

10-8-2012

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 8, 2012

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2012 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 8, 2012" (2012). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 45.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/45

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Regular Meeting
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
10/08/12 (3:01 p.m. – 4:56 p.m.)
Mtg. #1721

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

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

Press present included Emily **Christensen** from the *Waterloo Courier* and Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan*.

Provost **Gibson** offered information on the State of Iowa surplus recently announced.

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** had comments on two topics. First, he noted that the Fall Faculty Roster is now available and encouraged contacting him if anyone has any concerns about it. Second, he gave further information on the proposed new student fee and how it would go to Athletics for the first 2 years and then perhaps impact the General Fund in year 3 or year 4. He would like to see the broader University community discussing the details of all this.

Chair **Peters** noted that today's guest speaker, Diana **Gonzalez**, would join the meeting about 3:45. He also requested a volunteer to serve on the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence selection committee.

Chair **Peters** then updated the senators on the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process, stating that they have circulated broadly across campus their initial report. This report of their work will be docketed today, and prior to it coming up for Senate action, they will incorporate, at their discretion, any suggestions received. Senator **East** will

receive any input and pass it along to the other Committee members, and **Peters** thanked them all for their expeditious work thus far.

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** also followed up on Faculty Chair **Funderburk's** comments on Athletics noting that perhaps inviting Athletic Director **Dannen** and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative **Jepsen** would be in order yet this semester. He suggested the possibility of an extra meeting and obtained a show of hands for a couple of possible dates. Suggestions were given for other possible attendees at that discussion, including President **Allen** and perhaps a representative of the Board of Regents. Also, input as to the facts as they now stand from the new Faculty Senate Budget Committee might be sought.

Lastly, Chair **Peters** noted that the meeting of interested senators with Dan **Powers** would need to be rescheduled and sought input on a different day/time. Next Monday at 2:00 p.m. was decided.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for September 24, 2012, were considered approved after noting that one change had been made regarding the placement of addenda in the order discussed.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 1162 | Request for Emeritus Status, Michael Janapolous |
| 1163 | Report from Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process |

Both items to be docketed were docketed in regular order per single motion by Senator **DeBerg** with second from Senator **Neuhaus** which passed voice vote.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

- | | | |
|-------------|-------------|---|
| 1148 | 1044 | Request for Emeritus Status, Timothy E. O'Connor
(Bruess/Kirmani), regular order |
|-------------|-------------|---|

****Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (Bruess/Kirmanj). Passed.**

1149 1045 Request for Emeritus Status, Roger A. Kueter (Edginton/Bruess), regular order

****Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (Edginton/Bruess). Passed.**

1150 1046 Request for Emeritus Status, Donna J. Wood (DeBerg/Gallagher), regular order

****Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (DeBerg/Gallagher). Passed.**

1151 1047 Request for Emeritus Status, Steven L. Wartick (Smith/Hakes), regular order

****Motion to bring to the floor for discussion and endorsement (Smith/DeBerg). Passed.**

1155 1051 Consultative session on Smarter Balanced, 10/8/12 [Neuhaus/Bruess]

****Completed with Diana Gonzalez, Chief Academic Officer of the Iowa Board of Regents.**

5. Adjournment

Time: 4:56 p.m.

Next meeting:

10/22/12

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full transcript follows of 41 pages, including 4 addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 8, 2012
Mtg. 1721**

PRESENT: Melinda **Boyd**, Karen **Breitbart**, Gregory **Bruess**, Betty **DeBerg**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Philip **East**, Chris **Edginton**, Jeffrey **Funderburk**, Deborah **Gallagher**, Gloria **Gibson**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Syed **Kirmani**, Michael **Licari**, Kim **MacLin**, Chris **Neuhaus**, Scott **Peters**, Jerry **Smith**, Marilyn **Shaw**, Jesse **Swan**, Laura **Terlip**, KaLeigh **White**

Absent:

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters**: Ok. I do note the presence of a quorum, so we'll come to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: Call for press identification. I see Emily **Christensen** from the *Courier* and Blake **Findley** from the *Northern Iowan*.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

Peters: Provost Gibson?

Gibson: I just have one comment and that is to share what I think is some good news. I know most of you may have received this from—an update from our Legislature, but I'd just like to read the first two paragraphs.

“In yet another sign of Iowa’s growing economy, Iowa ended the 2012 Fiscal Year with a record \$1.3 billion in surplus and reserves. According to the state budget officials who just officially closed the books on 2012, the state surplus is \$250 million beyond estimates at a record \$688 million with another \$595 million in reserve accounts.

“The State ended up with \$6.692 billion in total funds available for the year and approximate—appropriated, I’m sorry—\$6.004 billion, which leaves the \$688 million as an ending balance. By law, Iowa is required to pass a balanced budget every year and spend only 99% of the projected revenues. The state ended the year spending under 90% of the revenues.” So this is a report of the revenues for our State.

Peters: Thank you, Provost **Gibson**.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**, do you have any comments for us?

Funderburk: Yes, on two topics today. First, on the Fall Faculty Roster. The Official Fall Faculty Roster for 2012-13 is now available and can be viewed by visiting the Faculty Senate website [<http://www.uni.edu/senate/>]. It is currently listed on the front page and can also be found under the Resources tab. Thank you, Chair **Peters**, for getting that up on the Senate website. Please have a look to verify the information there that’s listed. And if you see anything you have concerns about, please send me an email.

Next is over the proposed new student fee that I mentioned last time. You may have heard some rumors about a new proposed student fee. Over the past few weeks, there has been a discussion regarding shifting funding for Athletics from the General Fund to a new student-fee-based approach. The current proposal is to increase student fees by \$25 per student per year for each of the next 8 years.

The program has been portrayed as a dollar-for-dollar exchange for General Fund money and one which would allow more money to be potentially directed toward academics.

In truth, the first priority of the program is to restore athletic funding to FY12 levels.

The new student fee program has been described as “revenue neutral.” While this characterization is not entirely untrue, it is misleading. The idea of being “revenue neutral” is relative to which year you use as the baseline for comparison. While most assume it is based on this year’s budget (that would be FY13), it is actually based on the original budget for FY12 prior to the significant cuts experienced last spring.

If implemented as proposed, this would mean that initially there would be no new revenues available in the General Fund. The new student fee would be replacing funds for Athletics that had been announced last Spring as cuts intended to occur over three years. No significant new shifts in funding to benefit the General Fund would occur until year 3 or 4 of the program.

While I am not necessarily opposed to shifting funding for Athletics to a student fee model, I am troubled by the way in which this program has been presented to the University community. Whether intentional or inadvertent, the representations made have often been misleading. Students should be allowed to decide if this is a model they support, but they need to be given clear and accurate information on which to base their decision.

As rising costs associated with college attendance have an impact on all components of the University, I also believe the discussion of this new student fee should happen with the broader University community.

That’s all.

Peters: Thank you, Chair **Funderburk**. Are there—are you willing to take any questions if people have questions?

Funderburk: If anyone has any questions.

Peters: Are there any questions? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: How are faculty members placed on the Student Fees Advisory Committee?

Funderburk: The structure of that Committee is determined by the State, I believe it is. But there are 2 academic representatives appointed by the Provost.

Peters: Other questions for Chair **Funderburk**?

MacLin: Just to say “thank you” for presenting that information.

DeBerg: We had no idea.

