

9-24-2012

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 24, 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, September 24, 2012" (2012). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 48.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/48

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
09/24/12 (3:31 p.m. – 5:01 p.m.)
Mtg. #1720

SUMMARY MINUTES

Summary of main points

1. Courtesy Announcements

Faculty Senate Chair **Peters** called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

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

Provost **Gibson** offered a list of the new mandatory fees for Senators to review [see Addendum 1 to these Minutes].

Faculty Chair **Funderburk** first thanked all faculty who were able to attend the Fall Faculty Meeting on September 17th. He stated that he had received requests to have his comments published, so they are appended to these Minutes [see Addendum 2 to these Minutes]. He also reminded faculty present to encourage students to take the online survey soon on the proposal from Athletics to the Student Services Fee Committee to fund a large portion of Athletics from the Student Fee.

Chair **Peters** updated the Senators on his work to find members for the Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review [see Addendum 3 to these Minutes]. He reviewed the charge for this Ad hoc Committee, asking that they provide a framework to various named groups by early next semester for feedback and then to provide final recommendations mid- to late-Spring to the Grad. Council and the Faculty Senate.

Chair **Peters** also passed along a couple of items from Secretary **Edginton** who could not attend today. First, he read into the Minutes a short report from the UNI Faculty Senate Budget Committee which met this morning. Second, he read **Edginton's** comments regarding the recent death of the

former Dean of the College of Education Thomas **Switzer** along with an obituary [see Addendum 4 to these Minutes].

Lastly, Chair **Peters** reminded Senators that he had sent them an e-mail outlining an efficient way they might docket the many items on the Agenda in order to proceed to the two consultative sessions to be considered today.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript

Minutes for September 10, 2012 were considered approved after noting that one change had been received regarding a bit of the Summary at the beginning.

3. Docketed from the Calendar

For time efficiency, a special method was used to docket the many Calendar items listed on today's Agenda. Some required particular meeting dates; others were docketed in regular order. Senator **Neuhaus** moved that the proffered outline be passed. Senator **Bruess** seconded. Voice vote passed. See the full transcript below for details.

4. Consideration of Docketed Items

1147 1043 Consult regarding enrollment and admission
(**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

Vice-President **Hogan** made a presentation from projected data [see Addendum 5 to these Minutes] and fielded questions.

1144 1040 Consultative session on reporting of course grade distributions
(**DeBerg/Neuhaus**)

Registrar **Patton** made a presentation from projected data [see Addendum 6 to these Minutes] and fielded questions.

5. Adjournment

Time: 5:31 p.m.

Next meeting:

10/08/12

Oak Room, Maucker Union

3:30 p.m.

Full Transcript follows of XX pages, including 6 Addenda.

Regular Meeting
**FULL TRANSCRIPT OF THE
UNI UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 24, 2012
Mtg. 1720**

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

Absent: Chris **Edginton**, Syed **Kirmani**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair **Peters**: I'd like to call the meeting to order.

COURTESY ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Peters: I see Emily (**Christensen**) from the *Courier* and Blake (**Findley**) from the *Northern Iowan*. Any other press present? No, ok.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST GLORIA GIBSON

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

Gibson: Just one very brief comment. I am going to pass on to the Chair and the Vice-Chair the recommendations for mandatory fees for next year, and I do have 2 representatives on that Committee, Jeff **Funderburk** and Tom **Peterson**. So these are the recommended fees for next year.

Peters: Ok, we will attach these to the minutes. [see Addendum 1 to these Minutes] Would you like me to—should I circulate these [around the room today], or just attach them to the minutes?

Gibson: Oh, that's fine to just attach them.

Peters: Would people like to take a look at them now? (Passes list for Senators to review.) And they'll be attached to the minutes as well. Chair **Funderburk**?

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR JEFFREY FUNDERBURK

Funderburk: Just a couple of little things. First, thanks for coming to the (Fall Full) Faculty Meeting last week, those who could be there. There were a couple of requests that I share the comments I made, so unless there's any complaints here, I thought I'd offer those for attachment to the minutes this time going out. [see Addendum 2 to these Minutes]

Related to the Student Services Fee Committee, the Committee is currently considering a request from Athletics to move a large portion of the funding onto the Student Fee. I say that only here because there currently is an opportunity for the students to weigh in on their opinions on this, which is an on-line survey. So, if you have an opportunity to mention that to them and encourage them to go ahead and do the survey, that'd be terrific. I think the Committee will likely make a decision the middle of this week as to whether or not it supports the proposal.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY SENATE CHAIR SCOTT PETERS

Peters: Thank you, Chair **Funderburk**. I have just a couple of comments. I do have most of the membership for the Ad hoc Committee on Curriculum Review in place, and I've got their names up on the screen [see Addendum 3 to these Minutes]. Barbara **Cutter**, who I've asked to be on the Committee because of her experience in writing—helping to make the revisions to the current Curriculum Handbook. Todd **Evans**, who has been actively involved in curriculum development at the College and Departmental level. I thought it was important to have a voice of someone who was involved very early in the curriculum process. Ira **Simet**, past

Chair of the [UNI Faculty] Senate, who is also Chair of the Committee on Academic Program Reviews. Jerry **Smith**, of course Vice-Chair [of the UNI Faculty Senate] and was also Co-Chair of the APA Task Force from a few years ago. Laura **Terlip** has agreed to be on the Committee as well. She's not only on the [UNI Faculty] Senate but also the Grad. Council. And I'm still trying to get a member of the UCC [University Curriculum Committee] to be on the Committee. I have a request out at the moment and hope to hear back soon on that one. So, I will be in touch with this Committee soon to try to set up a meeting and get them started on their work. The charge is the basic one that we agreed on at our Retreat to review our curriculum policies, handbook, and standard curriculum review practices, and [to] recommend changes that will assure faculty control of the curriculum and enable faculty bodies to actively monitor and manage curriculum and academic programs. And the timeline I'm going to ask them to try to meet is to be able to present a framework at the beginning of next semester to College Senates, the UCC, the GCCC [Graduate College Curriculum Committee], the Grad. Council, and us for feedback, and then make its final recommendations to the Grad. Council and us by mid- to late-Spring semester. Are there any questions about that?

Ok. Secretary **Edginton** could not be here today but he did want me to notify you as to a couple of things. First of all, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee met this morning, and I'll just read the summary he asked me to read: "Following a far ranging discussion on the charge of the committee informing the Faculty Senate on how the budget priorities impact on academic affairs, the following initial action steps will be taken: 1) The committee will review the structure of the budget to gain base information; 2) The committee will determine specific questions regarding budget elements needing additional clarification from Vice President for Administration and Financial Services; and 3) The committee will meet with the Vice President for Administration and Financial Services Michael **Hager**."

And then he [**Edginton**] also wanted to take the opportunity during the comment period to remember and recognize the contributions to UNI of former Dean Switzer who died recently. The obituary he has asked to be attached to the minutes [see Addendum 2 to these Minutes], and I'll read

you the statement that he sent me: “From 1987 – 2003, Thomas **Switzer** served as Dean and Professor at the College of Education at the University of Northern Iowa. Dean Switzer graduated from the University of Northern Iowa in 1961, taught at East High School in Waterloo, and served as Associate Dean and at the University of Michigan and Dean of the Judith Herb College of Education at the University of Toledo. Among his most notable contributions while at UNI include the establishment of the Renaissance Group (a nationwide effort aimed at teacher education reform), the UNI Center for Early Development Education, and the College of Ed.’s statewide network of supervisors of student teachers.

Dean Switzer was a source of inspiration to many, an individual who always looked for the best in others; valued the continuity of leadership within COE; promoted international adventures; and was viewed as an individual providing intellectual and supportive leadership to his faculty, the university, and the profession.

Dean Switzer passed from this world on August 29, 2012.” [end reading of **Edginton’s** comment]

Finally, one last comment, I did send out the email with all the details about docketing in order to get right to our consultative sessions today. I’m hoping we might be able to take care of those in one big motion, just to docket everything all in one fell swoop, so we’ll try to do that in just a moment.

BUSINESS

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

September 10, 2012

Peters: Before we get to that, minutes for approval. There was one correction to the minutes that were circulated. It involved clarification of the Summary portion of the minutes so that the Summary accurately reflected what was said during the meeting. Otherwise, there were no

other corrections or additions submitted to Sherry [**Nuss**, transcriptionist], so if there's no objection, we'll consider the minutes from September 10th approved.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

Peters: And that leads us to our fun new experiment in docketing. In the future, I will try to wait to assign Calendar numbers to things until we have the schedule a little better sorted out, and that way I can assign the Calendar numbers in the order in which they are anticipated to pop up and reflect people's availability for meetings. But for now, if possible, I'd like to try to take care of this in one vote, rather than having 8 separate votes on all of these things and save ourselves a few minutes of time. So would anyone be willing to make a motion to docket these items consistent with the email that I sent out? Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Would you like it read or can we simply look at it over there [projected]?

Peters: If you want to briefly read it, I think that would be fine.

Neuhaus: I move that Calendar items 1153 and 1154 be placed, out of order, immediately following 1152/1048 Consultative session with Associate Provost Klafter for the Senate meeting of Monday, October 22;

In addition, Calendar items 1155 and 1160 be placed, out of order, and consecutively, to follow 1151/1047 (Emeritus Status for Prof. **Wartick**) on the docket for the Senate meeting of Monday, October 8, to coincide with the visit of Diana **Gonzales**, Chief Academic Officer for the Board of Regents; and

Finally, I move that Calendar items 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, and 1161 be docketed in regular order.

Peters: Thank you. Is there a second? Senator **Bruess** [who indicated]. Is there any discussion? Are there any questions about why we needed to do

it this way? And, again, I'll try not to make it so confusing in the future. Shall we proceed to a vote? All in favor of docketing these Calendar items in the order reiterated in the motion, please say "Aye." [ayes heard all around] Opposed, "No." [none heard] Thank you. The motion is approved, and I think that takes us to our consideration of docketed items.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

DOCKET #1043, CONSULT REGARDING ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSION

Peters: So, Vice President **Hogan**, let me cue you up here. [both working out logistics with the laptop and projection of **Hogan's** information; see Addendum 5 to these Minutes]

Hogan: Well, good afternoon everyone. I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to talk about this Fall's enrollment, and I do have some information we'll share on the screen here as we go through it, but while the Chair is getting that arranged, let me just start with a couple of brief introductory comments about where we are this Fall.

Our official Fall 2012 enrollment was 12, 273. We have a Board-mandated census date, which is the conclusion of the 10th day of classes in any given Fall semester, so our actual enrollment is higher than that right now, but that's our census date enrollment, and that's the number we use to compare year-to-year. That is a decline of 895 over the previous Fall and is approximately or at least 500 less than what had been projected.

Enrollment was down across virtually all categories, so new from high school, transfer students, graduate students, international students, and even the broader category of "other" which includes Second B.A's, high school [dual] enrollments, CIEP, and so on, as well as across continuing students in different ranks, so returning freshmen, returning sophomores, returning juniors, seniors, grads, in each of those were down. Multicultural enrollment was up slightly both in terms of new students and overall.

Relative to new students, there was a decline in both applications of about 9% and also in what we call "yield," and that would be what proportion of

those students who were admitted to the University chose to enroll. And that was a reduction of about 4 points, so it's not 4%, because it's a per cent so it went from approximately 57 to approximately 53, so a reduction of 4 points not by 4%.

Relative to continuing students, there was a decline in the return rate [laptop and projection now accomplished]. The return rate is not something we normally calculate year-to-year, but in this case we wanted to look at it a little more closely from a slightly different angle. So, this actually talks about the proportion of students enrolled in a given Spring who are eligible to return in the following Fall and who do so. So it would eliminate students who graduate, for example, or students who are academically suspended. But of those who are here in the Spring who are allowed to return or eligible to return in the Fall, what proportion return? So that return rate was also in decline Spring to Fall in of approximately 3 points across class ranks, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, grad.

You probably have seen some media coverage about our discussion about what might be some of the causes of this decline have been, and I would describe 3 as able to be anticipated to some degree. There was a decline in the high school graduating class State of Iowa. It was close to 3%, and it was actually the 2nd year in a row of that. They will now level off for about the next 5 years, they are projected to. Second, we did have a large entering class in Fall of '07, and so those—that large group of seniors graduated so that the number of seniors who graduated last year was about 270 more than the year before. So, the rate at which they graduate is approximately the same, but the number was just larger because it was a large entering class. Third is that there was anticipated some impact on enrollment of eliminated programs, programs that students might have come to study in, although the numbers are certainly not large enough in my view to account for the unexpected drop.

