have noted, there are a lot of students on campus that have no idea we have an Art Gallery, and there's many more that have no idea we have a Museum. Have there been talks about expanding the footprint and profile of the Museum on campus such as, for example, having display cases maybe in the lobby of the Gallagher-Bluedorn with revolving displays, since I think that would both improve the visibility for students and also many of our donors tend to walk through that lobby quite often.

Grosboll: Uh huh. Actually, we have had displays in the Gallagher-Bluedorn.

Funderburk: I mean standing, permanent displays, not yet another Christmas tree display as they happen to be doing that now.

Grosboll: Yeah. And we do have small exhibits around the campus. If you've ever seen the Drivo-trainer that's in the ITTC building, that belongs in our collection. Seerley's desk that is in the Great Reading Room, that's from the Museum's collection. There are some pieces scattered around campus that actually belong to the Museum, and we've tried to create more of those over the years, and that's part of what we'd probably do in this plan, is to put out even more. Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Roth**.

Roth: I just have an incidental question. Here recently the Physics Building was remodeled, and if you had to get rid of or do something with some

physics memorabilia that was there, what would the path be? Would you consult with the Department? Would you—like what would you do with that if you wanted to do something with some physics things there?

Grosboll: And we do have some physics things. Probably we would not get rid of that in the first place. But, yes, there would be consultation, and that's why I was going around and talking to faculty this past summer, because I wanted to find out if we pared down, where we should do it, and I could look at it from a museum angle, and for instance, Biology, they looked at it from a different angle, and I was pleased to say we were in agreement as to how that would be done.

Roth: I mean, I didn't mean my comment to be blunt and say "get rid of." I was just curious what you would do.

Grosboll: No. Yeah. And museums are very restricted on how they get rid of objects. You can't just pitch them out in the dumpster. That's a no-no. And there's certain criteria that we go through, and particularly since this is State property, we would probably offer to State museums first. This is what we've done in the past, offer to State institutions first or, and it always has to be to an institution that has—it fits their mission, ok. And we think are credible, particularly if they are accredited museums, we would do it. And sometime the last resort is selling it, but that's usually last resort. But when you sell something from a collection, it has to go back into taking care of the collection. That's part of the ethics policy.

Roth: Ok. Thank you.

Funderburk: Other questions or comments? Senators? Or anyone else in the room for that matter?

Grosboll: I might make one last comment and that is that I hope this group will consider how we might—you might help the Museum in finding space around campus. And if you have ideas, I would certainly be very appreciative of any of those ideas and comments that you would have about how we might do it and how we might reframe ourselves.

Funderburk: Well, thank you very much for a very informative presentation. (thanks from others voiced)

NEW BUSINESS

Funderburk: And excellent timing (as Vice-President **Hogan** walks in the door and as Director **Grosboll** and her team leave). I thought we might go 2-3 minutes of open mike, but as it turns out, Vice-President **Hogan** is with us now to speak on some enrollment questions that were raised at the last meeting. Of course, and also the person raising those questions is not here, but if you can (motioning to the guest table), it's actually not because it's the hot seat. It's because it's closer to the microphones so they can—for the transcript. (several saying "At least that's what he says" and laughing) So to refresh everybody's mind, part of what was raised before was the question of—it happened to come up during our athletics discussion, but I think not necessarily affiliated with that idea—is why is the UNI proportion of students admitted so much higher—that fall below the Board of Regents' guidelines, why is our percentage so much higher than that of the other two Regents' schools? So that was the first topic, and I'm sure there may be other enrollment issues that wish to be asked about are offered, so I think I'll just turn it over to you.

Hogan: Thank you very much. Thank you. I appreciate the chance to chat with you about this question and others that you might have about trends in enrollment. You may be aware that the Board of Regents adopted a thing called a "Regents' Admission Index" or "RAI," and this was collaboratively with the participation of the institutions. The work was actually concluded prior to my arrival, so I believe that '9—Fall of—Fiscal Year '9, Fall of '8 was the first year it was implemented. It was developed in the couple of years prior to that.

The idea broadly writ was to try to come up with a better set of statistics that would describe what we would view as readiness for the Regents' academic program. So there are 4 component parts to it. It has to do with

ACT score, class rank, grade point average, and courses taken out of a recommended core. And they are calculated and weighted in a fashion that comes up with a single number. And so currently the—what’s described as a 245--a Regents’ Admission Index score of a 245 will guarantee any resident of the State of Iowa admission to any of the Regents’ institutions. So I think that the way this has been communicated, there is a subtlety to that communication which is to say it is not a minimum for admission at 3 institutions, but rather it is a measure that, if achieved, would guarantee admission for an Iowa resident. So, from that point the description in the—of the program, as it was adopted by the Board, said “For students who don’t reach a 245 are therefore not guaranteed admission. Each of the institutions may put together a review by which they will make a judgment about how to react to those student applicants.” And in this case each of the 3 institutions do, and in fact this is not anything that is different.