Peters: Thank you Senator **MacLin** and Senator **DeBerg**. And I’ll have some comments along those lines in just a moment as well.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: Our guest today, Dr. **Gonzalez** from the Board [of Regents] Office, did let me know that she has a conference call scheduled, and she will be here probably about 3:45. So she is coming. At least as of this morning, she is going to be here.

I have a couple things. First of all, Chair **Funderburk** informed me before the meeting today that the Senate needs a representative for the Regents Award Committee, so if there’s anyone who wants to volunteer for that now, we welcome to accept that self-nomination. Otherwise, be thinking

about it. Do you [to **Funderburk**] know what the timeline is for getting that person in place?

Funderburk: I am hoping that we will get enough nominations together by the end of the semester to really start the work, so we have time.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I was the representative last year, and if nobody else has the—if somebody else wants to do it, great. If not, I'll fill in again.

Peters: Ok. So we don't have to name this person right away, but do be thinking about it. And if you are interested in it, let me know, and we know that Senator **Terlip** is willing to do it as well, so thank you for that.

I cannot remember if I updated everybody on this at our last meeting, but I know I did via email. But I do want the Minutes to reflect that the Ad hoc Committee that's charged with recommending changes to our policy process has issued its initial report. That's up for docketing today. While it is waiting to come up for Senate action on our docket, we are circulating it broadly across campus seeking comment. It will most likely come up in one of our November meetings, and before that time the Committee will finalize its recommendations based on whatever feedback it gets from the various people around campus, incorporating their suggestions at its discretion. If you have any—their preliminary proposal is up on our website attached to the petition. If you have any suggestions for the Committee, Senator **East** has agreed to be the point person for the Committee. So email him, and he'll send along comments to the rest of the Committee. So thanks, again, to Senators **East**, **DeBerg**, and **Neuhaus**, for their very expeditious work on this so far.

So, in light of the information that Chair **Funderburk** just shared with us about student fees for Athletics, and in addition to—actually, in addition to that information, over the last couple of weeks I've been copied on a number of emails from faculty members who are concerned about the recent series on Athletics in the *Courier*, particularly the final article in that

series in which Athletic Director **Dannen** appeared to be considering a move up to the Football Bowl Division conference or division level of what used to be called Division 1A. Those news reports referenced a Football Feasibility Study which, by the way, a copy of which is easily available on line if you Google “University of Northern Iowa Football Feasibility Study.” You’ll find a copy on the Des Moines Register’s website:

[<http://www.desmoinesregister.com/assets/pdf/D2155648414.PDF>]

The Senate discussed this report briefly with AD **Dannen** in 2010, and it came up again in a discussion with him in 2011. But neither of those discussions revolved entirely around the Report, and it’s not clear from reading back through the Minutes whether Senators had an opportunity to read that full report in advance. In light of the increased attention of this, and in light of the information about student fees and apparent additional revenue to Athletics, and given that Athletic Director **Dannen** has not come before the Senate since April 2011, it’s probably time to invite him for another visit. Also, I’ll note that Lisa **Jepsen**, professor in Economics, who serves as our NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative, will be writing a report to President **Allen** soon, and that may provide a good opportunity for us as well to discuss a variety of issues related to Athletics.

So we need to work on scheduling this, and we need to think about timing. We have some flexibility in our schedule in November, and I’ll be contacting Athletic Director **Dannen** and Professor **Jepsen** to talk about their schedules soon. But before scheduling this item, I could use some—a little bit of information from you. Right now we have two scheduled meetings in November, the 12th and the 26th. If the stars align such that it actually ended up that Monday, November 5th would work out as the best date to do this, would Senators be available for that, a special meeting on Monday, November 5th? I see a lot of nods. A quick show of hands: who is reasonably confident they’d be available for a special meeting on Monday, November 5th, if so needed? [many hands are raised] Ok. Thank you.

We will probably also need to look for room availability, because as I recall from last year, a meeting devoted to a similar topic gathered quite a large crowd, and I don’t think it would work in this room.

Finally, in scheduling this, I need to think about also the rest of the business of the Senate that we might like to get done before the semester ends. And so in that light, I'm wondering how many people are available or willing to meet during Finals Week? The second Monday of December is Finals Week. The Exam Session scheduled at this time on that date is for 2:00 p.m. MWF classes. So, if necessary, this would be kind of a last resort to take care of other business. If necessary, how many—can we get a quick sense of how many people would be available to meet at that time? [hands are raised] All right. Thank you.

Now, does anyone have any questions or any suggestions on how to proceed on this? I'm envisioning a meeting that focuses on funding for Athletics. We would invite Athletic Director **Dannen**, probably Professor **Jepsen**. Anything I'm overlooking? Senator **Deberg**.

DeBerg: Well, I think we should invite the President to that.

Peters: Invite the President is one option. Ok. Any other? Senator **Swan**.

Swan: So we have a new Budget Committee, might we ask that Committee to give us its view of the facts as they now stand?

Peters: That's a good suggestion. Thank you, Senator **Swan**. Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Is it possible to get a representative from the Board of Regents here for that meeting as well?

Peters: We can certainly check. Thank you. [light laughter] I keep looking over there and thinking the coat rack is somebody raising a hand. [laughter all around—the coat rack was only brought in a short time earlier in the meeting]. Just out of the corner of my eye, I keep thinking....[voices making jokes and more laughter]. Anything else on this matter for now?

Ok, and then I had one more quick announcement. Several of you had indicated availability for a meeting next Monday with Dan **Power** to talk about shared governance issues. Dan told me via email this morning that he's unable to attend that meeting--had a conflict. So we'll have to try to reschedule that. One option would be 2:00 p.m. next Monday. So, those of you who were interested in attending that, can I see a quick show of hands of people who might still be interested at a 2:00 p.m. meeting next Monday? [hands are raised] So, let's go ahead and plan on that then, and I'll get a room for it.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

September 24, 2012

Peters: All right. That leads us to Minutes for Approval. The only correction I saw this week involved moving some addenda around so that they were actually in the order the Minutes indicated they should be in. Does anyone else have any additions or corrections to the Minutes? If not, then we'll consider the Minutes approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Consideration of Calendar Item 1162 for Docket #1058, Request for Emeritus Status, Michael **Janapolous**, regular order

Consideration of Calendar Item 1163 for Docket #1059, Report from Ad hoc Committee on Policy Process, regular order

Peters: We have two calendar items up for docketing, and I think we can probably docket both of them in regular order, and we can take care of them in one motion, if someone's willing to help me out with that. And just as a note, I noted this via email to all of you, but as I do this if there is even

one Senator who thinks something—thinks there is discussion—is worth discussing whether or not we should docket a particular issue, then we’ll pull it out, and we’ll discuss it separately.

DeBerg: Well, I move that we docket items 1162 and 1163 in regular order.

Peters: Thank you, Senator **DeBerg**. Is there a second? Senator **Neuhaus** [who indicated]. Seeing no immediately jump to discuss this, we will proceed to a vote. All in favor, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No”? [none heard] The motion passes. And that leads us to our docketed items.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

Peters: Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist] has reminded me that our action with regard to Emeritus Status Applications is to—is that the Senate “endorses” someone’s application for emeritus status. So if we could have a motion to that effect for our first item.

