

3-28-2016

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 28, 2016

University of Northern Iowa

Copyright © 2016 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa, "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 28, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 242.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/242

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 Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Regular Meeting # 1777
UNI Faculty Senate
March 28, 2016 (3:30- 5:10)
Oak Room, Maucker Union
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

A. No members of the press were present.

B. Provost **Wohlpart** emphasized the importance of the Board of Regents Strategic Plan and added that streamlined changes will be evidenced at this year's graduation, a ceremony he hopes will be attended by many faculty.

C. Faculty Chair **Peters** had no comments in addition to those sent by email.

D. Comments from Senate Chair **O'Kane** urged members of the Faculty Senate to consider self-nomination or naming a Senate colleague for the position of Senate Vice-Chair at the April 25 meeting.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript of February 22, 2016
(**Walter/McNeal**) Passed.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1295 Emeritus request for Iradge **Ahrabi-Fard**, HPELS; Randy **Hogancamp**, School of Music; Ronald **Johnson**, School of Music; Thomas **Kessler**, Rod Library. <https://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-iradge-ahrabi-fard-randy-hogancamp-ronald>

** (**Dolgener/Cooley**) Motion to docket in regular order. Passed.

1296 Approval of recipients of Regents' Award for Faculty Excellence.

** (**Walter/DeSoto**) Motion to docket at head of today's order in Executive Session. Passed.

4. No New Business

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1296 1191 Approval of recipients of Regents' Award for Faculty Excellence.

** (Walter/Burnight) Motion to move to Executive Session 3:36-3:40.

** (Walter/DeSoto) Motion to approve two candidates.

1294 1189 Emeritus request for Zhojun Joyce **Chen**, Dept. of Communication Studies; Kenneth **Lyftogt**, Dept. of History; Otto **MacLin**, Dept. of Psychology

<https://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-request-zhuojun-joyce-chen-kenneth-lyftogt-otto>

** (Fenech/Gould) Motion to approve. All aye.

6. Consultative Session

A. Helen **Harton**, Associate Director, Center for Academic Ethics, presented information about a recent student survey about cheating. She explained that many of the things considered cheating according to UNI's policy are not considered cheating by UNI students. A similar faculty survey will be forthcoming with the intention to compare perceptions of faculty and students with policy. (See pages 6-11 Full Transcript)

B. Tim **Bakula**, Associate Director, Customer Service & Outreach & Financial Aid shared information regarding UNI student debt and methods used to improve financial literacy among students. (See pages 11-22 Full Transcript)

C. Jim **Wohlpert**, Provost, Board of Regents Strategic Plan. (See pages 22-54)

7. Adjournment

** (Walter/Burnight) Motion to extend session by 10 minutes. Passed.

** (Gould/McNeal) Motion to adjourn, 5:10. Passed by acclamation.

Next Meeting:

3:30 Monday, April 11, 2016

Oak Room, Maucker Union

Full Transcript follows of 54 pages, including one Addendum.

Regular Meeting # 1777

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting
March 28, 2016 (3:30- 5:10)
Oak Room, Maucker Union

Present: Senators Ann Bradfield, John **Burnight**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Associate Provost Kavita **Dhanwada**, Senators Cathy **DeSoto**, Forrest **Dolgener**, Xavier **Escandell**, Todd **Evans**, Lou **Fenech**, Senate Vice-Chair Gretchen **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Tim **Kidd**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Senate Chair Steve **O’Kane**, Nicole **Skaar**, Jesse **Swan**, Michael **Walter**, Provost Jim **Wohlpert**, NSIG President Paul **Andersen**.

Not Present: Senator Arica **Beckman**, Associate Provost Nancy **Cobb**, Senators Gary **Shontz**, Gerald **Smith**, Senate Secretary Laura **Terlip**, Senator Leigh **Zeitz**.

Guests: Jeff **Funderburk**, Anita **Gordon**, Helen **Harton**, (NISG) Avery **Johnson**.

O’Kane: Okay gang. It is 3:30 so I’m calling this meeting of the Senate to order. Do we have any press here today? I don’t see any, so as usual we’ll start with comments from Provost **Wohlpert**. Bear in mind that later in today’s session the Provost will be talking at length about the Strategic Plan, so he won’t be addressing that now.

Wohlpert: I will only say that the Strategic Plan is going to be a really important part of the conversation and I hope we spend quite a bit of time with it. We will be giving feedback to the consultants on Wednesday about it—It’s a pretty astonishing document. I use that word very carefully.

O’Kane: As we will see.

Wohlpart: The only comment that I want to make real briefly is to say that we're making a little bit—a few changes to what we do at graduation. I hope you all come to graduation. That's a fantastic ceremony. We're making a few changes to make things a little bit more streamlined, a little bit more efficient. We're going to spend a little bit more time recognizing the students and less time with deans parading back and forth to the microphone announcing their colleges. That's one of the things we've been working on. I hope you all will attend.

O'Kane: Very good. Thank you. Comments from Faculty Chair **Peters**?

Peters: I've got nothing to add to the opus I sent out via email last week.

O'Kane: I had to get a new pair of glasses. Very well. I just have one comment, and that pertains to filling the position of Vice-Chair, which we need to tackle at the second meeting in April. So if you are so inclined, you might wish to self-nominate. Or you may know of somebody you'd like to nominate, but do please be thinking seriously about running for Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate. Okay, Minutes for Approval. Do we have a motion to approve minutes from our last session of February 22nd? So moved by Senator **Walter**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of approving the minutes from our last session, please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstention, 'aye.' Motion passes. We have two items to consider for docketing. The first is Calendar Item 1295 which if we docket will be Docket Number 1190, and that is an emeritus request for doctors **Ahrabi-Fard**, **Hogancamp**, **Johnson** and **Kessler**. Their documents

are online and hopefully you've had a chance to look at those. Do we have a motion to move that to docket in regular order? So moved by Senator **Dolgener**, seconded by Senator **Cooley**. Any discussion? All in favor of the motion please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstention, 'aye.' Motion passes. Okay, we next have a calendar item which requires us to enter very, very briefly into Executive Session, and that is Calendar Item 1296, which is the Approval of the Recipients for the Regents' Award for Faculty Excellence. I would like to hear a motion...Scott, please...

Peters: I don't think we need to go into Executive Session just to docket it.

O'Kane: I was going to docket at Head of Order.

Peters: Oh, okay.

O'Kane: I think they want to know our answer right away. Is that okay with everybody? What I would like is to docket that at the head of the order and in fact that's the next thing that we would tackle so we can immediately move into Executive Session if we docket. Do I hear a motion to docket this item at the head of the regular order? So moved by Senator **Walter**, seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Any discussion. All in favor please say 'aye,' opposed, 'nay,' abstentions, 'aye.' Motion passes. We have no New Business, so the Senate will now very briefly move into Executive Session, so could I ask everyone who is not a Senator to please leave the room for just a few minutes?

3:40 Rise from Executive Session.

O’Kane: Okay so what we need now is a motion to approve the two Regents’ Award candidates that have been presented to the Faculty Senate. So moved by Senator **Walter**, second by Senator **DeSoto**, any further discussion? Okay so we have a motion to approve the two candidates, all in favor, please say ‘aye,’ those opposed please say ‘nay,’ abstentions please say ‘aye.’ Motion passes. Thank you very much. We have one docketed item today, and that is Docket #1189, which is an emeritus request from doctors **Chen**, **Lyftogt**, and **MacLin** that we placed on the docket last time. Does anybody wish to address any of these folks?

Fenech: Ken (**Lyftogt**) is in my department and he’s just great. That’s all I have to say.

O’Kane: I’d like to say something about Otto **MacLin** whose angered me by retiring. Otto is a superb colleague. He’s done incredibly good work here and has been really a loyal supporter of our University. Any other comments? Could I have a motion to approve the emeritus status for our three colleagues? So moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Vice-Chair **Gould**, any discussion? All in favor of the motion please say ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ abstentions, ‘aye.’ We have one abstention. Motion passes. Thank you everybody. We are now going to move into a Consultative Session and we have three people to hear from. The first is from Helen **Harton** from the Center for Academic Ethics. I’m going to have the presenters come up to this region. Helen is here to talk about a survey of faculty perceptions of student cheating and plagiarism. Thank you very much for joining us.

Harton: Thanks for having me. I'm Helen **Harton** from the Psychology Department. I'm also the Associate Director for the Center for Academic Ethics. Anita **Gordon**, over here is the Director of the Center. I just wanted to come here to make you aware of an effort that we're doing. One of the things that's part of the Center's mission is to try to foster academic integrity on campus, and I think one of the first steps is finding out where we are now. So, along the lines of that, the last few weeks we've been doing a student survey, taking items from the Academic Ethics code and asking students about those items. You know, "Have you done them?" "How common are they?" "Do you think they're cheating?" and "How bad do you think they are?" So we're just getting those data together, and there are some interesting things that are going to come out of that. One of the things just looking at it is that many of the things that according to our policy are cheating, our students don't think are cheating. So I think there's a problem there. But one of the other things we want to do is a similar survey among faculty. I wanted to come to this group to let you know about it, just to get your buy-in; to encourage you to do it, to encourage you to have your constituents do the survey which will be coming out later this week. We'll be asking similar questions of you: "How common do you think these are?" "Do you have students do these?" and so on, and one of the incentives for doing the survey for faculty is there will be a chance at the end to enter your email address. It will go to a separate file and---we're not tracking things---it's totally anonymous---but there'll be a chance for you to get a copy of the results of the student survey when they're done, so you can see the things individually. Also, if Faculty Senate would like for us

to, we'd be happy to come back and discuss those in more detail after we've got the results.