The areas that we're less able to predict about would be the continuing impact of competitiveness in the higher ed. market place, if you will. Private institutions, for-profit, on-line, our fellow Regents' institutions, community colleges all are pressed economically and otherwise to seek students as are we. Second would be continuing concerns the economy

and the overall cost of higher education. We need some broader discussion about the value of education and what it means to society and eventually what it means to individual students and their families when they make decisions about what to do after the conclusion of high school. I should note there that our student body as a group is—the wealth of or the socio-economic status of our student body is less than, if you will, I don't mean to frame it that way, but if you look at it numerically, Iowa, Iowa State, it's sort of a stair-step. It parallels our academic preparation. ACT scores sort of stair-step. And socio-economic status does the same. So the impact of ongoing economic concerns, uncertainty about the economy, or the cost of [higher education] might reasonably be presumed to have a greater effect on our student body. And then finally negative publicity last Spring, the timing of the discussions on campus, the debate—certainly all that happened was at a point in time when many, many high school seniors are making their final decisions about what to do, where to go, and although I can't measure the impact of that, I would presume it fits with the other two as 3 contributors that are less able to be predicted and/or measured.

I will certainly be open to questions, but let me—I did get, I think, 4 questions that the Chair [**Peters**] provided in advance, and I went ahead and put together a little bit of information on them. First was about the Enrollment Summit this past summer, why, who was invited, what was it for? [**1. Provide information on the enrollment summit this past summer (why formed, why summer, why not advertised better to general faculty, what are the goals, etc, etc—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes)**] We did convene a group on July 12 for a day-long meeting across the hall here in Maucker Union. We invited academic department heads, deans of the colleges and their associate deans, administrative staff who work in functional roles relative to recruitment—so Admissions, Financial Aid, Marketing, Orientation, and so on—and ended up with a group of about 80 members of the University community. Student leaders, faculty leaders were there as well. The purpose was to raise awareness about the need for broader involvement in new student recruitment in particular. We took a fair amount of time to educate about the current context within which this need exists, as well as about current practices and plans, and then to generate and discuss ideas for improved practice. At the end of this document, which I'm assuming we will share electronically with folks [see

Addendum 5 to these Minutes], I've listed sort of a summary of 9 concepts that came out of that Summit that are ones that the Enrollment Council is working on particularly right now.

One of the questions was "why in the summer?" Well, it was held in the summer because of the recruitment cycle. Generally, we gear up, and we're planning in the late spring to start a new recruitment cycle that starts essentially mid-summer. So we would have high school juniors making campus visits the summer 14 months before they will matriculate. It was hoped that the discussion would generate ideas and some degree of engagement that would affect that next recruitment cycle. In other words, if we waited until October to meet we essentially are now talking about the recruitment cycle for Fall '14 rather than Fall '13 because things for the first are perhaps already in place. So our goal was to be able to make enhancements to our institution-wide effort that would impact the class of '13 eleven months from now.

I mentioned who was invited. I think as part of the discussion—first of all, I appreciate that there was great enthusiasm in that group about what opportunities existed, things that we might do differently, that we might do better. The degree of willingness to collaborate was very positive. So I envision us determining the best ways to keep broadening that circle, and so with the question as to—relative to general faculty being invited to be engaged, it's not to say that we wouldn't welcome that, it's just that we haven't done that yet, haven't gotten to that step yet.

The next question was first about out-of-state and then about international students and asked for sort of 5 years' worth of data on those. [**2. Number and percentage of out-of-state students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as for the last six years; 3. Number and percentage of international students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as the last six years**—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes] I won't go through this in detail, but you can see [on the projected document] we start with the number of resident students, what proportion that is of the total number. The number of non-residents is the balance. The proportion of non-residents, international proportion, and then the total number. So you can see that over—that the 91% number for resident students as a proportion has been steady. There's been a very

slight uptick on non-resident students from 5.5[%] to 5.9[%]. The number for international, you can see, has been essentially flat as well.

A similar question was asked about race/ethnicity

Peters: Senator **Kidd**.

Hogan: Oh, yeah. I'm sorry.

Kidd: I just wanted to ask a quick question. Are the—is non-resident only US citizens? Or is that international as well?

Hogan: In this case, non-resident is the domestic only.

Kidd: Oh. Thanks. Yeah.

Hogan: So those add—are added, resident, non-resident, international.

Neuhaus: Terry [**Hogan**], while you've got that up there

Peters: Sen—sorry. Senator **Neuhaus**.

Neuhaus: Thank you. Does the “international students” [figure] include the CIEP students in that, or are they simply international students that are enrolled?

Hogan: CIEP students are and have historically been included in our enrollment count. Any other questions on this one, or is it....? It may be easier for us to do what we're doing, is to go at them as we go along. [pause and nothing heard] Question on race/ethnicity and the proportions there [**4. Number and percentage of minority students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as the last six years—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes**], and you can see that the majority White population at about 86.5[%] to between 88[%] to 86.5[%] has been somewhat stable, that the minority or multicultural—so this is the aggregating of African American, Latino/Latina, Asian American, and Native American, those 4 groups. We've seen some progress there as a proportion, both as a number and as a proportion of

the campus. Again, international as a proportion is about flat. The number is down a bit. And we do have a proportion of students who don't respond. I mean, our source of information on this is self-report. And you may wonder what the big change was where we went from no response [of high 400's] to a smaller number [mid 100's to 200] is when the Federal scheme for recording this information changed to allow the notion of 2 or more races. There were a whole more group of people willing to self-report because they felt that the other categories were not sufficient to.....

There was a question about the annual budget for international recruiting. **[5. Annual budget for international recruiting (including staff salaries, travel for recruiting, development of promotional material, etc) for the last six years—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes]** Again, this will be attached, and you can look at it in more detail [than as projected here today], but essentially we—between staff time and travel and printing expenses—we spent about \$150,000 a year out of the Admissions Office on this function.

There was a question about innovative steps **[6. What innovative steps, if any, VP Hogan is going to take in order to try to increase the number of out-of-state, international, and minority students at UNI—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes]**. I would hope these would be steps that we will take in order to increase enrollment in these areas, but for non-resident we have placed 2 regionally-based recruiters, one in Chicago and one in the Twin Cities. We did Chicago first. That person has been—has just completed a second recruitment cycle with this last Fall's entering class. The one in the Twin Cities followed a year later, so that person has just finished one recruitment cycle this past Fall. We've also created and seek to expand a scholarship program that essentially awards—it serves to incentivize non-resident students who live in population centers adjacent to the State of Iowa but over State lines who we identify as more likely to consider us than somebody from, say, the middle of the State of Illinois. So we're looking for the Illinois counties across from Dubuque and the Illinois counties as part of the Quad Cities as the first two where we've tested this concept. It has led to some increases in non-resident enrollment, but their—the percentages are positive but the numbers are relatively small. So a 20% increase sounds great, but if it goes from 10 students to 12 students, it's not having a huge

impact from a given county. We have identified the potential to expand those to Omaha/Council Bluffs and potentially Rochester, Minnesota, so there are some options for expanding the scholarship program there.

Relative to multi-cultural/minority recruitment, we've done some intensive work on our—what we might call our “pipeline programs” with Gary, Indiana, and San Antonio. We've had to address changes in personnel at those institutions as well as some of our own change in personnel. We're finally to a point where we have written memoranda of understanding with those institutions that clearly define expectations and commitments so that regardless of future staffing hopefully the programs are able to be sustained with less of an up and down sort of feel to them. We have initiated some planning on a similar program for Marshalltown and have identified Des Moines, Waterloo, Quad Cities, and Storm Lake and the notion of perhaps developing our first pipeline program with a Native American tribe in the State of Iowa as another option. Those are going to be somewhat—are—they tend to be labor-intensive, and they're going to be contingent on our ability to invest in those.

Third is at the initiation by Associate Provost **Klafter** and with support of the Provost, the Office of International Programs is going to broaden its involvement in recruiting by adding two recruiters in this coming year who will focus on South America and the Middle East. Although we've had a strong Saudi [Arabia] program and a Saudi relationship, we don't spend as much time traveling in the Middle East and certainly not in South America. We're mostly in Southern Asia and in Eastern Europe. So that will be—that will essentially triple, well, more than triple, because our current recruiter, Kristi **Marchesani** spends at least a quarter of her time processing admissions, so she's not on the road 100% of the time, or not recruiting 100% of the time. These two will be focused on recruiting.

Peters: We have a question. Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: Two quick ones. What's your funding source for the Good Neighbor Awards, the money that goes to that? And then could you speak a little bit to exactly what the regional recruiters do?

Hogan: Yes. The funding source for Good Neighbor Awards is it was carved out of our non-resident line in the tuition set-aside program. So it is—we've had non-resident financial aid. This is just being packaged in a different fashion. So it was not an increase in the Budget, per se, but a reallocation. The regional-based recruiters do a good deal of what our Admissions Office recruiters who are resident here do—visit high schools, visit with students and their parents, host information sessions at high schools, solicit or represent us at events, fairs, gatherings, to organizations that have an interest in helping students get to college. So they—it's a lot of relationship-building, awareness-raising, and in the end hopefully application-generation and then yielding. So they are in a particular—for example, this past year we hosted a reception in Chicago for admitted students and had University folks, officials go up there, and the event was hosted and organized by the regional recruiter, and so a group of students who were from the Chicago area who had been admitted here had another touch-point with a group of University representatives as sort of a yield activity.

Peters: Senator **MacLin**.

MacLin: And maybe I'm misreading this, but why would Waterloo only be identified as having a potential for expansion? It's our immediate neighbor. Why aren't we just doing it?

Hogan: Yeah, well, what we're talking about is that when we create a pipeline program it involves a commitment of resources to engage with families and parents from earlier on all the way through the recruitment cycle and through matriculation and through—actually, through orientation. So, for example, for the Gary and San Antonio programs, the Jump Start Program is the on-campus piece that serves to sort of usher folks. It's a matter of, you know—regardless of whether it's close or far, it—those activities require staff time to organize and to be present and to create presentations and to arrange meetings and to visit and so on. So, part of the circumstances that we have a relationship with the Waterloo community, and we have students from Waterloo/Cedar Falls, obviously, are the largest portion of our population right now, so I think that there's certainly more that could be done there. Even within the list of these

others, I think that we would—for example, Marshalltown—and I should say each of the pipeline programs is intended to be customized to a degree that meets the needs of that community as well as with ours. So, the Marshalltown program, for example, would be a combination of the high school school system, the community college there, as well as the University and with a particular angle that Dean **Watson** is very interested in relative to teacher preparation, where the principal at Marshalltown has basically said if we can help students move through this pipeline, part of the pipeline would be a commitment to employment back in Marshalltown when they finish. And so that will be very different than what the Gary, Indiana, program looks like and very different than the Palo Alto program from San Antonio.

MacLin: Wouldn't you agree, though, that there is exponential benefit to targeting Waterloo because it's right here in the Cedar Valley, it completely strengthens the links between the two communities, and I think that close or far, close still should be easier.

Hogan: Well, I think the question would be, "Would close or would Waterloo lead to incremental changes in enrollment in a fashion different than going someplace where we are not getting students from currently?" So, it—you know.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, could you explain a bit more about the scholarship programs, if they're need-based or merit-based or what basis the scholarships are given on, and how large the awards are?

Hogan: For these 2?

Terlip: Yes.

Hogan: They vary. Essentially, part of what we start with—first of all, it should be noted that scholarships awarded for these sort of programs [come] out of what is generically referred to as tuition set-aside. We've learned that that's an unfortunate choice of words that was made at some

point in time, but essentially what they are is we start with the fact that non-resident students pay a tuition-rate that's two and a half times the resident rate, and they pay the same rate for tuition board and—or, I'm sorry, room and board and fees. So, the awards vary in amount depending upon the circumstance. They are awarded through an interview and a selection process. We work with the faculty and staff at both institutions. Palo Alto Community College in San Antonio and the Gary Community School District in Gary to help identify students who, by virtue of their skills and ability, the faculty there think would be successful on our campus. They go through an interview and a selection process and then are awarded. They are obligated to maintain a certain academic level—level of academic performance to retain the scholarship, and it's—obviously, packaging of financial aid along with the outreach and sort of the nurturing effort. When we go to Gary, we go several times a year. We meet with parents of the prospective students and as well as the students as well as the faculty and staff. The financial aid is an important piece of the process. If we were simply going to try to recruit students from Gary with no involvement of financial aid in the process, we would just not be productive.