DOCKET #1044, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, TIMOTHY E. **O’CONNOR** (**BRUESS/KIRMANI**)

Peters: Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: I move that we endorse Tim **O’Connor**’s request for emeritus status.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Kirmani** [who indicated]. I am in receipt here of a letter from the Chair of the History Department, the Head of the History Department, Bob **Martin**, [see Addendum 1] who notes that Professor **O’Connor** joined the Department of History in 1982; that he received the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence in 1994; he was involved in administrative activities with the American Council of Teachers of Russian; and in the mid-1990s was appointed UNI’s Assistant Vice-President for International Programs. He was, as Bob says, “a fine colleague who had

incredible energy, impeccable integrity, and unquestionable commitment to his work, and his retirement represents a significant loss to our department and to UNI.” Any discussion or any Senators wish to speak on behalf of Professor **O’Connor**? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Yeah, I would like to speak on behalf of Tim’s request. He is a fellow PhD from Minnesota, but I was shocked when I learned that we actually had people who studied Soviet History. My advisor was always more akin to Orthodoxy and the old Imperial order, so I—and I didn’t know him in Minnesota, but he was instrumental in getting me to apply for the position here at the University of Northern Iowa. He was also very helpful with me and with others to receive travel funding from the American Council of Teachers of Russian and later on from the American Councils for International Education to study in Russia and what we now call the Russian "Near Abroad," which are the old imperial territories of the Soviet Union.

Tim, when he was appointed by President Deno **Curriss** and Provost Nancy **Marlin**, to head up the Office of International Programs, really took that place to unexpected levels. I know that it had been a sinecure for certain administrators on their way out, let’s say, and Tim actually turned it into a professional organization with a staff and a great deal of support for not only inbound but for outbound as well. I was just asking a few people before I came over here, and we estimated that well over 200 University of Northern Iowa faculty members had participated in exchanges, and I know that there are a few here at this table who participated in those exchanges over the years. And, of course, his close ties to Russia brought to campus a real internationalizing force in which we had at least 35-40 undergraduates every Spring on campus, not to mention the numerous graduate students that came from the old Soviet Union as well. So, I just wanted to give my thanks to Tim and just add some further accolades to a man who already possesses a tremendous number.

Peters: Any further discussion? Then we will proceed to a vote. All in favor of endorsing Professor **O’Connor**’s application for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1045, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, ROGER A. **KUETER**
(**EDGINTON/BRUESS**)

Peters: Calendar Item 1149, Docket #1045, Request for Emeritus Status for Roger **Kueter**. Can we have a motion for that?

Edginton: Move for approval.

Peters: Thank you. Senator **Edginton** moved to endorse emeritus status. Is there a second?

Bruess: Second.

Peters: Seconded by Senator **Bruess**. And I received an email here from Greg **Stefanich**, and I will read just part of it. [see Addendum 2] Dr. **Kueter** came to the University of Northern Iowa in the Fall of 1970. His primary instructional service at UNI was in Instructional Media. He created the first large group Educational Technology and Design class for [the] Teacher Ed. program at UNI. He was the Head of the Department of Teaching in 1988. He assumed that position in 1988. He was the first administrator of the 2+2 Program, which allows individuals to obtain an off-campus degree from UNI through partnerships with community colleges, courses offered through the Iowa Communications Network, and in some cases on-site coordinators. And then I also received an email passing on accolades from somebody at DMACC in Carroll, Iowa, which was the location of the original 2+2 Partnership, attesting as well to Professor **Kueter's** contributions [see Addendum 2]. Anyone else like to speak? Senator **Edginton**.

Edginton: I served as a colleague of his while he was a Department Head in the College of Education, and he always operated in the best interests of the University, was very entrepreneurial, was often outside of the envelope in terms of his thinking, his actions, and programs, which created a comfort level for me to have someone out there with me. But I think he was a great representative of the institution and organized and implemented many excellent programs.

Peters: Anyone else? Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: He loved to auctioneer, and I heard him auctioneer at many benefits for important non-profits in the area.

Peters: Seeing no other comments, we will proceed to a vote. All in favor of endorsing this request for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1046, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, DONNA J. **WOOD**
(**DEBERG/GALLAGHER**)

Peters: Docket item 1046, Request for Emeritus Status of Donna **Wood**.

DeBerg: I move that the Senate endorse this request.

Peters: Thank you, Senator **DeBerg**. Second? Senator **Gallagher** [who indicated]. And I think, Sec—sorry, Vice-Chair **Smith**, I think, has

Smith: Yes, I have a letter from Tony **McAdams**, Professor in the Management Department, former Head of the Department, that he sent to Scott [**Peters**] and members of the Senate [see Addendum 3] endorsing or supporting Donna **Wood**’s application, and let me just read this:

“I am pleased to write in support of Dr. Donna **Wood**’s application for Emeritus Status at UNI. I have known Dr. **Wood** since she joined the Management Department in 2002 as the first David W. **Wilson** Chair in Business Ethics, an appointment shared with the Department of Philosophy and World Religions.

“Dr. **Wood** was a highly influential figure in our department and across the campus. She arranged seminars, brought public figures to campus, and simply by her presence, strengthened the scholarly tone of the University. Dr. **Wood** is a nationally- and internationally-recognized figure in the corporate social responsibility discipline. She has published several books

and monographs, along with dozens of scholarly articles. Her work has measurably influenced her field.

“Dr. **Wood** cared about her students and treated them with respect. She believed in what she was teaching and her enthusiasm energized her classroom. Similarly, she was a stimulating and challenging faculty colleague who expected the best from herself and those around her. I believe Dr. Wood’s work and formidable intellect comfortably merit the recognition of Emeritus status.” [end **McAdams** letter]

Peters: Thank you, Sec—I keep saying, Secretary—Vice-Chair **Smith**. Any other comments? All in favor of endorsing Professor **Wood**’s application for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries.

DOCKET #1047, REQUEST FOR EMERITUS STATUS, STEVEN L. **WARTICK** (**SMITH/HAKES**)

Peters: And finally, that brings us to Docket #1047, Request for Emeritus Status for Steven L. **Wartick**, and again, I recognize—sorry, I need a motion.

Smith: I move that we endorse Dr. **Wartick**’s request for emeritus status.

Peters: Thank you, Vice-Chair **Smith**. Second? Seconded by Senator **DeBerg** [who indicated]. Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: And again, I have another letter from Tony **McAdams**. Again, addressed to the Senate and to Scott [**Peters**]:

“I am pleased to write in support of Dr. Steve Wartick’s application for Emeritus Status at UNI. I have known Dr. Wartick since he joined the Management Department in 1998. During his time with us, Dr. Wartick strengthened our important Business Strategy course, taught International Business and served for a time as Head of our department. Dr. Wartick was

respected for his professional accomplishments and for his good humor and collegial nature.

“Dr. Wartick is a seminal contributor to his research specialty, corporate social responsibility. His work was regularly published in some of the most selective journals in his discipline, and that work was widely known and routinely cited. Dr. Wartick held numerous leadership positions in his field including the Presidency of the International Association for Business and Society, and the editorship of the scholarly journal, *Business & Society*.

“Dr. Wartick was a knowledgeable, engaging and demanding professor. Faculty and students alike have admired his dedication to his work and the personal respect and affection he brought to the classroom.

“I believe Dr. Wartick is precisely the sort of colleague whose work product and influential personal presence should be recognized with Emeritus status.” [end **McAdams** letter]

Peters: Thank you, Vice-Chair **Smith**. Any other comments? Seeing none, all in favor of endorsing Professor **Wartick**’s application for emeritus status, please say, “Aye.” [ayes heard all around] Opposed, “No?” [none heard] The motion carries. And I could have sworn I saw Dr. **Gonzalez** come in.