Previously, the standard or the guarantee of admission was top 50% of class rank, and there was actually no reference to a minimum ACT or to a grade point average. It was actually top half of the class and a certain core of courses. And when that was the method or the scheme, if you will, institutions then made decisions for students who didn’t meet those two as well. So now although the measure is more robust because it integrates all four components into a single measure, the institutions still are charged to make judgments about students who don’t achieve that standard but are viewed by the institution to still be admissible and able to benefit from the program offered.

The second, I think, key fact I would share with you about this is that as we look at--ACT would be one example that has been a component of admissions process all the way along, so even though it’s now embedded in the RAI, we also can look at it discretely. And, in fact, regardless of the RAI being implemented, our—in fact, our standard has been very, very stable over time, if you look at it measured by ACT only. So we’ve averaged a 22.9 over the past 10 years, 10 or 12 years. The most recent report to the Board shows actually we were last Fall at 23.1, and, in fact, we have just gone up this Fall to 23.3. So the RAI report to the Board has statistics from last Fall, so it would have been 23.1. And our proportion of students admitted who

did not achieve a 245 would have been 16.4%. It's actually been reduced to—by about 3 percentage points, to about 13.4%, and the average ACT has gone up to 23.3, so you can start to get a sense of the relationship of those two numbers. A one-tenth change in an ACT score—if we went up one-tenth every year, that would be significant, and generally speaking the pool of applicants is more stable than that.

So what I can tell you is that the 245 is not a minimum but rather as a guarantor, for those who reach it. Our proportion not achieving the standard is actually being diminished over time.

The third piece is that students in that group who currently would fall below a 245 are meaningfully successful at UNI. Our operating standard would be really a 235, and we communicate that to counselors in high schools. And then we have a very specific extra review process for anyone below a 235. We get a—what we call a “folder review.” A team of Admissions staff, they look at it in detail. They sometimes request additional information. They'll sometimes request a personal interview. It'll depend upon the circumstances of that given student. So, the history of it is that the de facto admission standards of Iowa and Iowa State and UNI have never been the same historically. There's always been a distinction between them. Adopting a common standard to guarantee admission was not a change in that practice, although it had some features that might look like it when reviewed, if you presumed it has a minimum rather than a guarantor. So I think that's the basic situation about RAI, and if there are particular questions on that, I'd be happy to answer them or others on other admissions-related things. Yes.

Funderburk: Senator **Smith**.

Smith: I'm sorry.

Funderburk: I was doing it for her (meaning the transcriptionist).

Smith: You mentioned that you thought that students below the 245 had done fairly well here. Do you keep—do you keep statistics and monitor the

performance of, as a group, students who fall at certain levels, and how do they do in terms of GPA and graduation rates? Do you have that kind of information?

Hogan: I can tell you broadly, and there's a very clear correlation, and then I don't have the specific statistics, but they are available. They could be had. Generally speaking, there's a very strong correlation between--for example, ACT remains a very strong predictor of ultimate success. So the students in the highest decile of ACT score entering have the highest graduation rates, and it just goes down lockstep all the way. So, our average—our 4-year graduation rate for all students who start as first-year students here is about 37%. Our 6-year rate is about 65%. Compared to peer institutions, those are very strong, particularly the 6-year rate at 65 would—if you would compare us to the—there are websites like Ed Trust where it—you could compare us to the 50 institutions most like us in terms of the nature of the student body and the nature of the programs we offer, and our graduation rate would be in the top 2 or 3 out of that group of 50. So it's strong, and we're working to make it stronger. And embedded in there is that group that is not as strong, but even with that group we are able to maintain that level. Now, the challenge is one, in my view--is essentially about philosophy admission--is that we have made a commitment to try to be—provide as much access to residents of Iowa as we can. So our inclination is to take students that—there are students who get admitted to UNI who won't get admitted to Iowa, and we do that, and we do it routinely. And not all of them graduate, but not all of all of our students graduate. They graduate in a lower percentage than do the most well-prepared students.

Smith: Is it substantially lower than the normal rate?