O'Kane: That would be wonderful. Questions for our guest?

Andersen: I have a question about how many students that went out to?

Harton: It went to a stratified random sample of 3,000 students; 500 at each level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, grad, and we got a 20% response rate, so we got just over 600 back. And I'd also be happy to come talk to the students.

Peters: Have you ever done any sort of counts of how many times across campus in a given year students get reprimanded for plagiarism? Is that something that would be of interest, and if the Provost Office could provide a count of how many letters you have to generate. I think that might be an interesting thing for people to know. I've never run across it.

Dhanwada: We do keep track of those letters. Actually, I don't know since I've only been in this position since July, I couldn't tell you like, trends. But I guess it was more than I thought it would be, so there's several that come in. When I just read and look at what kind of violations they are, they are usually Level 1 or 2 violations for students who basically don't understand what plagiarism is, and so they think they can directly copy, but if they put the citation then it's okay. So, they have some sense, but they don't understand it completely, so I do see a lot of that. We have had a couple of higher ones and those are severe sanctions. I think, like I said, I don't know

trends, but it seems to me that there's more than I think there should be I guess.

Wohlpart: Do all of those go through your office?

Dhanwada: They do.

Wohlpart: So that would be interesting to pair with that data. [from the Center for Academic Ethics].

O'Kane: That would be great. We have a guest. Your name?

Gordon: Anita **Gordon**, thanks. One of things we want to explore with the survey is the extent to which faculty are using the policy, because we hear sometimes people say that they're a little bit uncomfortable with reporting to the Provost's Office, or they don't even know they're supposed to. And so we've asked them a little bit about that: How much they've used the policy and the comments on that. I've had people say they're anxious about it because they're afraid that there might be different kinds of consequences than what they felt were appropriate. I think there could be a lot of reasons, but I think it will be interesting to see what they say because there could be very different numbers. It's hard to say.

Andersen: What are the outcome goals of doing the survey? Is it to educate both populations of students and faculty more?

Harton: Yeah. The first thing is just to find out where we are. Are people even aware of the ethics policy? Sixty-seven percent of the students had

never read it; about 30% didn't even know it existed. So part of it is to get information, and then we can use that information to bring educational programs to work with groups. Like I talked with David **Grant** about this with their writing and plagiarism groups, and meet with others on campus so we can share this data to help foster academic integrity in general.

Kidd: This is something that—the policies, I put in my syllabus now. I've run into some incidents, and I would say that a lot or some departments discourage using this policy. They want to keep things in house and they don't want to report things out of the department. I've experienced this before. It might be nice to educate faculty in if it's appropriate, when it's appropriate to actually use this.

Harton: I think that another thing that's useful is looking back at the people who created the Academic Ethics Policy--almost all of them are gone now which made me wonder if maybe that was a precursor to leaving.

[Laughter] Most of them are gone now and it may be worth revisiting the policy. One of the things that I think will be interesting is to look at how severe the faculty and students think these things are, and see if that lines up with what the policy says in terms of seriousness.

Swan: Is there in your survey other means of finding out what students think? Is there a distinction between what they feel they know and understand, that they know something's cheating, versus or not they know of the policy, and the expression of the policy?

Harton: The way that we asked it, because we went over different ways of presenting this, was “To what extent do you consider this cheating?” and allow them to say not just ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ but to what extent do you think these things are bad? Then later we asked them about, “Are you aware of the policy, have you read the policy?” that sort of thing.

Swan: And you’re still analyzing the results?

Harton: We just finished yesterday.

O’Kane: Any further questions or comments? Thank you very much for joining us. We now have another guest. Tim **Bakula** is here. He’s the Associate Director of Customer Service and Outreach and Financial Aid. He’s here to chat with us about a Financial Literacy course, and he needs a PowerPoint.

Bakula: Thank you, **Dr. O’Kane**. As Steve mentioned, my name is Tim **Bakula** and I work in the Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships here on campus at UNI. I’ve been here as a staff person for about 13 years now, and one of my responsibilities in the office, for the last probably seven or eight years has been to evaluate and engage students in Financial Literacy initiatives on campus. Some of you have heard about our efforts through Live Like a Student programming, private loan counseling programming, we’ve now implemented Transfer Success counseling, each of which I could probably do a Consultative Session on at any point in time, if you’d like to know more. Or, we have a summary that’s available as well. However, during the Fall Semester of 2015, myself and Richard **Followill**

were asked to serve on a Board of Regents Financial Literacy Workgroup. He and I along with staff and faculty from Iowa State and Iowa met several different times during the fall semester in person and via video conferencing to discuss sort of what our offices are each doing; what each campus is doing, the needs of each campus: essentially see what the Board of Regents required of us to look at. We were to inventory financial literacy assets on campus. I just threw out three very personalized approaches that UNI takes, and I would---I'll be humble about it, but I still think that we are one of the leaders in the clubhouse in terms of what we do to help students at the point in time that they need help. It's important to us, to personalize as much as possible. So each campus, as we were initially meeting, talked about what does each area do. Iowa State, a very different campus, a more clinical approach to it probably with a Financial Literacy Counseling Center that's on campus. That's a great resource they have as well. We'd also assess utilization of students. How many students are utilizing our programming as opposed to what other campuses are doing? Identify unmet needs; identify the body of knowledge amongst those in the room. Which, when I mentioned the staff at the other colleges, each Iowa and Iowa State each had financial aid representatives, whether they led their Student Loan Centers at Iowa State for instance, or just served as a member of the Financial Aid Office. So, myself and the others that were staff primarily saw ourselves as practical practitioners of these student loan indebtedness, or how to help a student budget, as opposed to some the faculty who were very entrenched in the theory behind it, and the research-based approach. So there was a good mixture of content

information within the group. And then we were to identify and develop multiple solutions or options for what the Board would like to see in terms of a Financial Literacy course or training or workshop, available to students.

Bakula: We were given the timeline to present this to the Council of Provosts in February of [20]16, and I'll get to that in just a moment, as that meeting came up last month. The workgroup will determine whether or not there's a program that can focus on the needs of individuals, and what resources could be shared across institutions. Kind of going along with the TIER approach: What shared approaches could be utilized within and amongst the campuses? And then anything useful that could be added to student orientation presentation, which in my opinion alone, there's already a lot going on at orientation and we put our piece out, but sometimes get lost in the shuffle of what students essentially want to know at orientation—that's what are my classes and how do I enroll? and that's kind of their mindset there. Kind of a big charge: To look at all of those things. Within the first few meetings, as I mentioned there was some additional and growing trends that we saw. Each university already has their own approach I would say. Focusing on UNI, the personalized approach is what we've always looked at since 2008, when the Board of Regents essentially requested each campus re-evaluate what they're doing for students. That's when we started our Financial Literacy classes that are non-credit, by the way. That's when we started doing much, much more counseling about private loans, which are the loans beyond the federal loans that a student can borrow, and that's dramatically helped to reduce our indebtedness over the last six years. If you've noticed the growing

trends that you read in the media, indebtedness keeps climbing, steadily. At UNI, we've declined steadily. We've reduced over the last six years we've reduced indebtedness by 13%. We're well below the national average. The average indebtedness of a UNI student upon graduation with a bachelor's degree is about \$22,313. Iowa and Iowa State are both still at about the \$27,000 range for their average indebtedness, so I'd say our campus has done an excellent job, not just our office but there's many faculty advocates that we have out there that encourage students to finish on time or find different routes to their career path, all of the work of the campus has been very helpful there.

Bakula: Educating students on future costs of repaying loans and optional coursework in Financial Literacy are other things that we short of touched on in the programming that's currently done. Common challenges that we face: Counseling is labor-intensive. We have about 13 staff people in our office. Iowa and Iowa State have more than double that. The counselors in our office are really geared towards taking on one-on-one appointments. We field the general questions as well, but you can imagine, to counsel every student who's going to borrow a private loan, it takes some time. Each of those appointments are at least a half hour or 45 minutes. It's difficult to reach students before they make serious financial mistakes. This get's back to that just-in-time approach that we feel that is best serving our students: As they're about to borrow that private loan for the first time, what do they need to know? As they graduate, that's when the exit counseling comes into play.

Bakula: We don't get too much into buying a car or buying a home, even though we find it useful because I remember when I was a sophomore, if you told me about buying a home, until I actually went out to do it, to take out a mortgage and understand what it actually means, it didn't mean as much to me. There just wasn't that meaning associated with it, so finding that just-in-time approach, as well as giving them some of the bits and pieces they need to make sound financial decisions elsewhere.

Bakula: Many students don't access our available resources. When we offer the free Financial Literacy classes, we have about 500 students that take that in the fall semester. Typically, most of those students are freshmen who heard about it at orientation and probably were pushed into it by parents, which we appreciate. Parents are big advocates for us. But as you can see, it really is just now starting to infiltrate the masses of students, we'd say, now that we've done this for seven or eight years. There isn't a student that's on campus anymore that remembers the time without a Financial Literacy initiative on campus, so that's making inroads there.

Bakula: And then, just the wide variation of Financial Literacy courses: whether we do our own programming or some campuses use a third party. We looked at not just the Iowa, Iowa State, and UNI, but what are schools that are in our Peer Institutions as well as in the Midwest doing to help students with financial literacy initiatives.