Funderburk: She went on a personal break.

Peters: Oh, ok. Well, we can talk amongst ourselves for a couple of minutes. We’ll just sit here in recess for a moment [3:54 p.m.].

DOCKET #1055, CONSULTATIVE SESSION ON SMARTER BALANCED, 10/8/12
[**Neuhaus/Bruess**]

Peters: [4:00 p.m.] Ok, so we’re back now, and Dr. **Gonzalez**, thank you for joining us. Dr. **Gonzalez** requested to talk to us about the Smarter Balanced initiative which involves our attempt to implement the common core

competencies. And I was wondering if maybe before you get started talking about that if you could maybe talk just for a couple of minutes just about your role at the Board of Regents and what your position is and the kinds of things that you work on so that people on the Senate and then faculty members reading the Minutes have a sense of how the Board handles academic issues and what your role in that is.

Gonzalez: Sure. I'll be glad to.

Peters: Thank you.

Gonzalez: So, my name is Diana **Gonzalez**, and I am the Chief Academic Officer for the Board of Regents. In that capacity, I work primarily with the provosts, so Provost **Gibson** and the other two provosts, and the associate provosts, so Mike **Licari** and Ginny **Arthur** when she was here, and their counterparts at the other institutions. The scope or the focus of my work kind of really involves two components. One component is the—or the focus is on the governance reports for the Board, so that includes, for instance for the October Board of Regents meeting, that will involve the Annual Enrollment Report, the Strategic Plan Progress Report, and other similar reports. So that's the one aspect.

The other aspect has to do with what I call ad hoc kinds of activities. So, for instance, when the Board wanted to look at the admission requirements—so this was back in 2006—the Board Office was asked to lead the initiative, and I worked with a group of inter-institutional representatives, and we conducted a very intense and intensive study of the existing admission requirements and then, after talking with outside people, we proposed the Four Factor Regent Admission Index that now is in place and under which Iowa residents—new Iowa residents are admitted for undergraduate work.

Another initiative had to do with developing a transfer website. So, I don't know if you all are familiar with that website. It's called Transfer In Iowa.Org [<http://www.transferiniowa.org/>], and in that case we worked not just with folks from the universities but also worked with representatives from the community colleges. And what we wanted was a

tool that students that were enrolled in community college courses would know exactly how their courses would transfer to the 3 universities.

So, the process that we used that each university has its own tool—so, for the University of Northern Iowa it's called "Transfer Plan-It," "plan it." [<https://cgi.access.uni.edu/cgi-bin/transfer/transferPlanIt.cgi>] For Iowa State it's called "Transit," and for the University of Iowa, the tool is called "I-Chart." And the beauty of that is that a student at a community college-- but we also expanded it to high school students, because, as you know through the contractual arrangements students take—high school students take community college courses before they graduate, and in some cases it's as many as—we've had students that take 45, 60 credits before they graduate from high school. And they are able to go into—so Transfer Plan-It—and select a major and say, "Well, I think I want to major in Psychology." And then they are able to plug in their courses and find out exactly where that course that they took would transfer into and what requirements they might have met or not met.

So, those are two examples of that, what I call the "ad hoc studies" that we do on behalf of the Board. So, those are some of the activities that I'm involved in. Of course, one of the items on the October meeting also has to do with financial aid, so that's another aspect. So, it's not just academic affairs but student affairs. And I work very closely with the new chair of the reconstituted Education and Student Affairs Committee of the Board that reviews all of the academic and student affairs docket items on behalf of the Board. So that's some of it.

So, I'll start out by saying "thank you" for inviting me to come. I've been kind of making the rounds across the State talking about Smarter Balanced, because it's sort of a new initiative for higher education, and it will have an impact on all of us in higher education. So, I have been meeting with many different groups, both at the university level and community colleges, because they also will be affected.

So, let me kind of start at the beginning as to "What is Smarter Balanced?" or "How did it come about?" And so I go back to basically 2009 when the

National Governors Association started focusing on the development and adoption of National Common Core Standards for K-12. So, the idea was “What can we do?” or “What needs to get done to identify these common core standards that all students that go through the public school system and graduate would be able to do, would know and be able to do?” As opposed to kind of the more local control, and especially here in Iowa, that exists across the country to say, “Well, in Utah, you know, these are the skills that we value,” versus Colorado or Washington State or Louisiana or whatever.

So, the idea was to focus on these Common Core Standards, and they were developed, and eventually they were adopted by Iowa. They haven’t been fully implemented yet, and if you have—and I’m going to talk about information and where it can be accessed—if you hear the term “Iowa Core,” that refers to the National Common Core Standards.

So, why is it called “Iowa Core”? Well, because part of the adoption process, if you will, was that on the one hand all of the common core standards had to be adopted. So, you couldn’t cherry-pick and say, “Well, I like #7, but I don’t really like #13,” or “How about if, you know, I only look at A-L and not the rest of them?” So, it didn’t work that way. You had to adopt all of them, but we were given—each state was given an opportunity to add up to 10 standards. So, you had to take the bases or the basic stuff, but you could also add 10 more. And, in fact, that’s what Iowa has done. So, for instance in math, one area that had not been included was statistics. And so as the K-12—the leadership team was looking at part of the adoption, they came to the conclusion that that’s—they wanted to add that. So, when you hear the term Iowa Core, that is the Common Core Standards, but it’s undergone some tweaking for the State of Iowa.

So, that was kind of phase 1 or part 1 of the story. The second part of the story was that, ok, now you’ve got a common core of standards, now then what do we need to do? Well, you know, as faculty members we would say, “Well, maybe we need to find out are they being learned?” So, that was really phase 2 or part 2—is you’ve got the Standards; now you’ve got to have a process by which you can assess those Standards.

So, what the Department of Education—the U.S. Department of Education was to identify or to look to the development of a process that would accomplish that, would accomplish the assessment. And how it came to be was that two consortia were formed, and each consortium then invited states to join and then that process began. So that's kind of the back story, and then now I'm going to start with Smarter Balanced.

And because I'm a faculty member at heart, and I believe in assessment and follow-up, I'm going to start out with a quiz. So, my quiz is, "How many of you have heard of Smarter Balanced? Or how many of you are totally familiar and probably could do a better job than what I'm going to do this afternoon?" So we've got Deborah **Gallagher** who has heard of it, and Jeff [**Funderburk**], ok. And of course Provost **Gibson**. So, you know, what is it? What does it mean to us? Well, as I said, two consortia were formed. One was called the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, so if you see the letters "SBAC," that's sort of what they go by also. The other consortium goes by the acronym of PARRC [sic PARCC], and so that stands for Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for a Career and College. So that, in a sense, that's what the assessment is meant to do, and they just kind of used it for their acronym. Iowa is a Smarter Balanced State. So Iowa decided to join with Smarter Balanced. And there are two types of states within each of the consortia. One is an "advisory state"—an advisory state that has no vote at the table. So, you know, you're a member and you learn about things and you discuss things and so on, but when it comes to a vote, then, you know, you just kind of sit out that process. The other is a "governing state," and those are the states that do vote. And Iowa is a governing state. So, we're at the table to vote.

So, things started moving. In 2009, K-12 started working with their school districts in terms of how do we align the Common Core Standards, the Iowa Core, with what we're doing now? They've been very busy, very hard at work doing that. They've been very involved for a long time. Well, it wasn't until this year, so toward the end of the Spring semester, that at a National Governor's Association meeting the question came up of, "Well, where is higher education in this process? You know, what role is higher

education playing?” And the answer was, “Not. You know, higher education has not been part of the process, or at least not formally part of the process.” Nadene **Davidson**, who’s not here, was working with the alignment in her role of teacher preparation, but that was, you know, very specific and a very unique kind of role, not in terms of higher education itself.