Terlip: What about the Good Neighbor Awards? Could you maybe fill us in a little bit in terms of what the criteria are for those awards as well?

Hogan: Those are not selective. Those are what we would call a “scholarship” or an “award of circumstance,” and it basically says—similarly we have a “legacy award” that says if you have a parent or a grandparent who graduated, you get this award. The Legacy Award is \$1,000. The Good Neighbor Award is similar. If you are a resident of—and there's a list of counties then—and you are admitted to the University, you would then receive an award that—and I think we actually have that in two tiers now so that we have a higher end academic, a \$1,500, and a somewhat lower, admissible, but not at the higher end, of \$1,000, something in that range.

Terlip: All right, and my final follow-up is just how much have we spent, say, in the last year on each of those in terms of the set-aside dollars?

Hogan: Well, this is where it's a little—let me try and frame it this way. These are not dollars we're giving out in the sense that we have never collected, so what they are is essentially an offer of a discount equal to the amount of that award. Ok? So the dollar values of them--I think our total non-resident financial aid out of \$14 million is about \$250,000. So that would be those two combined.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: A question about the Legacy, is that a semester, a year, per you, know, 4-year degree? Or

Hogan: It's annual. I mean, it's an annual award. It's awarded for a year, not a semester, and I'm not positive if it's renewable or not. I would have to look it up myself.

Gallagher: Ok. And what's UNI's benefit for doing that?

Hogan: First of all, it's non-resident Legacy, I should

Gallagher: Pardon?

Hogan: It's non-resident only.

Gallagher: Oh. Ok. So, an out-of-state student to come back here.

Hogan: Correct. Right.

Gallagher: How does that benefit, either in monetary terms or any other way, UNI?

Hogan: It contributes to the development of non-resident enrollment which contributes revenue to the Institution that's 2 ½ times.

Gallagher: Oh, I see. More tuition. Ok. Something about that just kind of catches me the wrong way. I guess the legacy kind of thing. I'm just questioning it in terms of really does it benefit us that much given what it

sort of represents, I think? I mean, obviously it's not like a legacy to Harvard or Yale, but, you know what I'm saying,

Hogan: Right.

Gallagher: when we have students who experience more need, and in light of our efforts to recruit and retain a more diverse campus. I just thought I'd say that.

Hogan: Yeah. It's also—your point is well taken. In the scheme of things, it's a very small amount of money.

Gallagher: You don't know the total?

Hogan: I'd be happy to find it for you.

Gallagher: Ok. Thank you.

Hogan: Ok, so those were the three, yes. Then the question here [7.—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes], there's some introductory commentary, but then "Do we at UNI truly have a student enrollment and retention culture, as well as specific practices and institutional commitments to make it effective? If not, what are we doing to develop such a culture?" I would—this is my personal view, I would say that as an Institution we are in a transitional place. Historically, institutions like ours had an office of admissions whose obligation was to process applications and make judgments about who would be admitted, but it was less focused on going out and on recruiting. It was reacting to applications rather than generating them. Admissions and new student recruitment are also only a piece of the enrollment puzzle, and I think the place to which we are moving and need to continue to move and perhaps move at a greater pace is the notion of University-wide enrollment management which takes into account recruitment of students from all categories, so continuing education, distance learning, new students from high school, transfers from community colleges, graduate students, international students, all of those categories, and then retention of those which is another entire area of work. So, I think that we're midstream. We've had some discussion about

undertaking an enrollment management planning process that would perhaps formalize and more fully integrate the range of activities that are happening and look for some synergy and positive movement out of those.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith** had a question about that.

Smith: I've heard for instance that Iowa State is much quicker in making scholarship or financial aid offers than we were. We were very slow in doing that. They were very quick. And that kind of is consistent with this notion that maybe we haven't been as enrollment-focused as we need to, and my question is, we talked about the Enrollment Summit and some of the things in the Enrollment Council, do we have on our staff at this University the expertise we need to be really state-of-the-art in enrollment? Do we have the professional skills, people who have really done this before and really know it? Do we have that here, or do we have to get that expertise somehow?

Hogan: I think we could certainly enhance our capabilities on any number of fronts relative to enrollment, whether it's retention practices, marketing practices, financial aid practices, recruitment practices. I mean, we could—we can—there's no doubt we could be stronger in every one of those areas. Part of how Iowa State has done what it's done is because it has the resources that it has, and it's, you know, the investment that they have made in a marketing budget, for example, it's probably—I've heard different figures about what theirs is. I'm confident it's at least 15 times our budget. It might be 20 times. And then when you talk about staff, you know, the admissions staff that—or the Office of Admissions has a full-time PhD economist on its staff, at the Admissions Office. That's some expertise that they've acquired and put to good use.

Smith: How is the work of the Enrollment Council that you mention up there? Is that going to include the development of a comprehensive enrollment plan, and would you anticipate maybe as part of that work the possibility of bringing in, as maybe on a consulting basis, professionals, enrollment professionals, who could really give us a sense of direction of what we need to get up to speed?

Hogan: Yeah. I think when I talk about enrollment management planning that would be exactly it, is there are some—there are actually—two of the stronger firms nationally in this area are based in Iowa. Noel-Levitz and Stamats are both Iowa companies that do work in this area, and there are others, and I think that would be a wise investment.

A question here [projected on screen] about what we learn or how we do exit interviews [#7—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes]. There are actually 3 things that we do in this area where we try to learn from students who either come here and leave or students who choose somewhere else even though they've been admitted here. So there's an annual Board of Regents study that's of the group of leavers. It does have a low response rate. Phil's [Patton] office is responsible for administering this. It's a survey. It's a tough way to gather really useful information, because you're sending a survey to people who have left you and have gone and they have no compelling reason to respond or to be honest. You know, it's often easier to say, "I had personal problems," and then you just stop filling out the rest of the survey. And we've learned that from other institutions as well as experiences we've had directly. Partially because of that, we've taken on two more recent approaches. One is last Fall Institutional Research did for the first time ever a survey of non-matriculantes, so these would be students who were admitted to UNI who chose not to attend UNI. IR put together a survey that was, you know, had a positive tone about it and sought to get some insights from folks. We did learn from that last year that finances were cited very often. Now, it's still self-reported. We got a better response rate than the leaver study, but then we also got a lot of when people talk about personal situation they were able to describe their personal situation, so it was more believable. Like someone would say, "Well, I really wanted to play sports, and I was able to go to this small school, and I could plan whatever the sport was, and I could do that there."

Peters: Senator Smith.

Smith: Back to your leavers. Is there something in the process—I mean, do these people simply not enroll the next semester? Or is there something that they have to sign, something they go through? I mean, when you get out of the Army, you go through this extensive deal, is there anything like

that where you could get them at the time and survey them rather than mailing something weeks or months later.

Hogan: If we were the Army, we could do that. [laughter around] You actually hit on one of the issues is that the way a student leaves the University is they just don't come back the following term. Or, if they are here mid-term, oftentimes they get in the car, and they leave. Certainly, when there are occasions when students reach out or let us know or they come to the Registrar or they go to the Resident Assistant and say, "I'm leaving," we use those sort of one at a time to gather information about what their circumstance is. But a lot of institutions struggle with that question of "Is there a way to systematically do exit interviews to generate more meaningful data?" and some have actually gotten to the point where they offer financial incentives that basically say, "If you'll come in and participate in an exit interview, we are going to give you \$100 off the balance of your bill," because it takes something like that.

Peters: I'm going to recognize Senator **Neuhaus** in just a second, but I just want to note in the interest of time that we have about 15 more minutes or so so that we can still devote enough time to Senator **Patton's**—oh, I'm sorry, Registrar **Patton's** presentation.

Neuhaus: Terry [**Hogan**], I think we're still using MAP-Works, and we're essentially surveying everybody prior to their leaving. Has that—has there been some worth looking at that?

Hogan: Yeah, actually the third thing we're doing is actually premised on MAP-Works data. So what we have in MAP-Works is all—is new students coming to us, 92% of them are completing a survey, and we have tied to that survey their entering characteristics, so what was their high school performance like grade-wise and so on? And then we also have their academic performance while they're here, and what Institutional Research has done for the first time is looked at the leavers and compared what we know about them as a cohort compared to those who are retained. Interesting. So I said to Kristin **Moser**, I said, "So, do the leavers have a lower academic profile entering?" And she said, "No, actually the profiles are very comparable." At the time a student leaves, that's changed. And so

the one statistic I have here is that the average GPA for the leavers cohort is a 2.1, although they had comparable entering capabilities as measured by things like ACT or high school grade point, which—so, why do students get a 2.1 when they are capable? Could be any number of things, and so that next level of—and my professional assessment would be is that it is a combination of these things, and it's different things for different students: social adjustment, not having friends, struggling in school, being uncertain about a major or what I want to study, uncertain about life, family circumstances, I'm getting married, pregnant, I'm ill. You know, all those things that add up to the life of a student affect this group of students in such a fashion that their outcome academically of that first year is markedly lower by grade point measures than for those who are retained. So, this is our first attempt at using the MAP-Works for that sort of thing, and it's been

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, are you looking into linking that with other data that we collect? For example, it would seem to me that looking at that in conjunction with stuff from financial aid and socio-economic status might give us some other predictors.

Hogan: That's a great, great concept. And that's—I don't know that we've got—I know that we—we would have the potential to do that analysis, but we've not taken it to that level yet. You are right, though.

Peters: Senator **Shaw**.

Shaw: Have we ever looked at that in regards also to dual enrollment or advanced placement classes?

Hogan: I don't think we've tackled that at all.

Shaw: That might be a place to look at as well.

Hogan: In what—in what

Shaw: In dual enrollment, it depends on what school they are in and who's teaching the classes, and so maybe they're coming out thinking they are more prepared than they actually are.

Hogan: Oh, ok. Right. So an unwarranted self-confidence.

Shaw: Definitely.

Hogan: This question [9.—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes] was about enrollment across colleges and asked that—for—to be able to compare across 5 years that we—and I apologize for—but we kept CHAFA and CNS appearing to be separate units just for the purpose of having multiple years of analysis. But, so you'll see that essentially there's the two categories that are down are Business [CBA] and Other, and I did not get a chance to ask Scott **Busche** who all was in Other. [reading] "Primary Major's College at Fall Census." I'll have to clarify what that is, because that number seems large. It could be all of the Continuing Ed., undeclared, 2nd major. [a few voices offering ideas] Oh, I'm sorry, yes. Deciding. Deciding students, that's what that is. But notice there, and my interpretation of this is those who are more likely to persist during times of difficulty or stress or budgetary woes or whatever are those who have greater clarity, whether it's the right direction or the wrong direction, they have greater clarity about what they think they want to do, and so where we see this decline from 1900 to 1400 is in students who are undecided and have less certainty about that.

Students by admission type [10.] This [chart] shows Freshman, Transfer, Graduates, and Unclassified and just shows their changes at the Fall Census across those 4 categories. And you'll see that actually over the 5 years Graduates are—now I think that this is—Mike [**Licari**], would you say that this number of graduates in the two years are related to the coding?

Licari: There's coding changes and graduate enrollments—these are new graduate students. New graduate student enrollments are heavily affected by our cohort admissions practices that we do, and so you'll see every other year they go up and then they go down and then they go up and then they go down.

Peters: Vice President **Hogan**, if you in our last 10 minutes or so if we could maybe try to talk a little bit as you talk about some of the issues in the Enrollment Summit and sharing of data? If we could try to spend our last 10 minutes talking about how faculty can get more involved and in what role you see of faculty in the helping with our enrollment numbers?

Hogan: Right. One specific question [11.—see Addendum 5 to these Minutes] was about confidentiality of enrollment data that Departments need, and so, to clarify, the issue is not one of confidentiality. It's one of finding and putting into place most effective ways of getting the right information to what—to the Departments—that people need. So, one of the items that came out of the Enrollment Summit which I've listed here of 9 concepts [see Addendum 5 to these Minutes], you'll see that item 3 is to: Provide academic departments across campus with timely reports and information they need to communicate directly with prospective and admitted students. That's one subset of a larger information need. So that is something that has been committed, and Institutional Research is going to work on it. In implementation of the new Student Information System, reporting is the last piece of it. We found that at the time we made the transition there was an inventory of 2500 reports that were being produced, and each of them had to be looked at to say, "Do you we still need it? Do we need it changed?" And then they'd need to be redeveloped. So, this has been a labor issue in terms of getting that done. It's not a policy question about confidentiality.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: One of the really frustrating things about what's not gone on maybe is that back in the CHAFA days with Jim **Lubker** and Reinhold **[Bubser]**, I was a Department Head, and every semester we'd beg the Admissions Office for the names of people who had applied in our programs so that we could contact them, and they just never came. You know, we'd keep asking, and they would just never come, so here we go again, #3, so, I mean, what's up with that?