Bakula: Iowa State actually offers a financial counseling and planning major on their campus, which is a great resource for them. One of the things they pointed out within our workgroup is an elective course that they've

developed. Over the last seven years, they've been tweaking this course to allow students take it online, which is not my preferred method for teaching Financial Literacy, but it also helps them reach more students. They've created a strategic game-based course that they gave me access to, as well as I've passed along to my graduate assistants and several in our office to take a look at. It's a great class. They teach a lot of good information in it. They are very proud of what they've done and essentially as we're meeting, if we were to look at a course, this would probably be the one that we would point back to. It's based in theory, it's had several different faculty members evaluate and work on it, and it's a one-credit hour class offered as an elective within that particular major, and I believe students outside that major can also take it as a university elective as well.

Bakula: When we met with the Council of Provosts in February we talked at length about that course and the merits of it. We also talked about just a training or workshop approach as well. As you can see, we presented those options to the Council of Provosts, which several people in the room were attending. I would say, and these are my own words, but there was a strong indication towards not mandating a course. And as I said in the room, and even had some inkling of going into the room, from faculty members from other campuses that were on this committee, having a mandated course could potentially lead to other mandates for curriculum that the universities weren't necessarily comfortable with. That's myself. That's my take away from that meeting, and I could see that as a potential slippery slope if the Board is now mandating coursework for the campuses to teach. However, the Council of Provosts will continue to work with the Board of

Regents to determine the best plan moving forward, which could be an alternative workshop or the potential is still there for a course to be required of students. The thought process from Diana **Gonzalez** as we were going through---and she's the Board of Regents staff member that was working with our workgroup on this was some type of mandated requirement of students before they leave campus. Whether that's a one-credit hour class or several credit hours; a workshop: something that's mandated of them. The term 'mandated' also is something that, while I initially started this in favor of mandating things, I know when I'm mandated to do something that I'm not fully interested in, the level of attention I give it as well. So, there was a lot of great discussion that evening as well as in this workgroup towards "What would serve our students the best?"

Bakula: I don't know Dr. **Wohlpart**, if that conversation's happened with the Board or if it's too early. I hadn't seen anything. That's sort of a pending discussion that we'll be having here at some point. I wanted to get this out in front of you just from the beginning to kind of catch you up on what we've been working on. I'd be more than happy to take any questions about the work of the group or the work that our campus has done as it relates to financial literacy at UNI.

O'Kane: Any questions or comments?

Funderburk: You said the average student debt or is the average debt of students?

Bakula: The average debt of students who have debt.

Wohlpart: How many of our students have debt?

Bakula: I'm going to approximate without having the annual report on hand here. About 75% of students graduate with some type of debt from UNI.

Wohlpart: So one easy way to bring average student debt down is to get a whole bunch of seniors who have no debt to take out \$100 loan. Right?

[Laughter]

Bakula: That would be one way to do it. And really it's, like I said, it is a testament to the students, the parents and the staff and faculty on campus. I think really just raising the awareness of what it means to have borrowed and to have debt really has those students thinking from the moment they start, "What do I need to do to borrow responsibly?" That's sort of the message we want them to have because I'll be honest: We're not offering the greatest financial aid packages in the world to some students. The other two state universities have far more resources in terms of scholarship dollars to be able to award someone. What do you do with those dollars to make best use of those dollars is where our students are really doing very well.

DeSoto: I think it's really great that you came here today and told us about this. I didn't know that this was something that we're doing here and I'm really glad to hear about it. I wondered also if you have testimonies of

graduates who graduated with a lot of debt to talk about, “This is what it’s really like to pay \$500 a month.”

Bakula: I don’t have testimonies, but we know someone who does and I’ll be talking about his visit to campus next week. We have an alum of UNI that has done an outstanding job of documenting and creating a documentary called, “Broke, Busted and Disgusted,” related to borrowing across the nation, not just UNI. When he initially came to us, I was a little bit leery. With that title, what’s really going to be portrayed in the film? However, he’s not coming to UNI because he’s an alum, he is talking about the efforts that multiple colleges across the country are making as well as hitting home on, “I’ve over-borrowed.”

DeSoto: I think students, and I remember it wasn’t all that long ago, I remember thinking, “I’m making \$40,000 a year, it will be nothing to pay \$600 a month back.”

Bakula: He talks about that in great depth in that film. I’m going to put a little bit of a plug out actually in my session here about Adam’s visit as well as that film being shown in conjunction with the John Pappajohn Entrepreneurial Center later in the month of April. There will be a showing of “Broke, Busted and Disgusted” on campus. So that would be something I’ll point out to all of us here.

O’Kane: Other questions or comments?

Wohlpert: I just want to comment that when this was brought to the Council of Provosts, I appreciate Tim (**Bakula**) and his work on the team.

They did a phenomenal job of putting together information. Your faculty leaders did a wonderful job of suggesting that a mandating a course should not be something that should come from the top down, but from the bottom up, but that has been the conversation of mandating the course on all the campuses.

Bakula: The other think that I'll point out is, I'll mention this to Dr.

Wohlpart we, up through last year had a course a one-credit elective that was offered online called The Money Course: just a very simple title. It was taught out of Applied Sciences I think in Continuing Ed. That course isn't being offered anymore at this point. However, it is something that I think whether it's not mandated, having some type of one-credit hour elective has several different benefits for our students. I'd be an advocate of something like that coming back once the faculty member is able to teach that.

O'Kane: Very good. Anything else?

Wohlpart: Do you want to add anything about the conversation, Steve
(**O'Kane**)?

O'Kane: Actually, I think he summarized it pretty well. The faculty leadership, both our leadership and the leadership of the other two schools, I think firmly enough made it know that we weren't very happy with something that would be mandated; required. It's already been said why. The main reason is that it might create a dangerous precedent of the Board of Regents dictating to the schools the curriculum, which would be a

---something that's never happened before. Tim (**Bakula**) I really appreciate your visit.

Bakula: Yes. Thank you for inviting me. What you have coming around though they look identical, they are flyers for a faculty/staff variation as well as a student variation. The student one has a student at the top of it. If you wouldn't mind sharing this, and I could get you an electronic copy to send to your email, with your faculty, staff, students in your departments and colleges. Much of this is coming up next Tuesday, on April 5th. Adam Carroll, the documentarian I was talking about, the UNI alum, will be doing two different sessions for faculty and staff. One is at the Panthers Achieving Financial Success Conference, How Do Students Interact With Money. How and why are students borrowing the way they are? Are they treating the money that they're earning as we think they are? That will be interesting. And at 3:30 Reshaping Your Retirement Tally. So if any of us are on the cusp of retirement, or just starting to think about it, that would be a good approach to how to think about it mentally as you prepare. Another big event that he'll be offering that evening is the "Money Savvy Student." He'll be speaking to primarily students, but faculty and staff are encouraged to attend if you'd like to. He's a very engaging speaker; does an excellent job in making this exciting and interesting topic for students. Our website is on the materials there. If you go to our website it would talk about the showing of that film that he worked on as kind of the narrator and host of, I guess you could say. It's definitely an interesting watch. For those of you

that would like to know more about it, just send me an email and I'll can definitely give you more information on it. Thank you for your time.

O'Kane: I really appreciate it.

Wohlpart: I would strongly encourage if you could go to Adam's presentation. He is very, very engaging.

O'Kane: You'll see that next we were planning to have Provost **Wohlpart** talk about three different things, but you'll also see that there's no way that we could do that in this amount of time, so Provost **Wohlpart** will be talking with us about the Board of Regents Strategic Plan and he and we would really love to hear your input.

Wohlpart: I hope others will take notes about this as well. On Wednesday from 10-12 we will be meeting with the consultants. They are going around to each of the campuses to get feedback about the Strategic Plan. It's going to be very important for us to hear your voices today as the elected leaders of the faculty so that we can provide that feedback on Wednesday. So we're going to go through especially, once we get down to the Goal Statements, slowly. Any questions about this? This is the Board of Regents Strategic Plan 2016-2021. This is part of the reason we have slowed down our Academic Master Plan because we have to align with this. This should be finalized in June. That's the idea. This is the Revised Mission Statement. The original Mission Statement was a little bit longer.

DeSoto: Is the previous one in Appendix A?

Wohlpert: Yes. If you have the printout, and I apologize I didn't put that in there. It's in Appendix A: "The Board of Regents, working through Iowa's public universities and special schools: Provides high-quality accessible education; Engages in high-quality research, scholarship, and creative activities; Provides public services; Creates and supports economic development in partnership with public and private sectors."

DeSoto Did the old one [mission statement] mention education by name? Is that right?

Wohlpert: Say that again?

DeSoto Did the old mission statement mention education by name?

Wohlpert: Yes. The very first goal was—"high-quality accessible education to students."

DeSoto: And that's been cut?

Wohlpert: So what's really interesting in the conversation we had is, and I think this still didn't get fully displayed, is whether or not this is a strategic plan to for what the Board of Regents do, or if it's a strategic plan for what the university is supposed to do. So the original said, "The Board of Regents through Iowa's public universities does this," and they've tried to shift it, but it's really about what the Board of Regents do, not what they do through the universities.

DeSoto: I see. It's a good answer.

Wohlpert: I'm not convinced that it's really successful when you look at the other things...

Koch: When I first read that, I was thinking that this sounds like the Iowa Legislature, so the education part is what's crucial to the specific mission of the Regents.

Wohlpert: Agreed. Other reactions?