So, the National Governor’s Association said, “This won’t work. We need to make sure that higher education does have a role and is part of the process.” So the way that they addressed it, the way that they fixed it, is that Smarter Balanced identified a position, if you will, that they are calling the Higher Education State Lead. So there was a State Lead for higher education for each state, and that’s the role that I am filling. So, I am the Iowa Higher Education Lead.

So, part of my role—I just came to be in that position probably in late April, so I say that to emphasize that K-12 had been working on this process for 3 years. Higher education, we’ve been at it for less than 6 months. And so for many of us—you know, Deborah excluded—many of us hadn’t, you know, hadn’t heard of SBAC or how we needed to align or anything. So, my first role as the State Higher Education Lead was total immersion just to find out, “Well, what is it?” and “What needs to occur?” And so I have done that. I have been doing that. I mean, it’s an ongoing thing.

The second was really to start bringing in people to the process because my sense was in the beginning, and probably still to some extent, is that for many of us it’s kind of an abstract concept. So, you know, it’s kind of like—I’m going to use the term “astrophysics,” because that’s not my field, and if whoever is here representing that field, I apologize for lack of knowledge, but for me astrophysics is kind of an abstract term. So, yeah, it’s kind of out there, and it applies to a certain group of people, but it doesn’t apply to me, at least not in my everyday life. And so for that reason I have been meeting with different people. So, a couple of weeks ago I met with the community college deans. Before that I had met with the University of Iowa and Iowa State associate deans. I was invited to attend the annual meeting of the Iowa Communications Association. In another week the

community college math faculty are meeting. So, you know, trying to really extend the network and knowledge to people.

The other thing that I did was to put together a little advisory team so that, you know, I could discuss aspects of Smarter Balanced as they were occurring and to, again, extend the network. So I asked the provosts for nominations. I asked the community college chief academic officers for nominations. And I have this little team together. I'm still growing it. And I had a couple of people—for instance, last Wednesday the community college presidents asked me to come address them. At the end of the meeting, I had a couple of people come up and say, "I want to be on the advisory team." So that was good.

From the University of Northern Iowa, DeeDee Heistad has been meeting or is part of the advisory team. So that, you know, that has been extremely helpful, and we meet once a week on Wednesdays at 3:00—we have—by conference call, and sometimes our meetings are short and sometimes they're longer. For instance, one of the agenda items that I have been focusing on has been to invite the K-12 Leadership Teams to meet with us to explain to us, well, what's happening in math? What's happening in English Language Arts or in the Social Studies, or in Science? so that we're more familiar with, well, what's going on?

Then, or maybe to kind of start bringing it to a point, one of the key things that is going to affect us in higher education is the fact that the assessments that are going to be done—remember that I said, well, the assessment was based on finding out, well, what about these Common Core Standards? So, you know, we don't want to just say, "Ok, you know, here's what you need to know and be able to do," and then "Ok, that's fine."—that we want to assess them. But there's a step beyond the assessment, and that is—the objective is to eradicate the need for developmental work in higher education, so the idea is that a student that graduates from high school is deemed to be proficient for credit-bearing college work. So that's the piece that is especially applicable to us. You know, I mean, all of it is of value but the piece of the proficiency is especially applicable to us, because if a student is deemed proficient, then

they come to us or to the community college and they are ready to undertake credit-bearing work.

So, to get to that point of determining proficiency, Smarter Balanced has identified the need to do two things or to come up with two definitions. One is, “What is the definition of ‘college readiness’?” So, if a student is deemed to be “college ready,” then what does that mean? Does it mean that you graduated from high school? I mean, is that a definition? And the second are what they call “achievement level descriptors.” So that relates to a proficiency level that would be determined as the student is assessed. So I’m not just going to make up levels because they’re still in the process of being developed, but let’s say that we’ve got a 4-point scale. So, a 4 might read something like this, “The student is completely proficient in Mathematics, and is ready to move into credit-bearing—an entry-level or a first-level of course that is credit-bearing in higher education.” And same thing for English Language Arts. A 3 might say something like, “Well, the student is sort of proficient but might need, you know, some extra work.” And then maybe going down to 1 where the student would be deemed completely not proficient for credit-bearing work.

The assessments that will occur somewhat mirror the assessments that we who might have had children in the public schools have gone through with the ITBS and the ITED. So, the ITBS the assessments were 3rd through 8th, and the ITED, the Iowa Test of Educational Development, the student was assessed in 11th grade. So, the timeframes are going to be identical. The student will be assessed in elementary, in middle school through the 8th grade, and then high school in 11th grade.

So, I mentioned the two aspects that will be developed that will have impact on all of us. Last week the Smarter Balanced brought together a group of faculty that worked on both the definition of “college ready” and the “achievement level descriptors.” Well, who were these faculty? Well, each state was asked to nominate two faculty members, one in Mathematics and one in English Language Arts. So, again, I asked the provosts and the chief academic officers from the community colleges to nominate faculty, and then we submitted those two names to Smarter

Balanced. The part that I think could have gone more smoothly or made me happier was if they would have invited both faculty members to be part of the workshop. But from the beginning Smarter Balanced said, “We’re going to pick—you nominate two people. We’ll pick one from your state that we feel we need to be part of the workshop.” So that part of it wasn’t as inclusive, let me put it that way, as I would have liked, because I felt like, well, when we nominate two, then we should have two at the table. So we nominated in Math, and that was Wolfgang **Kliemann** from Iowa State, and then the other person was Justin **Robertson** from Iowa Central Community College in English Language Arts. And Justin was selected, and we came to find out later that only two faculty members from a community college were nominated, so that, you know, probably wasn’t as inclusive as maybe it needed to be.

Today is the—is it the 8th? The 8th of October, ok. Tomorrow the website will be open for folks to look at samples of test items that have been developed so far. So, I’m going to give you the web address for Smarter Balanced, and that will be open to the public. So I would invite you to take a look at that.

So that Smarter Balanced website site is: SBAC.org

[sic, <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/>]

And if I get any additional information later today, Scott, I’ll send it to you, and then we can send it on.

The other piece, and this is where I’m going to invite you and strongly urge you to participate and that is that between November and the end of January the definitions that these faculty members put together last week—they had a one-week workshop—the definitions that they put together will be open to all of us to comment and to give feedback. So, I would invite you, and again, Scott, you know, any web address or links or whatever that come up, I’ll send them to you as soon as that is available. I think it would really be in our best interest to take a look at them, give comment, and not just comment. You will be able to comment directly to

SBAC, but I'm going to—remember that I said I was a faculty member, so assessment and follow-up—and my follow-up is a homework assignment. And that homework assignment, and again I'll work with you, is I would like to get from you all, and I'm asking this of all of the groups that I'm meeting with, and that is "What do you see, after you go through all of these, you know, definitions and so on and you become familiar with it, what do you see as a barrier or as an impediment to what we do based on these definitions and all of this?" So, to the extent that we can put together that level of information, I think then we can communicate, "Well, how do we align higher education with the K-12 assessment process?" So, I know you [to **Smith**] were waiting to speak, so I'll stop.