Hogan: Well, I think act[ually]

DeBerg: Why doesn't that—why didn't that happen before this new complicated 2500 report-generating system? I mean, it's so frustrating to—you know

Hogan: I understand, and I appreciate the frustration. I can imagine how it would be. Currently, CHAS, in its combined form, it is actually the College that has the most robust sharing right now. And that's been very positive and something that we actually have shared at the Enrollment Summit to other Colleges as a model for "This is where we would like to get to." But it's my understanding that the information on admitted students and prospective students are going routinely, not to every Department, that's what the charge here is to do, but that they are going, in fact, to CHAS departments, because those were in place before, so they got re-placed. The other ones were—never existed, because there was—you know, so.

These are the set of 9 items that the Enrollment Council is currently discussing [see Addendum 5 to these Minutes], and you'll notice to the Chair's point the very first one is to seek to expand faculty contact with prospective students and their families. We know that the notion of students, prospective students, personally connecting with someone in their academic area of interest who takes an interest in them is very, very important. It's valuable. We hear that from students and families. What we are going to work to do is, collaboratively with Departments, is to systematize that in a fashion that it happens routinely and day-in and day-out with the least amount of stress on Departments as is possible. And there were some ideas kicked around at the Summit about, as a variation on that, is developing perhaps Admissions Ambassadors at the Departmental level. What would it be like if the Chemistry Department had 2 undergraduate students who were really good and who wanted to help with this, and they could be host and facilitate introductions to faculty and so on.

I won't go through the whole list, but there are 9 items. I think we substantially agreed to 4 of them at the last Enrollment Council meeting. We're meeting again this Wednesday. The challenge for us as a community is to work together through a difficult environment and difficult set of

circumstances. I—I'm, you know—it's like one doesn't hope for trauma to bring people together, but if trauma happens and it brings people together, then I think we need to go forward with it and use that—the opportunity that has been presented to us in this case. I can assure you that the staff who work in Admissions and Financial Aid and New Student Programs and the Academic Learning Center and Academic Advising and the Registrar's Office have—want nothing more than for this community to have a robust number of students that allow us to be a healthy place and to be financially viable and to continue to do the great things that we do in terms of impacting the lives of young people. And that's going to be something that happens through the pooling of resources and ideas and energy.

Peters: We have about 5 minutes left. Senator **East**.

East: I have a couple of mostly rhetorical questions or for your consideration kind of questions [laughter around]. I wonder if you're evaluating all these things that you're doing with recruiting centers hither and there and whether or not they're actually financially useful at some point in time? Or are these more programs like we might be familiar with in the faculty of "Oh, yeah, we got a new major," and 25 years from now we decide, "Well, we've only graduated 1.5 students a year, so we probably ought to drop it."?

Hogan: I can tell you specifically on the non-resident, the Chicago, the Twin Cities, and the Good Neighbor, we've done those analyses.

East: And the second one is I wonder about reacting to market conditions or doing kind of program-based marketing or recruitment where you might decide, "Oh, we think we see something going in that we have a possibility of we think this is likely to be happening in the next 10 years," and we have a program that might be useful or we might could market or strengthen somehow to increase our numbers by 50 or 100 students and thereby maybe even—so I wonder if those kinds of things are

Hogan: I think that concept is one the Summit and the Council were thinking about on item 9: "[Provide] opportunities for faculty to refine curricula to meet changing needs." It is exactly that—is what might be a

variation on a current program, an emerging program, a program where there is a well-known need but we don't have it here. And those are really faculty decisions to think about to make, but, yes, we think that that's a piece of the puzzle.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: I was just curious on if we're looking at given the trends of fewer high school students and all of that if our goal for what number we want to recruit is being monitored. I mean, bigger is not necessarily always better. So, has there been any thought about or discussion of what is reasonable for us given the current circumstances?

Hogan: That's a great question, and it's a deep question. I think that the assessment that was made at the time of President **Allen's** arrival was that we had a physical infrastructure and a campus capacity that would accommodate something in a range of 14,000 students, and so in a sense we're paying for McCollum, we're paying for these certain services and all to be offered, and there's some variable with lower enrollment, but other things are fixed costs. So I think the question of "Could we be a robust institution with 12,000 students?", certainly we could. It's a decision that's something that the President and the Provost and others in the governing structure of campus would need to conclude, but from where I sit I view myself as one who's intended to act on what the number is rather than to be the one to determine the number or suggest the number. But knowing what I know about higher eds. across the country, 12,000 is a very, very viable number. Where I would be worried is if I was in this role at a private institution that had 1,222 students, and I know that if we drop 30 students, 5 people are going to get laid off. We're not at that place.

Peters: All right. Well, Vice President **Hogan**, thank you very much.

Hogan: Thank you very much.

DOCKET #1040, CONSULTATIVE SESSION ON REPORTING OF COURSE
GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS

Peters: Registrar **Patton** has some handouts [see Addendum 6 to these Minutes] for us [as guest speakers exchange places].

Patton: If I counted noses right, I think I've got just enough, if we make it all around. Thank you for your time. I'll try and keep this short for you, because I know you've got a lot of other things on your agenda. What I'd like to talk to you about is public publishing of grade distribution information. And you've seen the resolution, so you have an idea, and your Chair was nice enough to give a sample of what is on MyEdu [MyEdu.com] now. So to give you an idea of what's available out there in the public domain, I've given you some sample of other institutions and how they display grade information. And literally what I did was I just put into Google grade distribution by faculty, and here are probably the first 6 or whatever that popped up. So here are some examples of other institutions [see Addendum 6 to these Minutes] and what they do, and then I'll kind of go through some of this.

The first one you have in front of you is Indiana [University], and the reason I kept this one is I particularly liked the bottom part of the first page which was where it said "Grade Distribution Not Available—Small Class Size" That's just to indicate that, you know, you publish information based on an adequate cell size, not just 3 people. But you can see in their case what they're doing is they're publishing, you know, by a term, by a course, and listing the instructor for the course and reporting percentages of grades. You know, A – W or incomplete or something like that. Pretty standard kind of way of doing it.

The next one I gave you was Miami [University] of Ohio. Again, a little bit more linear in nature, giving all the possible grades that could be awarded, but again did it by percentages and the average GPA for that course.

Next one I gave you is University of Missouri. A little bit truncated because of its length in terms of giving course title, instructor name, but again gave ranges of percentages of grades given A-F.

The next one was Texas A&M [University]. Again, fairly similar. Gives the percentages by grades. It goes through the entire grade lexicon, though, going through unfinished, satisfactory, dropped, and so forth.

And then I have University of Madison, for you—or University of Wisconsin at Madison. Fairly similar in nature. It does show how you'd report on multiple sections of the same course.

The last one is—I'm not sure to say if it's interesting or scary. It actually is two pages, so when you get to the last one you actually have to put them side by side. This is the University of Texas at Brownsville, and you can see what they're reporting line by line for all faculty from salary, restricted funds, total compensation, sections taught, size of classes, standard deviation, average student satisfaction score, research, expenditures, a very, very comprehensive listing of everything. Obviously probably a State mandate.

We have been for about the last 10 years providing grade distribution information to external bodies as they have requested it. This first started about 10, 12 years ago with a corporation called Pick-A-Prof and then another one that's emerged since then called MyEdu. We started giving that information but do not give it by instructor. We post it by section, but again it is a distribution of how many A's, how many B's, and so on down the list. When this first came up again, 10 or 12 years ago, the question was what is public information and what is not public information? Because all 3 institutions were being asked the same question about the same time, we asked the attorney general to weigh in on it. The attorney general ruled that if it's aggregate information, it's public information. So, any requests that we have in terms of open records or anything like that in an aggregate form, we must release that information, and that's what we've been doing for the last 10 or 12 years.

I'm coming to you to see if you want it to be more visible on the UNI campus? It's quite visible off the campus. Do you want it to be visible on campus? Do you want it published on our website or other types of websites so that students can see the grade distribution by faculty across the curriculum.

I've just jotted down some notes as far as I'm concerned which might be positives or negatives, and let me just kind of give those to you. First, I see it may foster faculty communication in the consistency of awards of grades across multiple sections of the same course. If you've ever seen this kind of distribution, some of you have, you can see in multiple section courses there can be a wide range of how the grade distribution goes across a similar course by different sections. It may help with discussions relative to grade inflation. It may foster communications and educational outcomes and assessments of learning. Provides transparency to students, faculty, and public on grade distribution across departments and colleges. Now a negative, may be used by students in selecting courses in which they feel it will be easier to obtain a higher grade. May be viewed by individual instructors as an invasion of their academic freedom or an unwarranted demand to justify or explain their reasons, methods, or philosophy of grade determination. As the last one from Texas showed you, this well could be legislative mandated, and the question is do we want to be ahead of the curve or behind the curve in what we provide? And with that I'm going to be quiet and just kind of—I came here asking your opinions, if you think this would be beneficial to put this in a more public display or not? And that's truly what I'm asking. I'm asking for your input and advice.

Peters: Senator **Kidd**.

Kidd: So when you said aggregated information, what does that—can I get like an example so I can understand it better? Is it like—so if you have a class of whatever, say a section of General Physics like I teach, right? Would that be averaged over all the years that you taught this course? Would that be like broken down per year into like individual classes? What would be the idea?

Patton: Usually what's done in these situations are it's by semester, ok? So we would take a course, and I'll just use General Physics as an example, ok? Let's say there are 4 sections of General Physics. It would literally show sections 1, 2, 3, and 4. It would show their percentage of A's, A-, B+, B, B- throughout the system. The aggregate size for like section 1 has to be 5 or greater. We won't report anything that is less than 5, so we get away

from Independent Study or some research-type thing. As long as the cell size of the class is 5 or greater, that's usually been used from a research perspective as you're not able to personally identify the 5 or more people in the class, that's why the 5 cell. But it would show sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, and each of those grades as a percentage given in the course across the grade spectrum by semester and just keep accumulating over the years.

Peters: Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: Are all these done by instructor name or by the section? So, if you have, for example, 4 sections, just section 1, 2, 3, 4, or it will name the professor that's in each one?

Patton: David, that's one of the reasons I'm here, to ask what you want, ok? Currently, what we give externally is not by instructor name, ok? So as I come to you, it's kind of a multi-prong situation. One, do you want the grade distribution out there? And then two, how do you want it out there? Do you want it by instructor? Do you want it just by section number?

Hakes: We already get it from you in our Department, and we distribute it by section so that we don't know which instructor, but we can see if there's an unusually large distribution, because we have many sections of the same course that are large numbers. And so we can see if there is an outlier or not, but that's the extent.

Peters: Senator **DeBerg**.

DeBerg: Well, I don't want it in pub—I don't want it easy for students to find, because I think then they'll shop for low easy graders, and I think that's bad—I think that's bad for students. I don't think it's good for them. It's also—you know, so I'll say that. It's also bad for demanding and low-grading instructors at a time when obviously people are going to be scrambling for enrollments since enrollments seem to count so much right now, so I also think it's unfair to really demanding professors. I think it's good to have—for instance, in Liberal Arts Core categories, I think it's good to have grade distributions there to look at consistency across sections and what not. So I would be in favor of some kind of password or CAT ID-

protected data base where people, maybe all faculty and academic administrators or some—you know, so there's a number of people who have access to this. I don't have a problem of that for faculty use especially, but I just think it's bad all the way around for students to have access to this information. I mean, if they want to find it, they can find it somewhere, but I don't know why we should make it easy for them.

Patton: And we could do exactly what you're talking about in terms of level of security by CAT ID things like that. Historically, though, we do run an internal grade distribution report which does categorize by department, by liberal arts categories, by liberal arts total. So we already have existing reports that do exactly what you are mentioning.