Hogan: Well, if we were to look at a—at a—if we were to look at a 6-year rate where our average is 65, the range or the, you know, 2 standard deviations in each direction might get you to 82 and then down to in the mid-50s. So it's

Smith: I mean, it's just important to me because I had a student in my office earlier today who came in to talk about—he's a senior, and he's taking my course. He's a foreign student, and he's saying he's going to be—his scholarship's going to be done this, you know, at the end of this year, and he's not going to pass my course. He's worried about meeting our College's GPA, and not passing my course means he wouldn't be able to get our major, and, you know, my—I don't know if this is an issue with foreign students. He doesn't seem to have a huge language problem, but that is kind of an issue. You just kind of wonder, should he have been admitted to this University? He's not the only student like that. Is he—I'm sure almost every faculty member here has those kinds of cases.

Hogan: Yeah. And that—for—at—on ques—on--a first question there is, the RAI and ACT and all that would have no effect on an international student, because they—they're

Smith: It's a whole different

Hogan: It's a whole different ball of wax in terms of

Smith: Wow.

Hogan: And it is far less—the predictive power of the measures we look at are not as strong as the ACT because, you know, we're here—you know, in Iowa we can start to get a pretty good sense of what students—which high schools are strongest, and which are weaker. Well, when you start to evaluate the high schools around the world, there's just no way we have that level of insight. So, it's a bit more challenging to predict success for international students. That being said, even for domestic students, there are a range of issues that affect individual students about their preparedness and where they're strong and where they're weak--the nature of their high school experience, their degree of motivation, their economic support. The variables that add up to success and retention are just extremely complex. So, this is what it—the task that Admissions has been charged with is to try to use some commonly available measures to

improve the predictability of success, but it is as much art as science, I'd say.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus** and then Senator **Van Wormer**.

Neuhaus: **Terry**, kind of following on that, I know you are at least somewhat familiar with the MapWorks program that we've implemented here. Have you had enough chance, or have some of the folks in your media office had enough chance to look at the metrics on there? I know it's too early to tell on this campus yet what certain an impact it's having, but just from knowing the kinds of things that you would tend to look at, how does that—how does that program and how do the metrics in there seem to work for you folks?

Hogan: Well, I think the—and Professor Licari is deeply involved in this as are we in terms of the Retention Council as a unit to deploy MapWorks as a tool—it has some demonstrated success elsewhere, and if you could imagine a student who is having difficulty, what it essentially does is provides us with a tool that allows us to better identify students who are having difficulty earlier. So, you know, if you're 13 weeks into a course, and you're—and that's when somebody first finds out that you're not comprehending the material or you don't have good study habits or you're, you know, whatever, so it—the intention of it is to try to be essentially an early warning system where students can tell us very directly, or in fact, faculty who observe students or staff who observe students can essentially press a button to let somebody know that this student's having trouble so that there can be some intervention. It will not make up for a—the lack of an adequate academic preparation. If there's a fundamental lack of it, it will not make up for that. What it's going to help us with are those students at the margins who are close to having enough of what it takes, but they need some help with some certain aspects of their college experience. So, sometimes some tutoring appropriately applied or supplemental instruction or some more intensive academic advising or helping a student deal with non-academic issues that are affecting their ability to attend to academics—financial aid issues or other sorts of things.

Funderburk: Senator **Van Wormer**.

Van Wormer: Do you have different standards for our athletes coming in?

Hogan: No.

Van Wormer: And one more question, how about community college students? I know they don't do ACT's. How about their graduation rates?

Hogan: We've done a pretty fair analysis of them, and one thing I would tell you is it's similar to what countries students come from or what high schools they come from. There are very distinct differences in success rates of students depending on which community college they transfer from. It will also vary based on how many hours they've done at a community college. It will also vary on how many hours they did as a high school student before. You know, so there's all these permutations of "I did high school work plus 1 year community college," or "I did no high school work, 2 years community college." So we haven't broken them all out. But across community colleges are different rates of success, and I would say if you take a 4-year grad—and this is not really apples to apples—if you take a 4-year graduation rate of students who come from a community college with already 2 years under them, so that would be a total of 6 years, if you compare that to a 6-year rate for native students, the community college rate for those with an AA degree is actually better than our 6-year rate for native students. It's in the low 70s in terms of percentage. But that's a subset of transfers who are the strongest. They come with an AA degree completed. They transfer in. They spend 4 years here. I mean, so that's 6 years total, and that's how we measure undergrad—native undergraduates as well. So there are differences within community college credit earners as well as between community college and native, but some are stronger and some are weaker, depending on how you slice the—how you slice it.

Funderburk: Well, I'll try to interpolate part of the things that were being asked from the Senator who—and I can't pull it up from the Minutes. The Board of Regents' Report, as I recall, on a percentage basis we are in the 3 or 4 times larger number of admissions, not in real numbers but in terms of

a percentage of our student body, than our other colleagues. Does that seem to be accurate from—? You seem to be looking at the document.