Burnight: I'm just wondering about the semantics of 'improving the excellence.' That seems...I'm not sure exactly what that means. It seems like a semantically empty statement to me in a lot of ways. Looking at the old mission statement compared to the new mission statement, the old mission statement was very clear and articulate, and the new one to me seems fuzzy to me, maybe just because I don't understand it.

Wohlpert: I think these are very accurate observations and very much appreciated. Other comments about this?

Skaar: Can I just ask a question? Why did they change the mission statement? Is it just because it was too wordy, or was there a purpose in changing it?

Wohlpert: It goes back to the answer that I gave a moment ago, that they were trying to shift it to a conversation about being a strategic plan for the Board of Regents, as opposed to for the universities. Once you get to the goals, the goals really are about the universities.

Skaar: Right. But I noticed at the top of when you start with the Strategic Priorities, it says The Board of Regents in partnership with..." It does seem like a disconnect between what we're talking about in the mission and what is actually in the plan.

Swan: A Board of Regents is supposed to protect the universities from the winds of shifting political activities, and I don't see how this Mission Statement says anything about protecting the universities. It's also supposed to promote activities of universities and the most important thing a Board of Regents is it's supposed to do to promote the activities of it's universities is to provide the financing and other material resources that the institutions it's supposed to support need, and that's no where in the Mission Statement. So these fundamental purposes for an American Board of Regents seems to be entirely absent from this expression of a mission statement.

Wohlpart: In what other ways would a Board of Regents support and support universities, other than financially? Are there other things that we could list?

Swan: So additional ways...You're asking for additional ways that a Board of Regents supports the universities, in addition to finances and material resources? Politically? So there's political action, of political defenses?

McNeal: They're advocates for us?

Swan: Advocates.

Andersen: Bringing students to Iowa for education.

Wohlpart: That's something the universities do more than the Regents do. So the question is, at that high level, what do the Regents do that supports and nurtures? That's a tough question.

Swan: Although the financing and material resources is so huge that a lot of concentration really should be on that.

O'Kane: Let me pause for a moment. Kathy, are you okay with me not saying each person's name?

Sundstedt: Yes.

O'Kane: You are. Okay.

Wohlpart: These are revised Vision Statements and there are three different ones. There is a choice.

DeSoto: Again you sort of wonder like why the changes were made with the consultants, like did they deliberately decide to leave out Graduate Education, for example? Are they de-emphasizing that with thought behind it or...? I don't know, but that would be a question that would be a question I would have when I compare it to the old one.

Wohlpart: So the old Vision Statement opens by saying "The Board of Regents strives to provide effective and quality public education for the

citizens of Iowa,” and that is missing from this, and it jumps into the second one and again the reason it’s missing is they’re not the ones who do that. It’s the universities who provide for quality public education, so I think that was the reason for that shift.

DeSoto: It says ‘excellence in undergraduate and graduate education and professional education’ here the word is changed to ‘public.’

Wohlpart: So one of the things we could do is suggest that the original wording in the Vision and Mission Statements were good and rather than suggesting that The Board of Regents do these things, we could talk about that the Board of Regents is supporting the universities here.

DeSoto: Perhaps that might be better. I don’t feel completely prepared to give complete feedback because that was one of the main questions I had: Why were the changes made? Your information is helpful in trying to put that into context, but I might need to kind of chew on that a little bit, and think about if that seems to make sense. I’m not sure.

Burnight: The change is to shift it to those that represent the Board itself, then the statements they have, is it that the Regents are “going to be engaged in active research and learning?” That doesn’t make a lot of sense.

Wohlpart: And John (**Burnight**) even when you get further down to the goals, it devolves even further.

Burnight: I just want to be sure it’s not me missing something.

Wohlpert: Let me describe the scene. We were in Des Moines in one of the hotels in a large room with no windows for eight hours. The first half the day there were presentations from research and community partners and folks about what the universities do, should do, and could do. The second half of the day somebody pulled up the screen, and the Regents moved to the front of the room and they started typing up the vision, mission and goals and the end of the day. Is that an accurate description of what happened?

DeSoto: How long ago was that?

Wohlpert: A month maybe?

Gould: Yeah. It was the beginning of February. [almost two months]

Walter: So these are direct comments/inputs from the sitting audience?

Wohlpert: No. Then the Regents who were crafting this, but it has been revised since that original draft, so they have done some work with the consultants to revise some of the language, but it's not far off what it was.

Walter: So, apart from a mandate to reword the document occasionally, what was broken or wrong with the previous statements? What was broken that we're trying to fix?

Wohlpert: Michael, (**Walter**) I don't know that there's anything that was necessarily broken, except that this is something that you do every five years with your vision and mission.

Hakes: It seems like we're acting as though the Board of Regents is our advocate. But if we were sitting in the Statehouse, they think that they're their advocates. Aren't they just like the middle ground between us and the Statehouse in a state where the State is paying for roughly 50%, and yet this reads as if they're our advocate. But if you were on the other side, you'd be looking at this and going, "they're representing the taxpayer," and they're the middle person but they're not an advocate for either side. they're representing both, aren't they?

Wohlpart: That's an interesting perspective.

Hakes: Again, I don't know what they're representing, but it seems to me that they are as opposed to on one side carrying the load to the other side. Because sometimes we feel like they're carrying the load from the Statehouse to us, so that doesn't sound like an advocate. Does that make sense? So the whole thing just reads strange to me, since I don't know exactly what they do. It does seem to me...

Peters: Traditionally in Iowa, the Board has a high degree of independence from the Legislature to the people in Iowa and the Legislature does sort of respect that in some regard. I do take your point that obviously they are a government agency funded by the Legislature; the people's representative, et cetera. But, the Legislature in Iowa doesn't seem to get involved terribly often in the inner workings of the universities or the even the inner workings of the Board itself, even as controversies arise. The Legislature

tends to limit itself maybe to in ...it takes it out in the confirmation of people to the Board, but it doesn't do investigations into the inner workings of the Board, so there is some independence there. I don't know. As I've read over the strategic plan, I can't tell what the Board wants to do.

Kidd: I think that the divisions should be their advocate. That's all.

Hakes: I might agree.

Kidd: It doesn't matter. It should be at least what their aim is to be.

Wohlpart: We will suggest that comment. These are value statements or values. I don't think these have changed. They're in alphabetical order.
Comments? Questions?

Cooley: Continuous improvement is something that isn't possible and it isn't always a good thing.

Wohlpart: One of the things when we get into these goals, I hope one of the things we talk about is an emphasis on qualitative, not quantitative measures for projects or initiatives, as opposed to always trying to count beans, and I hope we can steer things in that direction. I don't know how successful we'll be, but I think there are ways to do that.

Dhanwada: This is one of the areas where the Legislature did get involved with the Regents because it was mandated that there would be some sort of continuous improvement in our teaching, and you all will be getting an email tomorrow, so just to let you know that I think it was 2013 where

basically what we had to do is in all our courses where we have over 300-plus students per year, we had to talk about kind of ‘What are we doing? How are we improving our coursework? What are we doing in the classes to improve engagement or whatever it is?’ So it’s 300-plus students, then it went down to 200-plus students, and this year it’s 100-plus students. So in courses where faculty teach students of 100 or more during the year, you are going to get a form, and we’ve tried to make it, you know, as palatable as we can for you all. Basically it’s talking about what are you doing in the class? How are you engaging students? Do you have some stories where you can tell us in what you’re doing with the information that you assess? We want to collect those stories and we do have to do a report and send that to the Board every year, and I think that many times, like you send Jenny (**Cooley**), what are we doing? So the goal that we’re trying to do this year is that we asked for some stories and we’ve asked for you to write some examples of what you’ve been doing, so we are going to do something on the Provost’s website. We’ll have a section and talk about what we have found, and maybe highlight some of these stories. Obviously we’re asking everyone’s permission before we do that, but that’s what are going to do and to have conversations. So we don’t want it to be ‘check the box’ and nobody reads it, and hopefully, you will visit it and read these things. That was case where actually this was a mandate that had come down from the Legislature, and so the other Regents universities have been doing this, and we will be doing this.

Wohlpart: Culture. We have two pages of Culture. And this is where all of a sudden it slips from talking about high level Board of Regents into talking about really the institutions, and I don't believe this has changed. And then the second page, and so these are the three strategic priorities areas and then we're going to look at the goals that they've developed underneath each of these areas. Those are the three: Increasing student success; Promoting innovation in learning; Research and developing and efficiently using mission focused resources. This is the first priority and this is the first goal. So I don't know if you all remember the reports that were given in the TIER study. The University of Northern Iowa is significantly ahead of our peer group for first year retention rates. The other two institutions are below the groups in first year retention rates, and so this is going to have to be a place where we push back and suggest that, and you'll see this in some of the later goals---that the goals should be maybe be at or above your peer group. But to suggest that we would continue increasing that, when we're already at such a high level...

DeSoto: And again, I may need some more time just to chew on this. These are just sort of my preliminary impressions. I just want to say that as a caveat, but I did look strategic plans for our peer institutions because when I read these the changes, I was wondering what ...why is it like this? Why are these changes? The others ones, they are all very different. This really stands out. The other ones they talk about contributions that education...like what we have here it says 'increasing student success' but other of our peer institutions, they talk about the goal of education and

transmitting information, and like contributions to that so that they can make contributions to their communities and the world. So not just that the successful student is not just about retention rates, it's about that they go out into the world and make the world better. In each of the other ones that I looked at, they all have some variation of wording like that. They talk about engaged citizenship, success in their academic, professional and personal lives, and rigorous and engaging baccalaureate education. And it concerned me that there's nothing like that in there. So unless this is supposed to be some kind of really new model and totally different from what the university does, then I'm concerned I think.