Smith: It sounds like from what you said that the assessment focuses primarily on quantitative and communication skills. Is that correct? Is there any assessment of content knowledge?

Gonzalez: Content knowledge, yes, but it will be in the two key areas, which is Mathematics and English Language Arts.

Smith: So, there isn't an assessment, for instance, of whether students coming in here are prepared in science, whether, for instance, they would understand the theory of evolution. There isn't an assessment of their preparation on citizenship skills. They understand American History. Things like that. Those aren't addressed.

Gonzalez: Yes, yes, no. As of today, you know, in the process. Now whether that is going to evolve, I don't know. I know for certain that the two content areas that will be assessed that a student will be deemed proficient or not proficient are in Mathematics and in English Language Arts.

Smith: Ok.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Is there any distinctions between, right now in your thinking, between readiness for community college and readiness for a 4-year institution since so many high school kids are in community college courses?

Gonzalez: Yeah. That's a real good question. We haven't kind of segregated that to say that there would be a different level of readiness. As you, I'm sure, know, the community colleges are extremely, extremely involved in developmental coursework, so a large percentage of the students that enroll at a community college don't begin their work there in credit-bearing courses. They begin in developmental. And so being college ready and being able to undertake credit-bearing courses at the community college would be extremely, extremely important for them. And, of course, then the students that transfer to us, you know, the pathway would be also important. The one distinction that was made, and I'll say it now, is that initially when Smarter Balanced was talking about college ready, the terminology that they were using as if it were one sentence was "College career ready." "College career ready," as if

DeBerg: College career ready?

Gonzalez: Career ready. So, you know, kind of like it was one sentence, and so the State Higher Ed Leads had a face-to-face meeting at the beginning of August, and one of the discussions that we had was to ask them to separate the two, not because maybe there won't be a whole lot of overlap, but we wanted to respect the two to say, well, if you figure out—or I mean, we will figure out, well, what does "college ready" mean, and then on a separate time-frame, well, what does "career ready" mean? Then you can look at it and say, well, there's 80% overlap or whatever. But at least then you've gone through the process to say, "This is definition. This is the separate definition." And they did hear us, and, they, you know, they started to say, "Ok, well, you know, we'll take them separately."

Peters: Senator **Breitbach** has had a question.

Breitbach: I'm just wondering if these exams are going to be in addition to the exams we currently give our 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8th grade students and 11th grade students, the ITBS and the ITED?

Gonzalez: You know, that is probably the \$64 question, and I wish I had an answer to that. We've been asked—the State Higher Ed Leads have been asking more questions than we have answers for, because some of it is still evolving. Tomorrow I'm meeting with Steve **Dunbar** and Cathy **Welch** from the Iowa Testing Program, and I want to address that question. There are other questions that haven't been addressed. For instance, if a student is deemed proficient, probably one of the first questions that we ask is, "Well, then, what is the role of placement exams in higher education?" You know, we at the 3 universities just adopted ALEKS, a placement exam in Mathematics, and we're very, you know, we're very—looking to it for, you know, the tool that will really help the student in a formative way, so rather than taking the whole, it's diagnostic. It will help the student. "Ok, this is what you know, and this is what you don't, so now let's get you to that point." Some discussion that occurred was, "Well, if the student is deemed proficient, then maybe you don't need the placement exam." We're not quite there yet, you know, maybe because the test hasn't been developed so we don't really know. But we have a lot of questions. So, I can't answer your question directly other than to say, you know, we're pursuing that information, and I will discuss it with Steve and Cathy tomorrow.

Peters: Just a quick note that we should probably try to wrap up this discussion within about the next 10 minutes. Senator **Kidd**.

Kidd: So right now there are currently the SATs and the ACTs which are national standards used by colleges to determine college readiness in English and Math. How is this different?

Gonzalez: Right. That's one of the other questions [laughter around]. In addition to the placement exams are the entrance exams, you know, how will that occur. I'm sure that you know that ACT has just unveiled new standards that they've developed for their definition of "college ready." So, you know, we have a lot of unanswered questions, and questions that

concern us because, for instance, with the Regent Admission Index that I talked about before, that's one of the 4 factors, is the ACT or SAT. The other issue that we have as far as the RAI is that the assessments, as far as we know, and, again, you know, they haven't been developed, will not be course-based. So they are going to be distributed to say, "Ok, in Mathematics, for instance, if the skill is, well, maybe solve one equation and one unknown." So, it's not going to be, "Well, this is what you did in Algebra," but it will be distributed across a lot of different content areas to say, "Well, maybe you had that in Economics, or maybe, you know, some other kind of course." You know, for us at the university level and for the Board Office and the Board is, "Well, how are we going to reconcile all of that in terms of being able to say 'take additional core courses.'" Well, how do the core courses come together, and, you know, how do they mesh with the assessment? So, if you invite me back, maybe in 6 months or 9 months, I might be able to answer your questions more specifically. Today, it's really kind of to lay out the landscape and to talk about issues that, you know, that we're concerned about, and I want to learn what issues you see as barriers or impediments that I need to know as the Higher Ed State Lead so that I can share that. I meet monthly by conference call with my colleagues, my counterparts in other states, and, you know, this kind of information is what I would be sharing with them.

Peters: Professor [DeeDee] **Heistad** [Liberal Arts Core Director & Associate Professor, Language & Literatures].

Heistad: I thought that if I could just share with my colleagues some of my observations that I shared with Diana via our telephone calls and just kind of some of the stuff that I've learned, and I'll be very brief. So, one of the things I guess just to summarize, my understanding is that higher ed. is being brought into this after some development has taken place, and that we're being brought into it because they, Smarter Balanced, they want us to recognize this assessment, ok, as evidence that students are ready for entry-level, credit-bearing courses, and thus should be exempted from remediation in English Language Arts and Math. And I think that—and I took this as a quote from some of their materials, so I think that the first thing that came to mind is that with Smarter Balanced it is one assessment,

and it's in one area. It has the potential to change our admissions at the University. This is being supported by the Governor. We are a Smarter Balanced State, so one of the things I would ask immediately is to what extent, you know, should we have the ability to decide who does and who doesn't need remediation and based on what criteria?

I also think that it's important to note that Smarter Balanced will have a dual impact on higher ed. It's going to have a dual impact in that, yes, it does from the advisory point of view affect admissions. Ok, who's ready and who's not ready for college? It's also going to have an impact on our Teacher Education. How do we then prepare students who are going to be using the Common Core? Those are two separate issues, and sometimes I feel like they get mixed together in some of the discussions. But they are two distinct areas that have to be addressed.

I think that above all what I would say is that as I listened in on some of these conference calls, we need to continue asking the tough questions. This is a project in process. It's on a very tight timeline. We need to pay attention to this. I think it's very important. You know, you've already started to ask many of the same questions that I still have, and these are, you know, what I would consider to be some of my most serious concerns about this alignment. How does this align with higher ed? The Smarter Balanced Assessment is supposed to indicate "college and career readiness." As a group we thought that career readiness wasn't necessarily in the scope of what we were talking about, which is fine, but college readiness. Betty [**DeBerg**] raised the issue. You know, is a student college ready and ready to go to a 4-year institution or community college? That is not clear to me.