DeBerg: It doesn't filter down very well, though. Department Heads tend to sit on it, at least in my experience. I didn't, but it's my experience now, so I think it would be better to have it more widely available than just giving a copy to the Department Head. That's what still happens. See, I haven't seen it in years. I haven't seen it since I was the Department Head, so I didn't even know they were coming out still. So

Peters: Senator **MacLin**

MacLin: I think in part it's difficult for students to interpret just on their own. A high grade point average in a course could mean that the teacher is an easy grader or it could mean that they use a mastery approach where people get to redo assignments until a certain level of accomplishment. And if you look at the GPA of my classes, I think they'd probably be high, and I was questioned at some point by my PAC or my Department Head about that. I could justify it by showing my—what I do in my class which is they are allowed to progress and get better throughout the course, and then those grades have a higher weight than the grades in the beginning when they didn't know what the heck they were doing. But if you just look at it, there were many faculty members, and, as an untenured person, PAC members who would look at my GPA distribution and go, "We've got a serious problem here. She's giving away A's. She's work—she's, you know, doing all the grade inflation stuff." And so I think if it's difficult for faculty to monitor, I think it's very difficult for students to interpret, and I think it

will encourage the shopping for easy classes when that's not necessarily informative. And just quickly I'd like to point out, if you go to that last page of the packet [see Addendum 6 to these Minutes], if there's more data, there's—you can actually get an interesting story out of what's going on. If you look to Professor Yong, you can see that he or she has a fairly low average grade in his or her classes and yet a fairly high student satisfaction score. And I think that kind of thing can be very telling. It means that those students, even if they're not doing well, recognize that that class was being taught very well but it just—they didn't do well in it, and so it de-correlated the punishing a professor for their low grade. So whatever that professor is doing, if I were—I would be interested from a pedagogical standpoint saying "You're doing something right, if you are able to keep people happy even if some of them don't do well." And I don't mean "happy" like a customer is happy. I mean, that they're really—they're doing something in the class that's meaningful to them even though all students are still not getting an A.

Patton: Your point is well taken. What I'm suggesting is just kind of step 1, I guess. If you look at some of these sites, though, some of them are very elaborate because they go—they tie course evaluations to the distribution of grades, so they give just exactly what you're talking about. Some of them actually give to the extent of student comments. If you look at MyEdu, like you've seen what Scott (**Peters**) was showing, you can go out there and you can actually see a list of comments that students make about instructors, exactly like you're getting at. I remember one that just struck me was, "This is the hardest course you'll ever take, and you'll have the most fun in it." So the correlation of difficult grades but a wonderful course.

DeBerg: They can see that now?

Patton: Yeah.

MacLin: On these public sites.

DeBerg: Oh, but not on ours.

Patton: No.

DeBerg: Oh, ok, good.

Patton: And the public sites are student-reported, they are not institutionally-reported.

DeBerg: How's that different from RateMyProfessor?

Patton: It's not.

DeBerg: It's not.

Peters: Vice-Chair **Smith**.

Smith: Yeah. One point I want to make is informational and that is that the Senate in April of 2008 approved a proposal, a motion, a movement, whatever the—to ask the Provost to provide—the then Provost to provide or establish a policy that ensured that Department Heads provide all UNI faculty and instructors with information on their class GPA's and on comparable—GPA's for comparable classes. I don't know if that was ever implemented. It was approved by the Senate. So we were on record as supporting, not grade information to students, but grade information to faculty so that they could manage their grades, hopefully, and kind of reduce some of the variance. My belief is that if you do that faculty will self-manage a bit. People at the high end and low end, you know, the very hard graders, the very easy grades will tend to move a bit towards the middle, and that would reduce some of the opportunities for grade shopping among students, and because of that, assuming that were done, I wouldn't have a big problem with doing what these schools have done and making the information available to students. But before we do that, I'd like to make it to faculty for sure so that faculty can kind of adjust their grading practices in light of what their peers do. I think that's really the important thing.

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

East: It seems to me since the information is out there anyway, and you're already giving it away to various people, I would just as soon that if the student's going to go somewhere and look at that, I'd just as soon they came to UNI's website and looked at it. They might see something else there that's useful to them or encouraging them to actually come to UNI. I assume that this—or to stay at UNI or whatever, that these mostly are going to be available or used by continuing students rather than new students, but it could be the other way. I also think transparency is a good thing, and since the information is out there, rather than trying to hide it, we might gain some slight positive benefit or image effect by showing this information ourselves and making it debatable. But I would keep the faculty names separate from the sections, as you're currently doing. I think any student who's smart enough to remember that, "Oh, there's a Schedule of Classes that lists faculty names next to section numbers," so they'll write a computer program or do their own thing to go find out that information is probably—you know, it's worth their—it's ok for them to know it maybe.

Peters: Senator **Hakes**.

Hakes: At this time, though, we're only discussing the grade distributions but not the instructor evaluation data. Is that correct?

Patton: Correct.

Hakes: Do we have the right to release the instructor evaluation data by instructor that would attach? I don't think that contractually that we can. Which would be nice—I mean, if this is for the—if this is released, I would certainly want my instructor evaluation data along with it. If I had to have my name beside my section, I would want that. But if I—I may not have the right to even

DeBerg: Access to a faculty member's evaluation file and its contents is quite severely limited.

Hakes: That's what I thought.

DeBerg: Perusing the Master Agreement I see here.

Peters: Are there other questions? Senator **Bruess**.

Bruess: Phil [**Patton**], what is the status with our sister schools, Iowa and Iowa State? What have they done?

Patton: Yeah, I couldn't find anything on Iowa State's site. Iowa does do this, but it's like Betty [**DeBerg**] was talking about, password protected, so I couldn't get in to see it, because I don't have a Hawk ID, but they do have it available to their—internally on their campus. And I could find nothing on Iowa State.

Peters: Chair **Funderburk**.

Funderburk: If you don't use the faculty member's name, how do you track sections by number when the faculty members are changing in section numbers? I know like in LAC courses I teach when I'm off keep coming in, and my section number tends to change most of the time when I come and go. So, if you're listing a class by section number, then it's like it would be apples and oranges when you start aggregating all that stuff. If section 2 across 4 semesters had 3 different instructors, so how would you track that, if you don't do it by instructor name?

Patton: It's a semester-by-semester view only. I am not creating an ongoing aggregate.

Funderburk: Ok.

Peters: Senator **Dolgener**.

Dolgener: Is there anything that you can think of that might produce some kind of financial impact relative to releasing this information? One way or the other? Or is it just information?

Patton: Off the top of my head, Forrest, I can't think of anything.

Peters: Senator **Gallagher**.

Gallagher: I guess my concern is that, well, it stems from an experience I had just this past week. On Thursday morning we were having a great discussion in an honors seminar, and suddenly one of the students out of the clear blue sky completely derailed the discussion to say—they had just turned in papers that day—“How are you going to grade our papers?” Well, I had already laid out quite a bit of detail in a detailed syllabus, and I said to her, “Are you that worried about your grade?” And every one of them shook their heads, and said “Yes, we’re honor students. We’re worried about our.....” There was laughter, you know, a nervous laughter. And I guess my concern is, as an educator here and as that’s my field, is that whole sort of “making the grade” mentality and grades as commodities, and the more we do to exacerbate that and take students’ eyes off of what they’re actually learning is of concern to me. And so I would actually say, in a word, “No.” I don’t think it’s a good idea to add to that mentality. And people who study academic motivation as a particular field of scholarship would tell you—like Martin Covington spoke on—entitled “Making the Grade.” He talks about how that actually lowers performance when you continually focus students’ attention on the grade they’re going to get. Essentially many students, if not most, are so concerned about not failing, and whenever you put someone’s eyes on, you know, a negative, sort of “I don’t want to fail,” you know, the motivation is all on what they don’t want. It actually depressed student performance. It leads to things like procrastination out of fear, and I just wanted to add that part as a reason why I think we wouldn’t want to do.

Peters: Senator **Terlip**.

Terlip: Yeah, I’m wondering what the impetus was for this discussion? Why did you come and ask us this? What was the reason that we’re faced with this question of, “Do we want to publish it or not?”? Is it a bandwagon thing that everybody’s doing it? Or, you know, why?

Patton: It’s been so long since the time we first talked to getting here, I’m trying to remember why. The best of my memory is it was just coming up time for re-write of the Grade Distribution Report, so part of the concept is

“how would we re-write this report?”. Terry’s [**Hogan**] comment about how many reports are being re-written in the new system. So the question was also getting a request from Liberal Arts Core for their standard release of information by GPA. So I thought it was time to come forward and say, “Do you want it, you know, publically on the UNI website?” No great bandwagon. No great arm twisting. Just a, kind of, it’s here; do you want

Terlip: No, I was just wondering if there was some great advantage we were going to get from doing this that, you know, would make it

Patton: No.

Terlip: Ok.

Patton: No. I think it goes back a little bit—I think, Phil [**East**] said—I wasn’t sure—just a kind of transparency kind of thing. We have it. We’ve been doing it externally for 10 years. Why would we not do it internally?

Peters: We have probably close to about a minute left before our scheduled time to adjourn. Do we want to extend for any time or shall we wrap things up?

Patton: Could I ask just one question?

Peters: Certainly.

Patton: And this may not be fair, but basically I’m going to ask you if you wouldn’t mind by a show of hands, “Should I continue this and come up with a more formalized proposal?” or “Drop it, Phil. Just drop it, and don’t ever come back.” Ok?

Peters: Senator **Shaw**.

Shaw: I just want to make one more comment on a show of hands before we get there. I will agree with Senator **DeBerg** and Senator **Gallagher**. I’ve had students--because I advise, I’ve had students come in and say to me, “I need to get into a class that will give me a good GPA because I can’t have

my GPA go low. So I need an easy teacher.” And so they are in that mindset. They do want to make sure that they can go the easiest route to get to the end product, because they feel that 1) economically, they can’t afford to stay any longer in case they don’t do well, 2) there’s some outside forces pushing them to have a high GPA to compete in the market.

Peters: I heard a moderate level of support for making these available internally and a tiny bit of support for making them available externally. Shall we ask Register **Patton** to—I think our two options are either to tell him—to ask him to drop it or to ask him to prepare a plan for distributing it internally. [voices making comments] Shall we take a quick straw poll as we’re running out of time here? In favor of coming back with a plan for sharing it internally?

DeBerg: Maybe with a password protection?

Peters: Password protected, sharing it internally for faculty member and appropriate staff member use?

Male voice: As opposed to dropping it?

Peters: [counting] As opposed to dropping it. [continued counting] Eight, nine, ten. The other option would be to just drop it. Two people say just drop it altogether. So there is some level of support for some sharing among faculty members.

Patton: Could I steal 15 seconds more?

Peters: Sure.

Patton: If you don’t mind, I would like to come back at a later time and talk to you about a proposal I’d like to do about how the change in advance registration is done. I’d like to just, again, throw out some ideas and get your opinion on that. And then just as a point of information for those of you who work with students, particularly those of you who work with graduate students, the new cycle of fees that are coming out, the Late Registration Fee is changing. Right now, for those of you who work in that

area, right now the Late Registration Fee is \$20. At the Board of Regents' request, and to get in conjunction with our sister institutions, that now goes to a sliding scale based on the number of days that you're late, meaning after the first day from \$30, \$60, to \$100. So words to the wise, if you've got students who routinely register late for a term, the academic—or I should say the financial penalty is going up considerably. This will be for Fiscal Year '14. And finally, thank you all. I appreciate it.

ADJOURNMENT

Peters: Thank you. [other voices expressing thanks] And if there's nothing further, we'll just consider ourselves adjourned. [5:01 p.m.]

Submitted by,

Sherry Nuss
Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Next meeting:
Date: 10/08/12
Oak Room, Maucker Union
3:30 p.m.

Follows are 6 addenda to these Minutes.

Mandatory Fee Comparison	Regent Institutions
--------------------------	---------------------

[illegible]

**Faculty Chair Funderburk
Remarks for Fall Faculty Meeting
September 17, 2012**

The face of American Higher Education is changing in radical ways. Persistent reductions in public funding for education, increased competition from a variety of sources and a significant shift in the perceptions and expectations from the general public are driving much of this change.

While these are national trends, they have had a significant impact on UNI and continue to do so. UNI and similarly positioned universities are particularly challenged by the changes that are occurring. The current realities in American Higher Education seem to parallel the trends in the American Economy where the rich get richer but many of the others are left out.

Now, in case you missed the memo or are new here, UNI is NOT one of the Rich!

A key challenge for UNI in the coming years will be to define a unique identity as an institution and to clearly articulate the importance of this institution and its mission for the continued success of our students as well as the State of Iowa. It is easy to become so engaged in the challenges of the moment that we neglect to address this larger looming issue. I would submit that, once our identity is defined, acquisition and assignment of resources should become easier.

As UNI works to more clearly articulate its identity, it is critical that faculty play a central role in determining the course of UNI as it seeks to take the fullest advantage of opportunities presented in this new landscape of higher education.

The challenges ahead are many and diverse, but we are positioned well due to the impressive expertise and knowledge displayed in this faculty. Given the magnitude of the challenges and opportunities facing UNI, it is imperative that we utilize this invaluable resource for the benefit of the

university and the state of Iowa. Faculty should be involved in all aspects of planning for the future in cooperation with the administration, students, Board of Regents and other constituent groups.