Wohlpart: Thank you.

McNeal: It sounds like these goals are measurable, when it's harder to measure what the other schools have. This facilitates bean-counting.

DeSoto: To me, it downplays what universities really do: That they make the world better. They make people informed citizens, not just get a job--- which is good, but besides that. I don't know if that makes sense.

Wohlpart: Absolutely. Other responses? Feedback?

Peters: Previous plans---for the last five, six years the emphasis has been accessibility, accessibility. That does seem like something that I could see a statewide governing body having a clear interest in: We want to make higher education as accessible as possible, and we're going to do it in these ways while keeping costs low, whatever it could be. But that's gone---

surprisingly, that's gone from this. I think the student success things are connected to that. That is to say like if you're going to try to make Higher Ed more accessible, you have to understand that you're bringing in populations of people who might need more help, and so maybe that in turn means you need to focus on retention rates, you need to focus on student support. I think the student support kind of goals make more sense if framed in terms of accessibility and affordability.

Wohlpart: ...and then support for students.

Peters: I guess affordability is in there as 1.2.

Wohlpart: Yes. It'll be there. That's good feedback. So you'll see that this next one---this is still Part 1.1, with a couple more metrics and goals is a comparison to peer group. If you look at where the University of Northern Iowa is, we are significantly beyond our peer group. The other two institutions are significantly below. One of those things we did discuss when we were in Des Moines is the idea of having accountability measures, but not having those measures connected directly to the goals of the Strategic Plan. So you're going to track these things. This is what you do. You really should be focusing on accessibility, bringing a group of students and then helping them succeed as your goals. These then should follow from that, not be the goal. This should flow out of what we do, and we do well, but that shouldn't be the goal.

Skaar: One of the things that I was thinking about with this objective and the metrics that are under there is if it says, "Create pathways for students

to enter, move through and complete their education goals.” What are the student’s education goals? Usually that’s tied to program. And nowhere, (and I read the rest of it) is there anything in the plan--- and I didn’t see it--- does it say that we’re creating programs to help students meet those educational goals, and helping students stay in Iowa if that part of the deal too. So just thinking about my program, which is the School Psychology Program, we serve the State of Iowa in that we are the only school psych program currently in the state of Iowa. How does that program then serve this objective? And I didn’t see any connections to programs within the strategic plan and how we select for...and just thinking about the recent past, and how programs kind of went, and how is that connected to student success? Like, if the School Psychology Program would have been on of the programs on the chopping block we would not have not been meeting this objective, and students couldn’t have met their educational goals. How do programs work into that?

Wohlpart: So we could have a goal for the Board of Regents that they’re going to assist with creating programs to meet student’s workforce needs; allow students to succeed academically and professionally.

Skaar: It goes back to what Senator **Swan** said in that one of the major purposes of the Board of Regents is to help with resources. Well, programs need resources and so it all sort of fits together.

Wohlpart: Other questions about this?

Swan: At the Board level, this kind of goal would concern itself with the separate universities. So in California for example, that has them have a university system, a state system, and a community college system that then student-citizens are tracked into. Is that something that the Board is thinking about here, which Iowa's never done? The universities are complete and it's comparable going to one or the other--- the three universities. But are they looking to have these other kinds of distinctions: research, high-level research at one university, vocational training at another university? And that's what this kind of goal at a Board level would seem to encourage, and that's a very bad idea for the State. We're not a California. We're not a Wisconsin for that matter.

Wohlpart: Jesse, are you suggesting that we should or shouldn't have more distinction among the universities?

Swan: I think we should have more distinction especially along these ways. We already are distinct, the three universities, but not in ways that this goal might encourage us to continue to be. For example, vocational education would not be pursued, I can't imagine, at the University of Iowa just because it's doing so much high-level research already, so if you're going to distribute that, it should be distributed elsewhere, and that's not necessarily what the University of Northern Iowa should be doing. That's a huge transformation for the University of Northern Iowa to be saddled---to suggest to have that concentrated on this University because of some new objective. It's not that the University of Northern Iowa can't have more vocational education, as could the other universities, but that takes a

different kind of approach than a concerted objective like this, that might encourage you to have different universities with different pathways.

Wohlpart: I'm just thinking through. I would agree with your comment about vocational training. None of the universities should do that. But what about some level of distinction in this plan for Iowa, which is one and we are not? An expectation of the kinds of research that happens in those schools, different from what we do, and then a recognition and support for the kind of work that we do in the Strategic Plan? You don't really see that kind of flavor. It's everybody lumped in together.

Skaar: I saw that, kind of thought that when we get down in the Strategic Plan later when they talk about awards and funding. And I wonder if that idea might play out there. Because where UNI would want to do more internal sorts of granting, because we don't have a lot of external grants happening here at UNI because we're teaching more, that might be where to parse that out a little more. External funding goals for Iowa and Iowa State, whereas we have more internal sorts of granting and awards being done here.

Wohlpart: When we get there, let's talk about this.

Skaar: Yes.

Wohlpart: So this is the last possible metric of 1.1, focus on underrepresented students, and then this is the last place for the special schools. This is 1.2.

Cooley: I find the first point here, “Do not increase tuition by more than x% per year,” a little bit shocking in itself, but also it reveals a certain tension within the document itself. If you get lower in the document, on page 11, they start talking about “increasing need-based, merit-based opportunities for student financial aid,” and then they also say, “maintain tuition rates that are at or below median tuition rates for peer institutions.” They start off talking about increased aid for students, increasing support for transfer students,” there’s quite a bit of tension here in terms of on one hand, you can’t raise tuition, and on the other hand, they’re suggesting it’s going to be part of our mission and vision to be providing better and more service.

Wohlpart: And if they’re not successful, what happens to this goal?

Skaar: My question about this one was when I saw it, how can we have a goal when we have little control over that goal? Because so much of this depends on what happens at the Legislature. So can we have a goal—we can’t control it? That doesn’t seem feasible to write a goal that we have no control over. I don’t like goals that I don’t have control over. It just seemed weird.

Wohlpart: Thank you.

Peters: There are a lot of specific things in the plan that I don’t like, but the more I think about it, the more that bothers me about the overall tenor of the plan, is that I really wish it was just a more... I’d like it to be a full-throated defense of public education and the value of public education. That’s what I would like it to be. I would like it to say, “This is why Higher Ed

is worth spending money on,” and when I look at it, I don’t see that. I don’t see...

Wohlpart: [To **Peters**] Are you going to be there Wednesday for this?

Peters: Yes.

Cooley: It’s in contrast to our peer institutions. We’re the ones who don’t do that.

Peters: It should... Let’s not focus on limiting tuition. Obviously, we want to keep tuition as low as we can. What do we know about how we make Higher Ed affordable? We convince the State that it’s worth spending money on. That’s what we have to do, and that should be the Regents main goal above any other--- that’s their whole raison d’être.

Swan: That’s a very good goal to come up with.

Peters: Again, that’s outside of their control, so it raises that, but...to advocate more forcefully, to build the case for the value.

Swan: To do the politics—to lobby the Legislature and in the Executive branch the Regents are supposed to do, that would successfully produce more support.

Cooley: I think that even in these three bullet points there’s a tension: On the one hand, “do not increase tuition by more than x%,” and then the third bullet point. We can’t even raise the tuition. We have to utilize State

appropriations and resources. They're cutting us from one end, and they're cutting us from the other as well. That's quite a lot of scripting, you know?

Swan: Without doing what Chair **Peters** said in the beginning, or getting more State funding, there are other avenues of funding that they could pursue. I think it's very admirable in fact that the Board wanted to have the goal to have in-state tuition increase as close to zero as possible, and that they would then take it upon themselves to get the resources to provide that for Iowans.

Walter: In essence, this is really a negotiation....Why water it down? Why not open up with bellicose?

Koch: Along those lines, as Jesse was talking about universities in California and their way of doing things, an opening salvo would just deal with what Higher Education does per se, which is nothing revolutionary and radical, but would, at the same time mean that we have ways that the State of Iowa can uniquely reach those aims, it's general goal

Wohlpart: So revising a goal like this might help to advocate for appropriate funding levels, balancing State appropriations and tuition in order to maintain quality and affordability. That's their job. Could you imagine that as a goal? That would be a tough thing to take on as a Regent.

Swan: And if you achieve it, it would be applauded.

Wohlpart: So this is the debt load, and I'm glad that Tim (**Bakula**) came and presented today. You can see again, they want a decrease of 10%. We've already decreased by 13%, and the way that we've done that---I don't know if you have seen the charts---the amount of private loans that our students have taken out has gone from like \$17 million a year down to like a million. And it's those private loans that create these, because there's very few restrictions on students when they take that. We're not required to go in and do counseling. When it's federal grants, they have to come in and get counseling and get feedback. That's all upfront and by reducing the private loans, our debt has come down. That's not going to come down much more than that.

DeSoto: And so it wouldn't be fair for us to be required to reduce it by 10% since we're already at the bottom.

Wohlpart: So if you were going to use a metric like this, you should again compare it to your peers.

DeSoto: Yes.

Peters: And we should look be looking at trends, not getting upset about any year to year, a little blip for one year is not necessarily a...