The issue of sustainability, the entire project, is being built around, I think, a \$176 million grant, and there have been some issues of sustainability. Who is going to assess? When will it happen? Will it be happening online? Will it be happening, you know, pencil and paper? And we've had—you know, these are questions that you probably have and just so that you know, we, too, are aware of these. You know, what happens in a school district that doesn't have access for all of the students to take this online? What about

languages? In what languages will this test be offered? So there are lots of issues about the sustainability of the project? When asked the question, the people at Smarter Balanced said that their goal was to have it all online, and that, immediately for a lot of schools, presented an issue. So, you know, have you—if you have a lab of 20, how do you get them through? You get the idea.

I think it's also important for us to remember that there are some states that are moving forward with Smarter Balanced. There are other states that are moving forward with neither of the two—some moving forward with PARCC; some of the states that are not choosing to move forward with either include Texas, Nebraska, and Minnesota, if I'm not mistaken.

Gonzalez: And Utah.

Heistad: And Utah. So I think that, you know, for us, we do recruit in Texas. We have neighbors very close. What would that mean for admissions to our institution if they're not in fact using the same assessment?

One of the things I'm concerned about is the value added of this particular assessment? I haven't seen the assessment. It's going to be released tomorrow. We've talked a lot about it without actually seeing what it is. Why is it that this is going to be value added to Iowa Basic Skills or ACT? What is it going to give us? When Robert **Stein** asked us—came to one of our meetings, I asked him, you know, what is the collaboration that is taking place? And the first question I asked was, "How is it different?" And he said that these—this assessment should be more robust, have the potential to replace Iowa Basic Skills Testing and ACT, and then he said that it will have less of a focus on the soft skills—less of the focus on the soft skills. So going back to what Jerry [**Smith**] was asking in terms of communication, you know, I'm not sure what that means. So, that was a concern of mine.

Now, these college assessments are slated to take place the final time in year 11, so during year 11 students could be deemed not on track for

college, you know, maybe almost on track for college, or ready for college. If all of the students end up in the college-ready category and they have a year left, we do begin to ask ourselves what happens in the senior year. One of my fears is that if the senior year becomes a year of AP or college credit, and if in fact this proficiency is based more on quote/unquote “hard skills than soft skills,” will UNI have the possibility of becoming nothing more than a finishing school? Ok? Will students be coming to UNI having already satisfied these soft skills? So, you know, it’s a concern. [pause]

That’s all.

Peters: Thank you, Professor **Heistad**. Thank you. Are there any other questions for now? This is obviously something we have to keep monitoring. Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: Quick question. The origin of Smarter Balanced and who funds it?

Gonzalez: The Consortia are funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Each Consortium received a grant.

Gallagher: So it’s Federal money.

Gonzalez: Correct.

Gallagher: It’s Federal money. Are there any corporate interests involved in this?

Gonzalez: Not that I know of. [voices stating not the ACT or the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the dilemma for Iowa with its own test] For Iowa, yeah.

Gallagher: And, as well, are—will these assessments be norm referenced?

Gonzalez: Yes, they will. Yes, they will.

Gallagher: Ok, so, a normal curve is a forced normal distribution, so by definition, somebody is going to have to be.... I just wanted to make that point.

Gonzalez: Yeah. Yeah.

Gallagher: Because I see it as a potential tool of, for want of a better word, “oppression.”

Gonzalez: Well, that’s a huge concern. I lived and worked and had a—our son was in elementary school at the time that we lived in Texas, and they have high-stakes testing, and students that don’t pass—it used to be called the TAS; I think it’s called something else now. High school students that don’t—didn’t pass the TAS didn’t graduate. And so

Gallagher: Well, everybody can’t be above average, and we know that [voices referencing Lake Wobegon with light laughter], and one of my concerns is having studied the origins of the normal curve in the history of statistics, we know that it emerged directly out of the eugenics movement, and its sole goal was to create social and economic higher—yeah, so I have really great concerns about expanding this enterprise, to say the least.

Gonzalez: And one of my concerns is if a student is not being proficient at the end of 11th grade, then what is the next step? You know, will the test be diagnostic enough that the school will say, “Well, here is an intervention strategy to help this student become proficient by the end of 12th grade?” Will it be a situation of, “Well, you’re not proficient, you know, you’re on your own.”? I mean, these are unanswered questions, but that’s a huge concern for me as an educator, as a parent, as a community person.

Gallagher: Is this more evidence for the prosecution of public education, too?

Peters: Senator **Neuhaus** actually had a

Neuhaus: I'm afraid you may have already answered my question, but I was wondering what happens to that other half, the non-ready half, or the non-ready third? I don't know where you're going chop the tail off there, but would that non-ready third be able to wander off to a community college because they have these sort of preparatory or rather remedial developmental classes?

Gonzalez: Well, you know, the underpinning of the proficiency movement, I guess I'll call it, is that a student would be able to enter any higher education institution and immediately enroll in credit-bearing courses. If a student that is deemed not proficient at the end of 11th grade and doesn't move into 12th grade from not being proficient to being proficient, then in essence, you know—it may—what happens to that student? If I were the parent of that student—I mean, if we were told, well, you know, your son or daughter was not proficient, and let's say, you know, at a level of 1,—I mean, hopefully that would not occur because of the diagnostic nature of the tests in 3rd through 8th. So, hopefully between 3rd and 8th as the student is being assessed that the tests are diagnostic enough that there are intervention strategies that are put in place to say, "Well, gee, at 3rd grade this student can't add 2 numbers. Well, how do we move them to be able to do that? Or, you know, going along the continuum?" But, I don't know. I don't have an answer to that. So, I mean, these are just questions that we have raised and that personally would concern me because, you know, also as a teacher certainly you don't want to leave a student in the lurch and say, "Well, gee, you didn't make it, and good luck. You know, figure it out on your own."

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**

DeBerg: You may have said this at the beginning but is Iowa participating in this because the Governor decided to? Who made the decision to have us not be Texas or not be Nebraska but to do this?

Gonzalez: Well, part of it was a requirement that flowed from the Stimulus Funds, that a state chose to accept or not to accept. And so part of that was to say, "Well, you know, a state that does then would adopt these

Common Core Standards,” and then the next step would be to participate in the National Assessment. So whatever assessment tool comes up, that’s going to be used nationally, too, you know, for us, too.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: I wonder if you can tell us—I think there’s several questionable things about this. I understand we didn’t have any vote in doing it or not, and I think there’s questions being raised of whether or not it’s appropriate for a public thing to be competing against ACT and Iowa Teachers test, do you have any idea if there’s anything set up for State review since we bought in? I’m assuming there’s a process of review every so many years about whether or not we stay with or abandon? Or are we part of it for good? (an aside) We have a surplus. We can give it back. [some laughter around]

Gonzalez: Yeah, I’m not sure that a determination has been made, but that’s certainly a discussion that the Higher Ed. Leads have focused on to say, you know, you’ve got to build in an evaluation process that says, well, this is working or this isn’t working, just like we did with the implementation of the RAI. You know, 2 years later we did an assessment to say, well, is it doing what it was supposed to be doing? And if that’s not a piece of it or part of it, then, you know, we would not be happy with that, because we certainly don’t want to introduce something and then, well, is it working? Well, who knows? You know, is it working the way it’s supposed to? I hope so. I mean, that just wouldn’t be, you know, the next step to take.

Peters: Senator **Shaw** did you have a question?

Shaw: Well, if we are stating that all of our students need to be college ready, by the end of 11th grade they are tested and then they don’t make it, so we don’t graduate them, but yet we have then in the economy technical skills that need to be fulfilled to run technical positions which say they need a high school diploma, so are we hurting our economy overall by saying....?

Or what is college ready? Just college ready in these 2 areas? How does this trickle down to other elements?