Unfortunately, recently the expertise of the faculty has not been consistently sought at times of critical decision making. Faculty content experts have complained that they have not been invited to the table to take part in discussions about change.

Faculty leaders have been working diligently in the past year to improve communications with UNI students, the administration and the Board of Regents. We are stressing the importance of faculty participation in all levels of faculty shared governance. If nothing else, events of last year should have driven home to all parties the need for faculty to be actively involved in all areas of the university.

I am happy to say that there are many reasons to be encouraged going forward as all parties are interested in improving communication and cooperation.

This is a pivotal moment for the University of Northern Iowa.

This year the 10th UNI president will be selected. That person will be charged with leading this institution forward through a series of changes. However, the responsibility for plotting our course cannot be left to the vision of a single individual or leadership team. The faculty of UNI is ready and eager to work collaboratively in plotting our course forward.

The role of faculty in helping arrive at solutions to the many challenges will be crucial.

It is the duty of every faculty member to step forward and offer their assistance in guiding this university in order to assure the richest experience for the students at UNI and also to secure the greatest benefits for the state of Iowa.

Please don't wait to be asked to help, but rather actively seek opportunities to share your talents for the benefit of all. Service on committees, while sometimes draining, is an essential component of shared governance and collaborative efforts. Please demonstrate a willingness to

serve and also demand that those committees on which you serve function with the greatest integrity, efficiency and impact.

There will be many opportunities this year to take part in the process of determining the future of UNI. The first of these occurs today following this meeting as the Board of Regents is sponsoring an open forum to discuss the qualities of the next UNI President. Please take part in that meeting which begins at 5pm in the Commons Ballroom.

Later in the search process, there will be presentations by candidates for the position of UNI President. Please attend these whenever possible and pass along your observations to the members of the Presidential Search Committee.

Additionally, we will be working to present a series of meetings and presentations for the faculty and university community with an overarching topic of “What is the UNI of 2025?” These sessions will explore the issues, possible solutions and potential pitfalls facing us.

Currently, all branches of faculty governance are working together to sponsor a speaker for what will be the first of these presentations. Details are being finalized and we are inviting NISG, the student government, to join us in sponsoring a presentation by **Benjamin Ginsberg**. Dr. Ginsberg is the David Bernstein Professor of Political Science, Director of the Center for the Study of American Government, and Chair of the Government Program of Advanced Academic Programs at Johns Hopkins University. His provocative book entitled, “The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why it Matters,” deals with many hot button topics in American Higher Education. Given that one of the first actions by President Leath, the new President at Iowa State, is to call for a review in order to seek greater efficiencies in the systems at ISU, it makes this topic relevant locally as well as nationally. This presentation should result in some lively discussion and we hope that all elements of the university will take advantage of this opportunity to discuss such an important topic. More details will be forthcoming soon.

Last year was perhaps the most challenging yet in the history of this university.

Many decisions and actions of the past few years have strained relations between the various groups on campus. The impacts of many of the changes have not yet been fully realized and absorbed.

And yet, I still believe that we are poised to have a terrific year and a brighter future. As we all work together, we will discover the opportunities that lie within the many challenges. We will make great strides this year in setting UNI on a course to enjoy unprecedented success.

Congratulations on being part of UNI at this exciting time. I look forward to working with you as we go forward this year in building a better future for all.

Good luck with your teaching and research this year. Take full advantage of every opportunity to enjoy and encourage our students.

A very exciting and eventful year lies ahead of us!!

Thomas Jon Switzer Obituary

Thomas Jon Switzer was born May 16, 1939 in Marshalltown, Iowa, son of Howard R. Switzer and Gladysce Niederhauser Switzer. He died August 29, 2012. He graduated from Marshalltown High School in 1957 and received a B. A. from the University of Northern Iowa in 1961. After teaching history for five years at East High School in Waterloo, Iowa, he worked for the American Sociological Association project funded by the National Science Foundation to develop curricular materials for high schools.

Switzer received a Ph. D. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Michigan in 1973, where he served as Teaching Fellow and later as Assistant Professor, Undergraduate and Certification Chairman, Associate Professor, and Associate Dean. From 1987-2003, he was Dean and Professor at the College of Education, University of Northern Iowa. In 2003, he became Dean of the Judith Herb College of Education in Toledo, Ohio, where he retired in 2010 as Dean Emeritus.

Some of his many accomplishments include establishment of the Renaissance Group as a force in the national initiative to reform teacher education, development of the Judith Herb College of Education at the University of Toledo as a state of the art technology-mediated facility, receipt of an IBM teacher education grant for initiatives in technology for the College of Education faculty at UT, recipient of a PT3 catalyst grant for implementation of technology into teacher education at UT, launching of the Camp Adventure program on the Toledo campus, establishment of a UNI Center for Early Developmental Education, creation of a new early childhood education school at UNI, development and implementation of a state-wide network of clinical supervisors and teacher cadres to support the UNI student teaching program, recipient of the AACTE Award for Excellence in International Education, author of numerous publications on education, grantee of major awards from Kellogg, IBM, the McElroy Foundation, USAID, the U. S. Department of Defense, and the U. S. Department of Education.

He was preceded in death by his parents and one brother (Don Switzer). He is survived by his four children: Tim (Donna) Switzer, Brad (Pam) Switzer, Beth (Michael) Haworth, and Jeremy Switzer; sister Patricia (Robert) Metge of Marshalltown; eight grandchildren: John Patrick Medicus, Thomas Switzer, Ryan Switzer, Christopher Haworth, Andrew Haworth, Haley Switzer, Brad Haworth, and Colton Switzer. He is also survived by nieces Kellie Meyer, Jill Weiskerker, Doniese Switzer, Darcy Switzer, nephew Jeff Metge, grandnieces and grandnephews.

He passed from this world peacefully with his children present on Wednesday, August 29, 2012.

Ad hoc committee on curriculum review

Membership:

- **Barbara Cutter**, Associate Professor, History & Interim Director of Women's & Gender Studies. Professor Cutter was heavily involved in revising the Curriculum Handbook in 2008, when she was an administrative fellow.
- **Todd Evans**, Associate Professor, Health, Physical Education and Leisure Services. Professor Evans is the current chair of HPELS Curriculum Committee and a past chair of the College of Education Curriculum Committee .
- **Ira Simet**, Associate Professor, Chemistry. Professor Simet is chair of the Committee on Academic Program Reviews, and is a past chair of the University Faculty Senate.
- **Jerry Smith**, Professor, Management. Professor Smith is Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect of the University Faculty Senate and was co-chair of the Academic Program Assessment Task Force.
- **Laura Terlip**, Associate Professor of Communication Studies. Professor Terlip is a member of the University Faculty Senate and Graduate Council.
- +1 member of University Curriculum Committee yet to be named

Charge:

To review our curriculum policies, curriculum handbook and standard curriculum review practices and recommend changes that will: 1) assure faculty control over the curriculum; and, 2) enable faculty bodies to actively monitor and manage curriculum and academic programs.

Ideally, the committee will have a framework of its recommendations completed and will consult with relevant faculty committees early in the Spring semester. After any necessary revisions, the full package will be ready to present to the University Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council by mid-Spring.

**Comments by Terry Hogan, Vice President for Student Affairs
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 24, 2012**

Introduction

Official fall 2012 enrollment was 12,273, a decline of 895 over the previous fall and approximately 500 less than expected.

Enrollment was down across virtually all categories:

- New from high school
- Transfer
- Graduate
- International
- Other
- Continuing students across all class ranks

Multicultural enrollment was up slightly (both new and overall).

Relative to new students, there was a decline in both applications (-9.1%) and yield rate (-4 points).

Relative to continuing students, there was a decline in return rate (spring to fall) in all categories (approx -3 points).

Anticipated contributors were:

- Decline in Iowa high school graduates
- Large class of graduating seniors
- Impact of eliminated programs

Not able to be predicted contributors were:

- Increased competitiveness
- Continuing concerns about economy/costs of higher education
- Negative publicity last spring about program changes

Questions forwarded from Scott Peters (on behalf of Senators) are in bold:

1. **Provide information on the enrollment summit this past summer (why formed, why summer, why not advertised better to general faculty, what are its goals, etc, etc)**

Date of Enrollment Summit: July 12, 2012

Purpose: To raise awareness of the need for broader involvement in new student recruitment; to educate about current practices and plans; and to generate/discuss ideas for improved recruitment practice.

Timing: Was held in summer because that is when we get a clearer picture of fall enrollment and also when the next recruitment cycle begins. Goal was to make enhancements to our effort that would impact the class of 2013 (and therefore needing to be in place prior to fall 2012).

Invitees: Academic department heads, deans/associates; student/faculty leaders; administrators with recruitment-related roles (about 80 attended). As an initial campus-wide gathering, it was not intended for general faculty. Future efforts will be expanded.

2. Number and percentage of out-of-state students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as the last six years

Enrollment by Residency at Fall Census

	Resident	Res %	Non-Resident	Non %	International	Int %	Total
Fall 2007	11,444	90.8%	693	5.5%	472	3.7%	12,609
Fall 2008	11,562	89.6%	882	6.8%	464	3.6%	12,908
Fall 2009	11,896	90.9%	731	5.6%	453	3.5%	13,080
Fall 2010	11,978	90.7%	743	5.6%	480	3.6%	13,201
Fall 2011	11,915	90.5%	765	5.8%	488	3.7%	13,168
Fall 2012	11,095	90.4%	724	5.9%	454	3.7%	12,273

3. Number and percentage of international students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as the last six years

See chart above.

4. Number and percentage of minority students at UNI for Fall 2012 as well as the last six years

Enrollment by Ethnicity at Fall Census

	White	%	Minority	%	International	%	No Response	%	Total
Fall 2007	10,903	86.5%	745	5.9%	472	3.7%	489	3.9%	12,609
Fall 2008	11,148	86.4%	810	6.3%	464	3.6%	486	3.8%	12,908
Fall 2009	11,568	88.4%	904	6.9%	453	3.5%	155	1.2%	13,080
Fall 2010	11,638	88.2%	922	7.0%	480	3.6%	161	1.2%	13,201
Fall 2011	11,509	87.4%	967	7.3%	488	3.7%	204	1.5%	13,168
Fall 2012	10,601	86.4%	989	8.1%	454	3.7%	229	1.9%	12,273

5. Annual budget for international recruiting (including staff salaries, travel for recruiting, development of promotional material, etc) for the last six years

International Student Recruitment Costs				
	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12*
Marchesani, Kristi Salary (75%)	35,458	35,048	36,431	37,370
Marchesani, Kristi FB (75%)	13,509	12,370	12,095	12,482
Graduate Assistant (100%)	8,392	8,392	4,322	8,892
Silva, Fred Salary (Jan-June, 2011)	0	0	16,205	0
Silva, Fred FB (Jan-June, 2011)	0	0	3,225	0
Dowd, Bryant Salary (25%)	0	0	8,015	9,583
Dowd, Bryant FB (25%)	0	0	3,719	4,506
Total Personnel for Recruitment	57,359	55,810	84,012	72,833
Admissions S&S	89,003	93,395	89,679	72,743
Student Affairs supplemental S&S	0	0	18,975	11,250
Total S&S	89,003	93,395	108,654	83,993
Total International Recruitment	146,362	149,205	192,666	156,826
* Actual overseas recruitment travel was approximately one week less than most years.				

6. What innovative steps, if any, VP Hogan is going to take in order to try to increase the number of out-of-state, international, and minority students at UNI.

Non-resident: We have regionally-based recruiters in Chicago/Twin Cities and we have developed special scholarship program (Good Neighbor Awards) for counties adjacent to Iowa population centers (Dubuque and Quad Cities). Will support these and consider their expansion.

Minority: We have strengthened pipeline programs in Gary, IN and San Antonio, TX. We have initiated planning for a Marshalltown program, and have identified Des Moines, Waterloo, Quad Cities and Storm Lake/Denison as having potential for expansion.

International: We will add two new recruiters through Office of International Programs (in FY13) to work in South America and Middle East where we currently have limited presence. We have developed peer group through Admissions Office and added one FTE to international application review/processing which contributes to recruitment. We have tested the use of “agents” in select overseas markets with limited success.