Andersen: I think it's hard when you're not doing the previous goal and you're not getting new resources, how are you going to provide the support the students need that did not get federal loans, did not get private loans, if

there's no other support or that's decreasing? That's the trend. What are students supposed to do in the same situation year-to-year?

DeSoto: Eat ramen noodles [in jest].

Wohlpart: This is 1.3. Now I'm going to acknowledge that this goal I think came out of what we're doing here at UNI with a lot of emphasis on engaging students and applied learning that I have been sharing with the Regents. I have all sorts of concerns about this goal, which I will share. If you think about applied and experiential learning activities, all of our students are doing some form of student government, student organization, internships. The range, if you think about broadly, which should cover every student, especially at a place like UNI. We will talk about this one as well.

O'Kane: Should that be 'learning opportunities,' Jim? **(Wohlpart)** 'Create work and learning opportunities' or 'learn opportunities?' I'm not sure what you're saying.

Wohlpart: I don't know the answer to that question.

Cooley: It says to see the Table of Contents. It says learning here.

DeSoto: This is kind of coming off of what Chair **Peters** is saying and people are nodding and saying 'yeah.' We'd sort of like for this to be a defense of public education, and I feel like when you see the whole document, this is one of the main objectives under the one that's closest to education 'increasing student success,' and I don't like it because it seems to do the

opposite, like because we are advocating for what universities really are, because it says 'create' work and learning opportunities for successful careers and graduate school preparation, but it should be for life: for life, for engaged citizenry. When you go to town hall meetings and you vote and you try to understand the issues before you as you go through life, you have a backdrop of your general education requirements to draw upon. I mean it's good that it helps with career and graduate school, but that's NOT the main objective. It is an objective, but it doesn't trump the other objectives of the university.

McNeal: This is the sort of stuff that came out of the Common Core. Basically this is like what was written in the Common Core objectives and they just copied it and spelled one of the words wrong. [laughter]

Andersen: I had a question about each institution and experiential learning.

Wohlpart: That would be an issue. I'm not sure that there's a real sense of what all that includes; what all that includes. It includes so many things that in fact, every student should be doing this. How do you capture how many students are? This would be a place where I would say, "Let's talk about quality...let's talk about the Regents providing support for creating high-quality experiential learning opportunities." How would they go about that? What would that look like?

DeSoto: You're saying that 70% isn't very meaningful?

Wohlpart: I don't think so. So this is Priority 2: Innovation and Learning.

Peters: Right away, the main goal that it's under is "Promoting innovation, research and economic development," but there's very little in the four objectives about teaching. I would like to think that we would be respected for our teaching as well as our scholarship, for example.

DeSoto: I didn't like that it said the goal for us is be to be respected and we actually doing it. We're not doing just respected for the scholarship and contributions, that we make, but that we do research and scholarship, independent of being respected for it. That should be primary. They should be supporting that. Does that make sense?

Swan: It makes perfect sense to me. This seems like a goal or an objective that an administration or faculty at a university would have, not a Board of Regents. I don't know why—what's the Board going to do to insure scholarship in some arcane field that no one on the Board has any confidence in, that it's going to be promoted. The administration or faculty at a specific university would be doing that. This seems inappropriate entirely as a Board objective.

Wohlpart: So again, think about how awesome it would be to have a goal that says the Board of Regents will provide for faculty contributions and scholarship? And then you could say 'In what ways do the Regents increase the opportunity to pursue licensing agreements and patents?' What is their role in startups? How do they support startups?

Skaar: This is where it begins as an educator of educators to feel like a very business oriented enterprise, and so I put out educators into the world, I don't have licenses and patents and intellectual properties and all this stuff. I put out practitioners, you know---teachers and school psychologists, and it feels from here on out...it feels very...the term economic development is in there, and I feel like we're a little left out. It goes back to what Cathy (**DeSoto**) was saying: What happened to informed citizenry and all of that kind of stuff? If we're thinking about UNI, and Teacher Education is a major thing of what we do here, I feel it is totally missed. Even, not to specifically say 'teacher education,' nothing like that. But the 'impliedness' isn't even there. We're working for a whole community; the service people and all that kind of stuff. It's just very 'businessy.' Sorry business people.

DeSoto: I would second that because this is the only objective, 2.1, under the Priority 2, "to insure Iowa's special schools and institutions are respected for their scholarship and contributions to their field and to Iowa," and there's nothing in there that would speak to many of the majors and departments and programs.

O'Kane: Very true.

Gould: When we were at the Strategic Planning workshop, they actually had started out leaving out anything related to academics or learning until Provost **Wohlpart** spoke up and said, "Where's the academic and the learning component in this goal?"

Escandell: I wanted to echo that sentiment. We're in the "business" of civic communities and knowledge and promoting ideas and engagement and it seems like that is lost in the background of this very specific document in favor of things tangible and measurable. I think we need to rescue this mission of civic which seems very foggy, I know, but that's what we are all about. I'm kind of missing that term from such a university-related document. We are something. We are a civic community, and that's missing somehow and that...again, rescue that term, maybe, which I think goes along with your point.

Wohlpart: It's almost five o'clock. I want to make sure we get through this.

O'Kane: If we get to five o'clock and we're not done, we may need a motion to extend our meeting perhaps ten or 15 minutes. I think this is a very important topic, so let's play it by ear.

Wohlpart: So this frames the concept of engagement in terms of our extension and outreach, which is one component of our engagement, but it leaves out whole other civic engagement that's not measured, and that's something we can point out here. We do a lot of this through a lot of our centers across the whole state of Iowa. But we can certainly add that what's missing is civic engagement. Questions or comments about this one, please.

DeSoto: You were making this point before, that it's not the number. It should be the impact, that the Board of Regents is interested in promoting; the actual impact, not the number, because I thought back over a couple of

activities over the years. For example, I talked to a high school careers class for 15 minutes---that's one. Or, I briefed the governor one-on-one about my research for an hour---that's one. They should be trying to promote actual impact, not just kindergarten kind of bean-counting.

Wohlpart: Awesome. That's really good. Thank you.

McNeal: This is limited to Iowa. Some people work with other states or other countries.

DeSoto: Yes.

Wohlpart: This is something that they are very big on—that we build more partnerships across the Regents institutions. We have been working very hard on that. They did just announced a 3+2 physics program and we have several other social work that are coming on board. We are working on those. Again, we should be thinking of quality and impact not just the number.

Skaar: Okay, here comes the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) thing now: STEM: There's so much controversy about whether there's data to say that we need more STEM, so I just want to know where, how that plays out in this goal. What about arts? What about other things? Why are we specifically pointing out STEM when the data is still sort of on the need there?

Wohlpart: We can talk about employer surveys that suggest there's some broad-based learning.

Skaar: There is, and Iowa specifically has some data that suggests that in Iowa there is not as high of a STEM demand and so...Yes, we want people in the STEM fields, but is it enough to warrant specifically pointing it out in our strategic plan?

O’Kane: We need a motion to prolong our meeting for some time. Can you frame the motion please.

Wohlpart: Ten minutes should do it because we’ve got one more.

O’Kane: Motion by Senator **Walter**, second by senator **Burnight**. All in favor, please say ‘aye,’ opposed, ‘nay,’ (one nay), abstentions, ‘aye.’ Thank you.
motion passes.

Wohlpart: So the third and final part, “Using Mission Focused Resources,” this goes to all of the TIER work that we’re doing.

DeSoto: I’ve got a question about who is defining that ‘high demand?’

Wohlpart: That’s one the previous one. This goes back to Nikki’s (**Skaar**) point.

Swan: What constitutes ‘workforce’? Non-NGO’s? Non-governmental organizations? Those are occupations. They’re rewarding, would that be considered part of workforce? I would suspect it is.

Wohlpart: It is, but not always one that’s paid attention to.

Swan: But all the kinds of occupations that should go under the heading of workforce---the ones that are always immediately thought of.

DeSoto: Again, I think a general education is not just to provide them for the workforce I think.

Wohlpart: Operational efficiencies? These are ones that are already happening already with the TIER.

Swan: I don't know if this goes under 'operational efficiencies' or not, or if this would go under. There are 'other efficiencies that could be obtained amongst the three universities I think of. For example, Library Resources. If the three Regent universities subscribe to certain databases through the Regents universities, it could achieve savings and provide greater access to faculty and students. And so there are other kinds of efficiencies that we could achieve with the Boards' leadership. The Board would have to do these things. One or the other of the two state universities often do not want to collaborate and engage in common contracts like this, so that actually does take Board leadership and that would be very appropriate.

Gould: My note on library efficiencies is that we are doing a little bit with Iowa and Iowa State. The big thing is that the discounts that Iowa and Iowa State would get are significantly greater when they go with like the Big Ten Consortium and other consortiums. The three of us doesn't get any huge discount for them. That is the one...

Swan: I didn't want to get into this, but you're saying that you have to be excluded and the Big Ten Consortium have to exclude other universities?

Wohlpart: This is something we actually work on a lot to in our relationship across universities in ways that we can be more efficient and cost effective in sharing resources. The Master Procurement Contracts are things like where you buy your computers from. When we all buy them from the same place they are significantly cheaper. So that's something that is already happening.

DeSoto: So the Master Procurement Contract just means something that would apply to all three universities?

Wohlpart: Correct.

DeSoto: Is this typical in a Strategic Plan for a university, to see something this specific? Because I didn't see anything on this.

Wohlpart: It's an emphasis that we have right now and it's something that we are already doing. This is another part of the TIER initiative, to take a close look at the classroom usage.