Gonzalez: Right. Right. Yeah, those are critical questions. And, you know, I can't sit here and say that a determination has been made that a student that is not proficient won't graduate. I don't know that, you know, I'm not really part of the K-12 aspect. So—and I'm not even sure that, you know, that they know, because a lot of it is evolving. Remember that I said that the Iowa core hasn't even been fully implemented. When I talked to the Leadership Team people, one of the things that they're focusing on is just professional development for teachers in the LEAs, you know, as to, well, what is the Iowa Core? How are you going to teach it? How do you introduce that? So all of those aspects have to occur before we actually get to the assessment. But the point that DeeDee made about the teacher preparation, that's not a piece of what the Higher Ed. Leads are working on, but that's a concern for me personally also. So, I, you know, worked with Dean **Watson**, with the deans at the other schools to say, you know, you all have to be talking about this, because obviously that needs to be part of Teacher Preparation in terms of the Iowa Core and then eventually the assessment. I mean, it's going to affect a lot of different areas, some of which we know already and, you know, we're still trying to figure out.

And I know my time has ended, so just one more thing. I mention the Smarter Balanced website, and I invite you to use that. What I have done is I've kind of distilled that website because it's very comprehensive. Some of it is K-12, which may not be as applicable. So I've taken a little piece of the Board of Regents website and created a link there for Smarter Balanced. I don't have a lot of documents yet, but as I, you know, as my little advisory team comes up with items or we come up with items, so if you go to the Boards' website—so that's Regents.Iowa.Gov

[<http://www.regents.iowa.gov/>] and then across the main page there are tabs, and there's one tab called Quick Links. If you click on that, then the first item under that says Smarter Balanced

[<http://www.regents.iowa.gov/smarterbalanced/smarterbalanced.htm>]

There are two documents there that you might want to start out with, and those are the Core in Mathematics and the Core in English Language Arts.

So, you know, you might be interested in looking at it to say, well, what is it? You know, what are the skills that are being included? And they are broken down by grade area, so you would be able to track it that way, yeah.

Peters: Thank you.

Gonzalez: So, thank you. I appreciate the time, and you know, I certainly would appreciate any comments either directly to me—my website [sic email address] is: Gonzalez@iastate.edu or through Scott [**Peters**], so, either one.

Peters: All right. We will not have the opportunity to talk about the next item on the agenda, so we'll have to squeeze that into our next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: So I guess it's time to adjourn. I heard a motion somewhere I thought. Without objection, we'll consider that motion passes. [4:56 p.m.] And I'll see you in 2 weeks—yeah, 2 weeks.

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:
Date: 10/22/12
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 4 addenda to these Minutes.

Addendum 1 of 4

Comments offered by Dr. Robert **Martin**, Head, Department of History, on behalf of Professor Tim **O'Connor** at the time of his application requesting emeritus status:

“Timothy E. O'Connor, a recipient of the Ph.D. in Russian History from the University of Minnesota, joined the Department of History in 1982 and over the next thirty years became a well-liked and respected member of the departmental faculty and UNI community. His conscientious work in the classroom, wide-ranging service to the University, and scholarly endeavors, including the authorship of three books, were recognized in 1994 when he received a Regents Award for Faculty Excellence. His administrative activities with the American Council of Teachers of Russian, later the American Councils for International Education, fostered important international ties for UNI and contributed to his appointment in the mid 1990s as UNI's Assistant Vice President for International Programs, where he served ably for many years. Tim was a fine colleague, who had incredible energy, impeccable integrity, and unquestionable commitment to his work, and his retirement represents a significant loss to our department and to UNI.”

Addendum 2 of 4

Comments offered by Professor Greg **Stefanich**, on behalf of Professor Roger **Kueter** at the time of his application requesting emeritus status:

“Dr. Roger Kueter came to the University of Northern Iowa in the fall of 1970, as an Instructor in Educational Technology and Media Services. While at UNI he completed his doctorate at the University of Indiana and progressed through the ranks, attaining the rank of full professor in 1988. His primary instructional service at UNI was in the area of Instructional Media. He created the first large group Educational Technology and Design class for the teacher education program at UNI, when it was added as a certification requirement in 1987. He served as the acting Head of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction on two occasions before assuming the position as Head of the Department of Teaching in 1988. When the 2+2 program was created Dr. Kueter assumed a position as director of 2+2 program and the UNI-Community College Liaison Administrator. The program allows individuals to obtain an off campus degree from UNI through partnerships with community colleges, courses offered through the Iowa Communications Network, and in some cases on-site coordinators. The primary audience for this program have been those seeking elementary education certification. He continued in this roll until his retirement in June of 2012.”

Comments offered by Mark **Renning**, UNI 2+2 Program Coordinator, DMAAC, Carroll, IA:

“In 2001, Dr. Kueter became involved with the 2+2 program, and assumed the role of Director in 2003. Through Dr. Kueter's efforts; UNI 2+2 partnerships were strengthened with Des Moines Area Community College and expanded to include 10 other community colleges across the state of Iowa. In February 2006; the 2+2 Program, through the work of Dr. Kueter, was recognized by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) with the award for Best Practice in Collaboration with Community Colleges. “

Addendum 3 of 4

Comments offered by Professor Tony **McAdams**, on behalf of Professor Donna **Wood** at the time of her application requesting emeritus status:

“Dr. Scott Peters and Members of the Faculty Senate:

I am pleased to write in support of Dr. Donna Wood’s application for Emeritus Status at UNI. I have known Dr. Wood since she joined the Management Department in 2002 as the first David W. Wilson Chair in Business Ethics, an appointment shared with the Department of Philosophy and World Religions.

Dr. Wood was a highly influential figure in our department and across the campus. She arranged seminars, brought public figures to campus, and simply by her presence, strengthened the scholarly tone of the University. Dr. Wood is a nationally- and internationally-recognized figure in the corporate social responsibility discipline. She has published several books and monographs, along with dozens of scholarly articles. Her work has measurably influenced her field.

Dr. Wood cared about her students and treated them with respect. She believed in what she was teaching and her enthusiasm energized her classroom. Similarly, she was a stimulating and challenging faculty colleague who expected the best from herself and those around her.

I believe Dr. Wood’s work and formidable intellect comfortably merit the recognition of Emeritus status.”

Addendum 4 of 4

Comments offered by Professor Tony **McAdams**, on behalf of Professor Steven L. **Wartick** at the time of his application requesting emeritus status:

“Dr. Scott Peters and Members of the Faculty Senate:

I am pleased to write in support of Dr. Steve Wartick’s application for Emeritus Status at UNI. I have known Dr. Wartick since he joined the Management Department in 1998. During his time with us, Dr. Wartick strengthened our important Business Strategy course, taught International Business and served for a time as Head of our department. Dr. Wartick was respected for his professional accomplishment and for his good humor and collegial nature.

Dr. Wartick is a seminal contributor to his research specialty, corporate social responsibility. His work was regularly published in some of the most selective journals in his discipline, and that work was widely known and routinely cited. Dr. Wartick held numerous leadership positions in his field including the Presidency of the International Association for Business and Society, and the editorship of the scholarly journal, *Business & Society*.

Dr. Wartick was a knowledgeable, engaging and demanding professor. Faculty and students alike have admired his dedication to his work and the personal respect and affection he brought to the classroom.

I believe Dr. Wartick is precisely the sort of colleague whose work product and influential personal presence should be recognized with Emeritus status.”