7. Like many public universities, UNI has traditionally relied on its low tuition rates to attract students. Unfortunately, tuition increases have eroded our price advantage over private universities, and our sister public institutions have been very aggressive in recruiting in-state undergraduates. Add in declining high school enrollments in Iowa and a general questioning of the value of higher education and you get a situation where UNI may no longer be able to rely on an adequate number of students applying for admission. Assuredly we do some marketing to increase student demand, but arguably we are not as focused on attracting and enrolling new students as our new environment requires. Do we at UNI truly have a student enrollment and retention culture at UNI, as well as the specific practices and institutional commitments needed to make it effective? If not, what are we doing to develop such a culture?

We are, as an institution, in a transition from an Admissions-focused, processing of applications mode to a University-wide enrollment management mode.

The Enrollment Summit was an effort to advance the process; the pace of change must be accelerated.

Enrollment Council has met twice to review ideas generated at the Summit, and one idea that has been agreed to is that we will form a recruitment/marketing working group that will routinely connect Admissions and Marketing with college leadership (associate deans).

8. When organizations lose valued employees, they typically conduct exit interviews to find out why these people are leaving. When businesses lose customers, they often do research to determine how their products or services might have fallen short of customer expectations. What do we do when a student who is performing well in the classroom leaves UNI without graduating? Do existing student retention efforts encompass any attempts to gather information from these "customers" so that we can identify possible shortcomings in our "products" and improve them? Are there any projects underway that will create this kind of information and put it to use?

We tackle this in three ways. First, there is an annual Board of Regents study that surveys students who are not-retained (leavers). It suffers from a low response rate and a high potential for respondent bias. It points to two major reasons for non-retention: personal reasons and finances.

Second, more recently-developed approach is a survey of non-matriculants conducted last year for the first time and underway now for the current cohort. Most significant concern last fall was finances/cost.

Third, is a post-hoc analysis of characteristics and academic performance of leavers compared to those retained. This has been developed by IR and uses data from new Map-Works programs where we have 92% participation by new students. While entering academic characteristics are similar, average GPA on leavers is 2.1 (which could be due to any number of issues: social, academic, financial, mental health, behavioral, etc).

9. I think the interesting data points for my department are those related to recruitment. Specifically, I need a comparison for the last 2- 3 years on the breakdown on enrollment by college (dividing CHAS into CNS and humanities).

Enrollment by Primary Major's College at Fall Census

	CBA	CNS	COE	CHFA	CSBS	Other	Total
Fall 2008	2,495	1,850	2,683	2,053	1,949	1,878	12,908
Fall 2009	2,374	1,989	2,875	2,134	2,039	1,669	13,080
Fall 2010	2,342	1,966	2,938	2,170	2,099	1,686	13,201
Fall 2011	2,211	2,007	2,915	2,273	2,127	1,635	13,168
Fall 2012	2,056	1,870	2,707	2,186	2,033	1,421	12,273

10. Need enrollment data sorted to compare new students (from high school & transferring from CC or other university) no matter if they are ranked as freshman, sophomore, etc...

New Students by Admission Type at Fall Census

	New Freshmen	Transfer	Graduates	Unclassified	Total
Fall 2008	2,015	1,052	405	314	3,786
Fall 2009	1,946	1,088	445	309	3,788
Fall 2010	1,978	1,138	413	387	3,916
Fall 2011	1,937	1,041	616	202	3,796
Fall 2012	1,704	985	563	104	3,356

11. We would like to know why the enrollment data would continue to be confidential after the official numbers were posted. Departments need data in order to make good decisions.

Enrollment data are not confidential. Our challenge is in replacing all reports that existed in previous student system with new reports being developed out of the new system. We started with those that are externally-mandated and are working to fulfill other information needs as quickly as we can.

One of concepts (of nine) from the Enrollment Summit that we have committed to is to develop a self-service portal that would serve each academic department and college with real-time data on applications, admissions, commitments, enrollment, etc.

Highlighted concepts from Enrollment Summit

1. **Expand faculty contact** with prospective students and their families. Ensure there are contacts in each academic department relative to arranging Admissions visits.
2. Improve **communication across campus** on enrollment-related matters so there is greater common understanding of current state (avoid last minute calls for help).
3. Provide **academic departments with timely reports** and information they need to communicate directly with their prospective and admitted students.
4. **Expand proven practices** used by some units to others.

- a. Provide Panther Peek Days for all colleges
 - b. Develop student “admission ambassadors” at colleges and/or departments.
 - c. Ensure at least one departmental communication to each admitted student.
- 5. Improve **relationships with community colleges** (relative to articulation and student transfer).
- 6. **Grow summer camps/conference** programs so more young people have a positive connection to UNI earlier in their lives. Systematically capture names and contact information.
- 7. Market UNI more aggressively; develop and deploy **more pointed competitive messages**.
- 8. Improve **coordination among colleges, Admissions and University Relations** (Marketing) relative to recruitment and messaging efforts.
- 9. Provide opportunities for faculty to **refine curricula** to meet changing needs. Encourage best practices that increase four-year graduation rates. Facilitate more effective transfer processes and meet continuing education needs of non-traditional students.

Grade Distribution Database

Criteria Selected: **Term(s):** Spring 2012 **Department:** BIOL

Results: 102

[1] 2 | [Next](#) | [End](#) (2 total pages) [Spreadsheet \(CSV\)](#)

Spring 2012 (Effective Date: 06-08-2012)

1

Term	<u>Spring 2012</u>				A+	B+	C+	D+	F	I	P	NY
Effective Date	06-08-2012				A	B	C	D	W	R	S	NR
Dept	Subject	Course	Class #	Instructor	A-	B-	C-	D-	WX	Other	NC	
<u>BIOL</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>BIOL-B</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>300</u> <u>(*)</u>	14944	<u>Knox,</u> <u>Eric</u> <u>(*)</u>	6	6	0	1	2	0	0	0
GPA Grades	Total Grades	Section GPA	Avg. Stdnt GPA	% Majors	12	15	9	3	3	0	0	0
68	79	2.940	3.142	83.1%	7	4	2	1	8	0	0	0
GPA Grades Summary					25	25	11	5	F: 2	Non-GPA: 11		

Click on an asterisk to return all instances of that element for the **term specified in this record** only.

2

Term	<u>Spring 2012</u>				Distribution	GPA Grades	Total Grades
Effective Date	06-08-2012						
Dept	Subject	Course	Class #	Instructor			
<u>BIOL</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>BIOL-G</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>901</u> <u>(*)</u>	14949	<u>Innes,</u> <u>Roger</u> <u>William</u> <u>(*)</u>	Grade Distribution Not Available - Small Class Size	3	54

Click on an asterisk to return all instances of that element for the **term specified in this record** only.

3

Term	<u>Spring 2012</u>				A+	B+	C+	D+	F	I	P	NY
Effective Date	06-08-2012				A	B	C	D	W	R	S	NR
Dept	Subject	Course	Class #	Instructor	A-	B-	C-	D-	WX	Other	NC	
<u>BIOL</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>BIOL-H</u> <u>(*)</u>	<u>112</u> <u>(*)</u>	14950	<u>Zlotnick,</u> <u>Adam</u> <u>(*)</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ACC Accountancy

ACC 611 V A Heitger Dan L. Accounting for Managers

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	0	6	20	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.62
%	0.0	16.2	54.1	27.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ART Art

ART 181 V2A Radcliffe Reid R. Concepts In Art

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	5	3	6	2	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.26
%	19.2	11.5	23.1	7.7	3.8	11.5	7.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Course Total ART 181

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	5	9	26	12	2	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.48
%	7.9	14.3	41.3	19.0	3.2	4.8	3.2	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Art Total

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	5	3	6	2	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.26
%	19.2	11.5	23.1	7.7	3.8	11.5	7.7	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ATH Anthropology

ATH 175 V A Gnivecki Perry L. Peoples Of The World

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	3	5	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.61
%	16.7	27.8	22.2	0.0	11.1	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Course Total ATH 175

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D+	D	D-	F	W	WP	WF	I	X	Y	P	S	Avg GPA
	3	5	4	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.61
%	16.7	27.8	22.2	0.0	11.1	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



- [MU Registrar](#)
- [Return](#)

MU Grade Distribution Application

Friday, July 06, 2012

Course Number

Instructor

Avg Class Grade

Course Title

Term

Course Dept

ARCH

Search

Clear Form

Course Dept	Course Title	Course Number	Section Number	Term	Course AU	Instructor	A Range	B Range	C Range	D Range	F Avg Grade
ACCTCY	INTRO TO ACCOUNTING	2010	01	SP2011	CBUSN	MILBACH,LAUREN	59	39	16	2	0 3.341
ACCTCY	ACCOUNTING 1	2036	01	SP2011	CBUSN	CUNNINGHAM,BILLIE M	77	84	61	24	12 2.736
ACCTCY	ACCOUNTING 1	2036	02	SP2011	CBUSN	CUNNINGHAM,BILLIE M	106	149	93	54	16 2.658
ACCTCY	ACCOUNTING 2	2037	01	SP2011	CBUSN	PRESTIGIACOMO,CARL CHRI	56	111	100	45	20 2.404
ACCTCY	ACCOUNTING 2	2037	02	SP2011	CBUSN	PRESTIGIACOMO,CARL CHRI	41	111	93	35	7 2.499
ACCTCY	HONORS ACCOUNTING 2 GH	2137H	01	SP2011	CBUSN	NIKOLAI,LOREN ALFRED	10	14	0	0	0 3.429
ACCTCY	HONORS ACCOUNTING 2 GH	2137H	02	SP2011	CBUSN	NIKOLAI,LOREN ALFRED	14	8	2	0	0 3.488
ACCTCY	COMP-BASED DATA SYSTEMS	2258	01	SP2011	CBUSN	HOCKMAN,KRISTEN MICHELL	7	9	8	1	1 2.769
ACCTCY	COMP-BASED DATA SYSTEMS	2258	02	SP2011	CBUSN	HOCKMAN,KRISTEN MICHELL	19	9	4	1	0 3.330
ACCTCY	COMP-BASED DATA SYSTEMS	2258	03	SP2011	CBUSN	HOCKMAN,KRISTEN MICHELL	7	22	6	0	0 2.977
ACCTCY	COMP-BASED DATA SYSTEMS	2258	04	SP2011	CBUSN	HOCKMAN,KRISTEN MICHELL	17	10	6	1	0 3.291
ACCTCY	COMP-BASED DATA SYSTEMS	2258	05	SP2011	CBUSN	HOCKMAN,KRISTEN MICHELL	7	11	10	3	0 2.758

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

GRADE DISTRIBUTION REPORT FOR SPRING 2012 - COLLEGE STATION

COLLEGE: LIBERAL ARTS
DEPARTMENT: ANTHROPOLOGY

SECTION	A	B	C	D	F	TOTAL		A - F	GPR	I	S	U	Q	X	TOTAL	INSTRUCTOR
ANTH-201-501	3 15.00%	5 25.00%	6 30.00%	5 25.00%	1 5.00%	20	2.200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	BRYANT V
ANTH-201-502	18 20.22%	28 31.46%	33 37.08%	5 5.62%	5 5.62%	89	2.551	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	91	GURSKY-DOYEN S
ANTH-201-503	21 21.65%	31 31.96%	33 34.02%	10 10.31%	2 2.06%	97	2.608	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	100	GURSKY-DOYEN S
COURSE TOTAL:	42	64	72	20	8	206	2.544	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	211	
ANTH-202-200	17 100.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	17	4.000	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	18	CARLSON D
ANTH-202-500	23 16.67%	42 30.43%	53 38.41%	17 12.32%	3 2.17%	138	2.471	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	142	WATERS M
COURSE TOTAL:	40	42	53	17	3	155	2.639	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	160	
ANTH-205-501	5 20.83%	8 33.33%	8 33.33%	3 12.50%	0 0.00%	24	2.625	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	ROSE K
ANTH-205-502	13 56.52%	9 39.13%	1 4.35%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	23	3.522	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	WELCH D
ANTH-205-503	19 16.52%	24 20.87%	46 40.00%	22 19.13%	4 3.48%	115	2.278	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	118	ALVARD M
ANTH-205-504	37 13.96%	85 32.08%	91 34.34%	34 12.83%	18 6.79%	265	2.336	4	1	0	17	0	0	0	287	BRYANT V
ANTH-205-505	104 84.55%	17 13.82%	1 0.81%	0 0.00%	1 0.81%	123	3.813	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	124	VIEIRA DE CASTRO L
ANTH-205-506	37 37.00%	47 47.00%	11 11.00%	4 4.00%	1 1.00%	100	3.150	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	101	BLONG J

TERM : 1124
Spring 2011-2012

Percentage Distribution of Grades
University of Wisconsin - Madison
(Non-Cross Listed)