McNeal: It noticed on the next set, 3.3, that we should be increasing our e-learning so if we're teaching more online, how are we going to make classrooms more efficiently?

Wohlpart: Because they want us to actually grow e-learning and grow enrollment so it does not necessarily decrease what we're doing on our campus.

McNeal: It seems like if we were going to e-learning we'd be using our classrooms less.

Wohlpart: Unless you're growing your enrollment. So in other words, do what southern New Hampshire did.

Swan: They're saying that there are different populations that would never come to a campus that they want us to capture through e-learning, correct?

O'Kane: I don't know that we know the actual demand for e-learning.

Wohlpart: So with this one, we actually are required to put together a committee to look at our room usage on campus. We are doing that. That is a requirement. That is something that is happening---to look at our room usage; to coordinate more closely. We're already looking at the use of technology and the technology licenses.

DeSoto: We hear in our department that there's a push to have more 8:00 classes and more evening classes. Is that true?

Wohlpart: I have understood the concern that classes start at different times across the three universities, and that might be a detraction to student's ability to take online courses at a certain time.

Dhanwada: Are you talking specifically about on our campus? I don't know think it's specifically 8:00 or evening, but there are peak periods when people are really using it, but there are other times when we could be much more efficient in scheduling our classrooms; just sort of spread out the classes during the day.

DeSoto: How would we do this? Students also choose classes that they want to take at certain times and sometimes students don't want an 8:00 class, just as much or more than faculty don't want to schedule it. How do we control that? Is that what they're talking about here with increasing the classroom space? [to Paul **Andersen**] What do you think about that? What if they said we're going to have to have 20% of the classes now offered at eight in the morning?

Andersen: Students won't be very happy with that. Students will wait semesters to take courses that happen at a certain time. Over a time period, you'll probably see that students won't graduate on time.

McNeal: One thing we could do would be to put required courses that they absolutely have to have at 8 a.m. [Laughter].

DeSoto: It's hard though. We struggle with that in our department. I don't like this metric. I don't know if that means there's going to be a mandate to have 8:00 classes or 6:00 p.m. classes, and I don't think that's a good idea, I don't think that's understanding the way the University actually works. It's

easy to say, “We’ll make students take an 8:00 a.m. class.” But, I mean, there’s students who don’t wake up until like 10:00, so it’s not that easy.

Escandell: Based on your input, what’s going to happen to the graduation rates? [Laughter]

Dhanwada: I think one of the things that goes into that as well is the class experiences that we now have. So not all classes meet at the times they’re supposed to meet. So there’s overlap, and so students aren’t able to take courses back to back or however it is, so we’ve got to take a look at that.

Wohlpart: It depends on how classes are scheduled, and how a class sits empty for a period of time. Those are some of the things we’re looking at. I do not believe that the Board of Regents is interested in coming to UNI and telling us that we have to start classes at 8:00.

DeSoto: Okay.

Wohlpart: And then the last one, this is the e-learning opportunities that we will have some responses to this. There’s no data that suggests this makes sense, nor the resources to do this.

McNeal: If we increase by 10% every year, we will eventually run out.
[Laughter]

Wohlpart: Well, it’s only a five-year plan, so...

DeSoto: But that's a lot even in five years. That was something that in my department, some of the faculty were concerned about. I would point out that our guest today said that he didn't think online courses were the preferred method to teach financial literacy, and I wanted to know why that was, and it's because it's not the same as being face-to-face.

Wohlpert: Thank you all so much. If you have other feedback, you can send it to other members of the group...

Gould: I'll be there Wednesday.

O'Kane: I'll be there Wednesday. Scott (**Peters**) will be there Wednesday.

Wohlpert: Awesome.

O'Kane: We need a motion to adjourn. Please. Moved by Senator **Gould** seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor say 'aye.' Okay. Thank you.

Submitted by,
Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Follows is ONE addendum: The Board of Regents DRAFT Strategic Plan

Building a Better Future for Iowans

Iowa Board of Regents


Strategic Plan Working Draft

2016-2021

Strategic Planning Process

Beginning in January of 2016, the Iowa Board of Regents in partnership with their stakeholders, began the process to create a five-year strategic plan that will begin in 2016 and last until 2021. This strategic plan builds off the work and successes of the previous plan (2010-2016) as well as emerging priorities in the state of Iowa and across the country.

This document is a working draft that has been put together based on initial research and stakeholder input and feedback and serves only as a resource to collect additional feedback to inform the final plan. Please note that the objectives, metrics, and goals presented in this document and in any related conversations are for input and feedback purposes only.



Contents

Strategic Planning Process	1
About the Iowa Board of Regents	3
Core Values, Mission and Vision	4
Strategic Priorities	5
Priority One: Increasing Student Success	5
Objective 1.1: Create clear pathways for students to enter, move through and complete their education goals.....	5
Objective 1.2: Maintain quality institutions of higher education that are affordable for Iowa residents.	5
Objective 1.3: Create work and learn opportunities for successful career and graduate school preparation.	5
Priority Two: Promoting Innovation in Learning, Research, and Economic Development	6
Objective 2.1: Ensure Iowa’s universities and special schools are respected for their scholarship and contributions to their field and to Iowa.....	6
Objective 2.2: Provide world class extension, service, and outreach.....	6
Objective 2.3: Build strategic collaborations within and between universities as well as with outside entities that foster opportunities for innovation and economic development.	6
Objective 2.4: Produce quality graduates to align with Iowa’s workforce needs.	6
Priority Three: Developing and Efficiently Using Mission Focused Resources	7
Objective 3.1: Continue to seek operational efficiencies.	7
Objective 3.2: Develop and maintain the physical and technological infrastructures.	7
Objective 3.3: Increase utilization of e-learning and other distance education program delivery systems.	7
Appendices	8
Appendix A: Previous Mission and Vision Statements (2010-2016 Strategic Plan).....	8
Appendix B: Peer Institutions	9
Appendix C: Relevant Data Points.....	10
Appendix D: Suggested Activities.....	11

About the Iowa Board of Regents

In 1909, The Iowa Legislature created the Iowa Board of Regents to provide governance to the University of Iowa, Iowa State University, the University of Northern Iowa, the Iowa School for the Deaf and the Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School through policy making, oversight and coordination as outlined in Iowa law.

The Board's nine members are citizen volunteers appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Iowa Senate to serve six-year terms. They elect one member to serve as president and another to serve as president pro tem for two-year terms. According to Iowa law, one member must be a full-time undergraduate or graduate student at one of the public universities at the time of his or her appointment, and not more than five members can be of the same political party. Gender balance is also required.

The Board meets approximately eight times a year at the five public institutions or other locations around the state. The meetings are open to the public except when Iowa's open meeting law allows closed sessions for specific reasons, such as the discussion of personnel matters.

The Board is statutorily authorized by Iowa Code Chapter 262, which states that the Board is responsible to "have and exercise all the powers necessary and convenient for the effective administration of its office and of the institutions under its control."

The current members of Iowa's Board of Regents include

- Bruce Rastetter, President
- Katie Mulholland, President Pro Tem
- Mary Andringa
- Sherry Bates
- Patricia Cownie
- Milt Dakovich
- Rachel Johnson
- Larry McKibben
- Dr. Subhash Sahai
- Robert Donley, Executive, Director

The Board of Regents provides governance to the following Public Institutions, and their current leadership:

Iowa School for the Deaf and Iowa Braille and Sign Saving School	Mr. Steven Gettel	Superintendent
Iowa State University	Dr. Steven Leath	President
University of Iowa	Mr. Bruce Harreld	President
University of Northern Iowa	Dr. William Ruud	President

Core Values, Mission and Vision

Revised Mission Statement

The Iowa Board of Regents enhances the quality of life of Iowans by improving the excellence, accessibility and public service activities of the Regent Institutions.

Revised Vision Statements

The Regent Enterprise will be an invaluable asset to the State of Iowa through active engagement, research and learning.

The Regent Enterprise will be an invaluable asset to the State of Iowa through active engagement, research and learning, while nationally recognized as leading systems of public education.

The Regent Enterprise will be nationally recognized as a leading system of public education and in the State of Iowa as an invaluable asset providing opportunities for active engagement, research and learning.

Values

The Board of Regents, and its member institutions, are committed to:

- Academic Freedom
- Academic Quality
- Access and Student Success
- Civility
- Collaboration
- Continuous Improvement
- Diversity among faculty, staff and students
- Ethical Behavior
- Honesty
- Intellectual Development and Creativity
- Open, effective communication
- Public accountability, stewardship, and service
- Transparency

Culture

The Board of Regents and its institutions nurture environments, consistent with their core values, which are characterized by the following:

- Passion for learning that enables individuals to achieve their full potential and enhances quality of life.
- Academic freedom that stimulates creativity, inquiry, and the advancement of knowledge.
- Leadership in demonstrating the highest levels of integrity, honesty, ethics and civil discourse in all activities.
- Collaboration and coordination across the Regent Enterprise and with other institutions and organizations, both public and private to meet the needs of Iowans.
- Respectful interaction among members of diverse backgrounds, culture, and beliefs in nurturing environments while promoting critical thinking, free inquiry, open communication, and broad participation.
- Effective communications that inform citizens of the roles, value, and impact of the Board and its institutions
- Governance that demonstrates effective, accountable service to the public through strategic planning, hiring of and delegation to presidents and superintendent, responsible oversight, and effective stewardship of resources.
- Recruiting, retaining and developing outstanding students, faculty and staff.