Hogan: I have a sheet. I have the one-pager that I think was drawn from. For Fall of '10, so that was a year ago this Fall, we admitted 16.4% of our new students at an RAI below 245. For Iowa State it was 8.3%, and for Iowa it was 2.7%. So there's lock-step, if you will, or stair-step there. As I mentioned when I started my comments, our number has actually gone down to 13.4. It's dropped this current Fall. But the difference between the 3 is the same. Now, if you would have looked at the previous measure, which was proportion of students who were not in the top half of their class admitted at the 3 institutions for the last 20 years, you would have found a similar stair-step difference in the 3 percentages.

Funderburk: And then as a follow-up to that as for the distribution of those people, do they seem to be equally divided amongst the areas, or are they particularly concentrated in Dr. **Smith's** class or.....? (laughter all around—and various voices joking)

Hogan: The students at this point during the admission process, there is really nothing that would allow them to be distinguished. Where they choose to go sort of once admitted, it—I—is essentially not a pattern that's different than the overall student body.

Funderburk: I'm assuming that this means that they are having to petition for admission because they would have been denied on the initial try.

Hogan: No, no, it would have been if they were above a 245, everyone across the State is getting automatic admission.

Funderburk: Right, but

Hogan: On our campus, if they are above a 235, they will get an automatic admission. If they are below a 235 and above—and I'd have to ask Christie Kangas what—where they use—they will give an automatic review to the next group. Below a number, they will get a rejection letter, and they can

appeal and perhaps get a review. Sometimes the appeal is just rejected right off.

Funderburk: So, we don't track the area to know if there's a particular density of majors in one area in particular they are coming in below, or—as the suggestion has been that it could be an athletics area or something? We don't have that data?

Hogan: Well, we could track where those students below a 235, in our case, where they end up majoring, but it wouldn't be a factor in the decision-making on the front end.

Neuhaus: Yeah, just as a follow-up. The 235, do you have the numbers for those in the last couple of years? I don't know if that's on that chart, or if that's just 245.

Hogan: No, we—the Board just asks below 245. Yeah, because it may be that—it may be that the percentage that what we consider to be an exception, if you will, of below a 235, and that percentage might actually be more comparable to the other two institutions, but I don't really know what that number would be. (pause) I should point out that the 3% fewer exceptions for us last year to this year—well, first of all, there's another dynamic you should know about that's a reality of the Admissions world, and that is the rate at which students enroll who are in that category, for Iowa residents in that category, 98% of them choose to enroll here. So, part of what we have to balance is to recognize that a student accepted there is almost certain to be a matriculant. Our overall matriculation rate is closer to 60% on average. So 60% of all the students we admit choose to come to UNI. That rate varies depending on where they come from, but in this group, the rate is 98%. Now, some 3% fewer exceptions, if you can use that terminology, that was 60 students for us this past year, and if we had accepted those students, our enrollment would have been up and not down, and you know, so—not to put too fine a point on it, but what we're trying to balance when we get to that place in the scheme of—in the pool of students that are out there is these are students who want to come here and who want to get—and are motivated to get a degree from a 4-year

institution and are choosing us as opposed to other options. There are certainly 4-year private schools they could be admitted to in the State, and there are certainly--any community colleges in the State would accept them. There are some higher end privates they wouldn't get admitted to, and there—they may or--probably not likely at Iowa; they might get admitted at Iowa State. So there—you know, this is—part of this is about—in meeting the educational needs of students who see us as offering something that they want, that they value, that they are motivated to pursue, and that's, I think, part of our service commitment to the State.

Funderburk: Other questions or comments on this topic or any—hopefully, anything else related to enrollment issues perhaps?

Kirmani: What was the enrollment this Fall?

Hogan: 13,168. We are down 33 students from last Fall.

Funderburk: Hearing nothing more, thank you very much. The presentation was very helpful. Thanks for coming in for this.

Hogan: I would point out to you Institutional Research has what they call a “Fact Book” online at their website, and many of the statistics we talked about today are there, including the historical. So you can look at the last 20 years of ACT scores, last 20 years of entering class sizes, all of this sorts of things are available to you.

Funderburk: Ok. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

Funderburk: I am sad to report that we have only one capitalized item left on here (the Agenda), unless something happens from the floor, and that

would be the adjournment. (light laughter around) Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Neuhaus: So move.

Funderburk: Senator **Neuhaus**. Second? Senator **Roth**. All those in favor? (ayes all around). Opposed? (none heard) Thank you for working (?) a good meeting again. (4:37 p.m.)

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Administrative Assistant
UNI Faculty Senate