Office of the Registrar
Institutional Reporting

ALS

MICROBIOLOGY
192 MICROBIO

Section	#	Ave	A	AB	B	BC	C	D	F	S	U	CR	N	P	I	NW	NR	Other
		Grades																
		GPA																
101 001	384	2.912	25.5	12.8	25.5	8.9	16.9	9.6		0.3					0.3	0.3		
102 001	38	3.684	60.5	18.4	18.4	2.6												
102 002	39	3.692	53.8	30.8	15.4													
102 003	41	3.683	53.7	34.1	7.3	4.9												
102 004	42	3.726	52.4	40.5	7.1													

General Microbiology Lab

Course Total	160	3.697	55.0	31.3	11.9	1.9												
--------------	-----	-------	------	------	------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

299 002	2	***																
299 007	1	***																
299 008	1	***																
299 012	2	***																
299 030	1	***																
299 043	1	***																
299 049	1	***																
299 061	1	***																
299 064	1	***																
299 071	1	***																
299 073	3	***																
299 091	1	***																

Independent Study

Course Total	16	3.970	93.8	6.3														
--------------	----	-------	------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Biology of Microorganisms

303 001	203	2.805	14.8	12.8	27.6	11.8	29.1	2.0	0.5	1.0					0.5			
304 001	37	3.203	27.0	18.9	35.1	10.8	5.4	2.7										
304 002	37	3.149	18.9	16.2	48.6	8.1	8.1											
304 003	35	3.071	20.0	22.9	31.4	8.6	14.3	2.9										
304 004	40	3.163	20.0	10.0	57.5	7.5	5.0											

Biology of Microorganisms Lab

Course Total	149	3.148	21.5	16.8	43.6	8.7	8.1	1.3										
--------------	-----	-------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

305 001	18	4.000	100.0															
305 002	10	3.950	90.0	10.0														
305 003	17	3.971	94.1	5.9														
305 004	15	3.867	93.3				6.7											

Critical Analyses-Microbiology

Course Total	60	3.950	95.0	3.3			1.7											
--------------	----	-------	------	-----	--	--	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Host-Parasite Interactions

330 001	36	3.306	33.3	25.0	25.0	2.8	13.9											
375 002	40	3.950	97.5				2.5											

Special Topics

450 001	72	3.141	27.8	6.9	48.6	1.4	11.1	2.8		1.4								
470 001	64	3.357	45.3	14.1	23.4	3.1	10.9		1.6	1.6								

Micro Genetics & Mol Machines

545 001	29	3.948	89.7	10.3														
551 001	20	3.400	30.0	25.0	40.0	5.0												
551 002	18	3.639	55.6	16.7	27.8													
551 003	19	3.658	57.9	15.8	26.3													

Physiol Divrsy-Procyot Lab

Course Total	57	3.561	47.4	19.3	31.6	1.8												
--------------	----	-------	------	------	------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Indus Microbiol/Biotechnology

632 001	24	3.521	16.7	70.8	12.5													
682 014	1	***																
682 061	1	***																

Senior Honors Thesis

Course Total	2	***																
699 002	1	***																

June 26, 2012

* Please note: This report does not combine crosslisted courses

*** Please note: In order to protect student privacy, grade distributions for classes or class sections with fewer than five students have been redacted.

The data in its current draft form is incomplete and has not yet been fully verified or cross referenced. In its present raw form it cannot yield accurate analysis, interpretations or conclusions.

Faculty Name	Annual Salary from State Appropriations	Annual Salary from Restricted Funds	Annual Salary from Designated Funds	Annual Salary from Auxiliary Enterprise Funds	Annual Salary from Teaching Overload	Total Comp: Salary + Est Benefits	Unduplicated Number of Sections Taught	UG Class Enrollment	Grad Class Enrollment	Total Class Enrollment	UG SCH Approx	Grad SCH Approx	Total SCH Approx
GORMUS, N A	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	2	72	1	73	219	0	219
HAYUNGA, D K	\$136,270	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$170,338	5	70	43	113	210	129	339
ISBELL, S E	\$12,513	\$0	\$41,710	\$0	\$0	\$67,779	10	354	4	358	1074	0	1074
KAR, S	\$7,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,750	1	69	0	69	207	0	207
KHAN, A K	\$8,167	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,927	3	88	0	88	264	0	264
LI, K	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	404	1	405	1215	0	1215
LOCKWOOD, J M	\$0	\$0	\$75,000	\$0	\$0	\$93,750	7	404	1	405	1215	0	1215
LOCKWOOD, L J	\$7,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,198	1	0	8	8	0	24	24
LUNG, P	\$157,020	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$196,275	9	34	130	164	102	393	495
MILLER, C D	\$10,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,477	3	135	17	152	405	51	456
MOORE, J H	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,116	3	112	0	112	336	0	336
NARAYANASA, A P	\$18,667	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,334	1	60	0	60	180	0	180
PANTA, H N	\$18,167	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,709	4	163	0	163	489	0	489
PETERSON, J R	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$16,395	3	0	29	29	0	87	87
PHILPOT, M T	\$9,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,837	2	13	39	51	114	114	153
RIVAS-AGUI, J A	\$18,667	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,334	3	85	0	85	255	0	255
SABHERWAL, S	\$159,610	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$199,513	9	144	41	185	435	123	558
SARKAR, S K	\$134,996	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$168,745	14	86	109	195	261	408	669
SAUER, M C	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,465	1	0	7	7	0	21	21
SCHOENING, D A	\$4,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,919	1	0	41	41	0	123	123
SCHWEMER, L C	\$64,185	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$80,231	12	360	151	511	1083	450	1533
SEALE, B L	\$0	\$0	\$40,910	\$0	\$0	\$51,138	6	798	2	800	2400	0	2400
SEO, Y	\$7,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,198	2	71	0	71	213	0	213
SHI, J	\$142,874	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$178,593	5	205	70	275	618	207	825
SONG, J	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	4	189	0	189	567	0	567
SRIRAM, P	\$6,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,813	1	55	142	142	261	168	429
SWANSON, P E	\$149,492	\$10,089	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$201,053	9	87	27	114	261	168	429
TIPTON, J M	\$4,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,372	1	27	0	27	81	0	81
TURNER, J D	\$25,001	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,326	8	501	4	505	1515	0	1515
UDDIN, M R	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	51	0	51	153	0	153
WEBBER, P F	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,116	3	87	43	130	261	129	390
WEEDON, L S	\$3,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,826	1	51	0	51	153	0	153
YAHAMI, E A	\$10,833	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,541	1	276	0	276	828	0	828
YONG, L	\$91,380	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$114,225	2	78	0	78	234	0	234
AKALIN, G	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	2	0	87	87	261	0	261
ALVERSON, M	\$9,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,837	2	64	50	114	192	150	342
BAKER, R C	\$166,283	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$207,854	3	32	0	32	96	0	96
BOND, P L	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	150	0	150	450	0	450
CAGLE, C J	\$14,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,500	3	131	146	277	393	444	837
CANNON, A R	\$123,960	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,950	8	185	11	196	555	31	586
CHEN, H	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	185	11	196	555	31	586
CHEN, H	\$91,417	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$114,271	9	185	11	196	555	31	586
DAVIS, C	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,750	1	218	133	351	654	399	1053
DESAL, M N	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,729	7	432	110	542	1296	330	1626
EAKIN, M E	\$123,783	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$99,886	10	1	161	162	3	483	486
ESTMAI, G O	\$79,909	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$213,534	7	181	0	181	543	0	543
FRAZIER, G V	\$116,745	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,875	3	181	0	181	543	0	543
HOUSE, D M	\$13,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	181	0	181	543	0	543
KANG, T	\$17,333	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,666	1	181	0	181	543	0	543

Because of its unique partnership with TSC, many Brownsville faculty teach both UTB and TSC courses which are reported separately. Only UTB faculty salary and teaching information are included in this report.

The data in its current draft form is incomplete and has not yet been fully verified or cross referenced. In its present raw form it cannot yield accurate analysis, interpretations or conclusions.

Faculty Name	WIGHTED UG SCH Approx	WIGHTED Grad SCH Approx	Total WIGHTED SCH Approx	Average grade	Minimum grade	Maximum grade	Standard deviation of grades	Average student satisfaction score	Research Expenditures FY09-10	Research Expenditures FY06-10
GORMUS, N A	377.01	.	377.01	2.98	.	.	0.79	4.57	\$0	\$0
HAYUNGA, D K	361.44	441.18	802.62	2.63	.	.	1.05	4.5	\$0	\$0
ISELL, S E	1839.42	.	1839.42	3.02	.	.	0.82	4.71	\$0	\$0
KAR, S	356.25	.	356.25	3.91	.	.	0.33	4.4	\$0	\$0
KHAN, A K	456.72	.	456.72	3.14	.	.	1.36	3.4	\$0	\$0
LI, K	\$0	\$0
LOCKWOOD, J M	2090.79	.	2090.79	3.8	.	.	0.44	3.61	\$0	\$0
LOCKWOOD, L J	.	582.48	582.48	3.71	.	.	0.45	5	\$0	\$0
LUNG, P	174.6	2657.61	2832.21	2.58	.	.	1.71	5	\$0	\$0
MILLER, C D	687.63	174.42	862.05	2.71	.	.	1.01	4.55	\$0	\$44,350
MOORE, J H	581.28	.	581.28	3.05	.	.	0.77	4.75	\$0	\$0
NARAYANASA, A P	309.54	.	309.54	2.67	.	.	0.75	4.6	\$0	\$0
PANTA, H N	842.25	.	842.25	2.71	.	.	0.76	4.89	\$0	\$0
PETERSON, J R	297.54	.	297.54	3.85	.	.	0.36	4.58	\$0	\$0
PHILPOT, M T	67.47	389.88	457.35	3.17	.	.	0.8	4.4	\$0	\$0
RIVAS-AGUI, J A	439.29	.	439.29	3.24	.	.	0.73	4.83	\$0	\$0
SABHERWAL, S	752.55	670.86	1423.41	3.33	.	.	0.67	4.67	\$0	\$0
SARKAR, S K	449.67	687.01	7036.68	3.77	.	.	0.42	3.6	\$0	\$0
SAUER, M C	71.82	.	71.82	3.29	.	.	0.45	4	\$0	\$0
SCHOENING, D A	420.66	.	420.66	3.59	.	.	0.49	3.21	\$0	\$0
SCHWEMER, L C	1539	.	3284.25	2.9	.	.	0.91	4.64	\$0	\$0
SEALE, B L	3785.58	.	3785.58	3.15	.	.	0.78	4.91	\$0	\$0
SEO, Y	364.77	.	364.77	3.45	.	.	0.62	4	\$0	\$0
SHI, J	1063.56	707.94	1771.5	2.27	.	.	1	4.22	\$0	\$0
SONG, J	980.91	.	980.91	\$0	\$0
SRIRAM, P	\$0	\$0
SWANSON, P E	449.67	1575.36	2025.03	4	.	.	0	5	\$0	\$0
TIPTON, J M	138.27	.	138.27	2.19	.	.	1.29	2	\$0	\$0
TURNER, J D	2524.23	.	2524.23	3.13	.	.	0.75	4.63	\$0	\$0
UDDIN, M R	\$0	\$0
WEBBER, P F	451.53	441.18	892.71	2.61	.	.	1.1	4.53	\$0	\$0
WEEDON, L S	262.83	.	262.83	2.66	.	.	0.84	3.78	\$0	\$0
YAMANI, E A	\$0	\$0
YONG, L	1428.72	.	1428.72	2.8	.	.	1	4.3	\$0	\$0
AKALIN, G	397.38	.	397.38	\$0	\$0
ALVERSON, M	.	2111.49	2111.49	\$0	\$0
BAKER, R C	326.58	513	839.58	\$0	\$0
BOND, P L	106.56	.	106.56	\$0	\$0
CAGLE, C J	772.92	.	772.92	\$0	\$0
CANNON, A R	672.45	2143.98	2816.43	\$0	\$0
CHEN, H	\$0	\$0
DAVIS, C	1591.89	106.02	1697.91	\$0	\$0
DESAI, M N	\$0	\$0
EAKIN, M E	1083.06	1364.58	2447.64	\$0	\$0
ESMAL, G O	2152.8	1128.6	3281.4	\$0	\$0
FRAZIER, G V	5.19	1651.86	1657.05	\$0	\$0
HOUSE, D M	822.21	.	822.21	\$0	\$0
KANG, T	\$0	\$0

Because of its unique partnership with TSC, many Brownsville faculty teach both UTB and TSC courses which are reported separately. Only UTB faculty salary and teaching information are included in this report.