Strategic Priorities

The Board of Regents in partnership with the Regent Institutions work to build a better future for all Iowans by creating and supporting services, activities and programs aimed at:

- Increasing Student Success
- Promoting Innovation in Learning, Research and Economic Development
- Developing and Effectively Utilizing Mission Focused Resources

Priority One: Increasing Student Success

Objective 1.1: Create clear pathways for students to enter, move through and complete their education goals.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Increase fall to fall retention for first year students by 0.5% each year.
- Increase 4 year completion rate by 3-4% annually to reach or exceed median of peer group within 5 years.
- Increase 6 year completion rate by 2-3% annually to reach or exceed median of peer group within 5 years.
- Increase the retention and completion rates for underrepresented students at all institutions.
- Increase the reading and math achievement levels at the Special Schools (ISD).

Objective 1.2: Maintain quality institutions of higher education that are affordable for Iowa residents.

Possible Metrics and Goals

- Do not increase tuition more than x% per year.
- Build upon existing efforts to increase merit and need based dollars available to students at Regent Institutions.
- Utilizing state appropriations and resources for student aid.
- Using 2014-2015 debt loads as a baseline, reduce average student debt load by 10% over 5 years.

Objective 1.3: Create work and learn opportunities for successful career and graduate school preparation.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Establish baseline in year 1--number of students participating in experiential learning activities including undergraduate/graduate research, internships, service learning, study abroad, etc.; increase baseline number by 5% each year over the next 5 years.
- 70% of all students will graduate with at least one documented experiential learning (undergraduate/graduate research, internships, service learning, study abroad, etc.) activity.

Priority Two: Promoting Innovation in Learning, Research, and Economic Development

Objective 2.1: Ensure Iowa's universities and Special Schools are respected for their scholarship and contributions to their field and to Iowa.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Awards, funding dollars, publications, etc. compared to benchmark institutions
- Intellectual property income
- License agreements/patents
- Licenses signed with start-up companies in Iowa

Objective 2.2: Provide world class extension, service, and outreach.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Number of Iowa counties where service, extension and outreach activities occur.
- Number of Iowa residents served by Regent Enterprise extension, service and outreach activities.
- Number or percent of students, faculty or staff engaged in outreach and service activities in underserved areas of Iowa.

Objective 2.3: Build strategic collaborations within and between universities as well as with outside entities that foster opportunities for innovation and economic development.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Number of partnerships and/or collaboration opportunities between campuses and partners.

Objective 2.4: Produce quality graduates to align with Iowa's workforce needs.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Percent of graduates from Regent institutions employed in Iowa (could be one year out, five years out, ten years out).
- Increase the number of returning students who have "stopped out" for a period of time who are re-engaged in coursework and complete a degree.
- Percent of STEM and high demand degrees offered.
- Percent of students enrolling in and completing STEM and high demand degrees.

Priority Three: Developing and Efficiently Using Mission Focused Resources

Objective 3.1: Continue to seek operational efficiencies.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Consolidate administrative activities, to reduce administrative costs across campuses to realize the estimated TIER savings projections.
- Expand the shared services functions to increase efficiency.
- Increase the number of master procurement contracts across the Regent Enterprise to better serve the system.

Objective 3.2: Develop and maintain the physical and technological infrastructures.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Increase the utilization of current classroom and laboratory space for educational opportunities by 10%.
- Increase coordination of technology used at all institutions.
- Consolidate multiple technology licenses into system-wide licenses to reduce license duplication by 25%.

Objective 3.3: Increase utilization of e-learning and other distance education program delivery systems.

Possible Metrics and Goals:

- Increase the number of percent of e-learning opportunities and distance education opportunities (courses and sections) by 10% each year.
- Increase the number of cross-institutional opportunities for e-learning and distance education by 50% each year.
- Increase the number of online degrees/certificates completed by 10%.

Appendices

Appendix A: Previous Mission and Vision Statements (2010-2016 Strategic Plan)

Mission

The Board of Regents, working through Iowa's public universities and special schools:

- Provides high-quality accessible education to students.
- Engages in high-quality research, scholarship, and creative activities to enhance the quality of life for Iowans and society in general.
- Provides needed public services.
- Creates and supports economic development in partnership with public and private sectors.

Vision

The Board of Regents strives to provide effective and quality public education for the citizens of Iowa.

The Regent Enterprise will be an invaluable asset to the State of Iowa through active engagement, research, and learning.

The Regent Enterprise will be recognized among the nation's leading systems of public universities for:

- Excellence in undergraduate, graduate, and professional education;
- Leadership in meeting state, regional, national, and global needs through quality undergraduate, graduate, professional, extension, and outreach programs, research, and service.
- The Regent Enterprise will also be recognized for its excellence in meeting the needs of students who are blind or visually impaired and deaf or hard of hearing.

Appendix B: Peer Institutions

Iowa State University

- University of Arizona
- University of California-Davis
- University of Illinois-Urbana
- Michigan State University
- University of Minnesota
- North Carolina State University
- Ohio State University
- Purdue University-Main Campus
- Texas A&M University
- University of Wisconsin-Madison

University of Iowa

- University of Arizona
- University of California
- University of Illinois
- Indiana University
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota
- University of North Carolina
- Ohio State University
- University of Texas
- University of Wisconsin

University of Northern Iowa

- College of Charleston
- Eastern Illinois University
- Ferris State University
- James Madison University
- Marshall University
- Southern Illinois University - Edwardsville
- Truman State University
- University of Massachusetts – Dartmouth
- University of Minnesota - Duluth
- Western Washington University

Appendix C: Relevant Data Points

Current Fall to Fall Retention Rates*

	Iowa State University	University of Northern Iowa	University of Iowa
Full Time	86%	85%	86%
Part Time	79%	33%	75%

*Based on 2013-2014 cohort as reported to IPEDS

Current Completion Rates*

	Iowa State University	University of Northern Iowa	University of Iowa
Current 4 year completion	39.5%	37.9%	48.2%
Average 4 year completion for peers	52.9%	30.3%	62.3%
Median 4 year completion for peers	53.1%	29.9%	58.8%
Current 6 year completion	68.9%	63.9%	70.0%
Average 6 year completion for peers	78.1%	57.2%	82.0%
Median 6 year completion for peers	81.2%	55.6%	83.8%

*Based on 2009 cohort as reported to IPEDS.

Current Average Debt Load/Student upon Graduation

	Iowa State University	University of Northern Iowa	University of Iowa	Average of all Enterprise Institutions
Current Student Debt Load/Student*	\$28,880	\$23,163	\$28,716	\$26,920
Average Debt Load/Student at Peer Institutions	\$24,591	\$27,804	\$24,871	\$25,755
5% overall debt decrease/per student	\$27,436	\$22,005	\$27,280	\$25,574
10% overall debt decrease/per student	\$25,992	\$20,847	\$25,844	\$24,228
5% above average Peer Debt Load/Student	\$25,821	\$29,194	\$26,114	\$27,043
10% above average Peer Debt Load/Student	\$27,050	\$30,584	\$27,358	\$28,420

*average student debt load for students who graduated in the 2014-2015 academic year as reported to IPEDS.

Appendix D: Suggested Activities

Priority One: Increasing Student Success

Objective 1.1: Create clear pathways for students to enter, move through and complete their education goals.

- Increase support for under-represented students to ensure they are completing desired credentials.
- Increase support for transfer students to ensure they are completing desired credentials.

Objective 1.2: Maintain quality institutions of higher education that are affordable for Iowa residents.

- Increase need-based/merit-based opportunities for student financial aid for Iowa residents by 5% across all Regent Institutions
- Maintain tuition rates that are at or below median tuition of peer institutions.
- Increase education opportunities for students related to financial aid.

Objective 1.3: Create work and learn opportunities for successful career and graduate school preparation.

- Increase outreach events and activities conducted by each institution
- Develop guidelines for experiential learning activities.
- Create reporting system for departments to report up through college/school and university, the number of students engaging in experiential learning activities.
- Develop course codes and related curriculum to allow student to place experiential learning activities within the context of their discipline and allow for easier tracking of participation rates and types.

Priority Two: Promoting Innovation in Learning, Research, and Economic Development

Objective 2.1: Ensure Iowa's universities and special schools are respected for their scholarship and contributions to their field and to Iowa.

- Provide financial resources and support for faculty to pursue their scholarly endeavors.
- Promote and share scholarship and contributions of faculty and staff to statewide audience.

Objective 2.2: Provide world class professional and extension services, and outreach.

Objective 2.3: Build strategic collaborations within and between universities as well as with outside entities that foster opportunities for innovation and economic development.

Objective 2.4: Produce quality graduates to align with Iowa's workforce needs.

- Targeted marketing and outreach to adult students who have "stopped" out of school
- Marketing to attract students to high demand and STEM related fields, aimed at helping them understand career opportunities in Iowa

Priority Three: Developing and Efficiently Using Mission Focused Resources

Objective 3.1: Continue to seek operational efficiencies.

- Continue working with TIER committees to further identify areas for consolidation and ensure the realization of these goals

Objective 3.2: Develop and maintain the physical and technological infrastructures.

- Ensure that campuses are working together to identify evolving technology needs and opportunities in order to most efficiently integrate new technologies on campuses.

Objective 3.3: Increase utilization of e-learning and other distance education program delivery systems.

- Provide professional development opportunities for faculty interested in teaching in an e-learning environment to ensure quality and consistency across courses.
- Provide financial incentives for faculty who develop cross-institutional e-learning opportunities.

DRAFT

DRAFT