

9-12-2016

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, September 12, 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, September 12, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 248.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/248

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 #1780
UNI Faculty Senate
Sept. 12, 2016 (3:31 -5:00)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library
SUMMARY MINUTES

1. Courtesy Announcements

No members of the press were present.

Interim Provost **Bass** shared the Board of Regents' suggested 2% tuition increase and that UNI's formal request is in process.

Faculty Chair **Kidd** encouraged faculty involvement in shaping the Strategic Plan by Oct. 1, either through meeting attendance or online input.

Senate Chair **Gould** reminded members of new audio setup.

2. Summary Minutes/Full Transcript of April 25, 2016

** (Cooley/Burnight) Motion passed.

3. Consideration of Calendar Items for Docketing

1300 Emeritus request for **Gerald Peterson**, Rod Library; **Mary Herring**, Curriculum & Instruction; **Doris Corbett**, School of Kinesiology, Allied Health and Human Services; **William Callahan**, Special Education; **Anthony Stevens**, Educational Talent Search; **Theresa Kouri**, Communication Sciences and Disorders; **Linda Schneider**, College of Humanities, Arts & Sciences; **Phyllis Baker**, Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology; **Jean Niebauer**, Office of Academic Advising; **Martha Wartick**, Accounting; and **Bill Stigliani**, Center for Energy & Environmental Education (CEEE). <http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/emeritus-requests-gerald-peterson- mary-herring-doris>

** (**Zeitz/Smith**) Motion to docket in regular order (with some names withdrawn). Passed.

1301 2017-18 Curriculum proposals for new majors and associated courses: BA Physics (CHAS), BAS in Technology (CHAS), and BAS in Managing Business Organizations (CBA) (Request to docket at the head of the order for today's meeting) <http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/2017-18-curriculum-proposals- new-majors-and-associated>

**** (McNeal/Zeitz)** Motion to docket at head of order as **#1196** Passed.

4. New Business: Elections

Senate Secretary: Jesse **Swan**

Senate Representative to the University Budget Committee- Tabled

Senate Representative to CETL – Leigh **Zeitz**

Senate Representative to IAAC – Bill **Koch**

Senate Representative to LACC – Tabled

Senate Representative to the University Writing Committee- Tabled

5. Consideration of Docketed Items

1301/1196 2017-18 Curriculum proposals for new majors & associated courses:

<http://www.uni.edu/senate/current-year/current-and-pending-business/2017-18-curriculum-proposals-new-majors-and-associated>

**** (Burnight/O’Kane)** BA Physics (CHAS) Passed.

**** (Fenech/McNeal)** BAS in Technology (CHAS). Passed. Two abstentions.

**** (Skaar/McNeal)** BAS in Managing Business and Organizations. Passed. Two abstentions.

6. Consultative Session

**** (Campbell/Burnight)** motion to move to for Presidential Search Update and Q&A with Regent Katie **Mulholland**, Professor Dan **Power**, Co-Chairs of the UNI Presidential Search Committee, and Dr. Bob **Donley**, Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer from the Board of Regents.

Information was shared about the UNI Presidential Search process. Questions were asked and answered regarding the resignation of former UNI president William **Ruud**. (*See transcript pages 31-47.*)

**** (O’Kane/Zeitz)** to move out of Consultative Session.

7. Adjournment

**** (Campbell/Zeitz)** Motion passed by acclamation.

Next Meeting:

3:30 p.m. Sept. 12, 2016 Scholar Space (Room 301) Rod Library, UNI

Full Transcript of 48 pages and 3 addenda follows.

FULL TRANSCRIPT of the
UNI Faculty Senate Meeting
Sept. 12, 2016 (3:31-5:00)
Scholar Space (Room 301), Rod Library

Present: Senators Ann **Bradfield**, John **Burnight**, Russ **Campbell**, Jennifer **Cooley**, Francis **Degnin**, Lou **Fenech**, Chair **Gould**, David **Hakes**, Rui **He**, Tom **Hesse**, Bill **Koch**, Ramona **McNeal**, Steve **O’Kane**, Amy **Petersen**, Nicole **Skaar**, Gerald **Smith**, Vice-Chair Michael **Walter**, Leigh **Zeitz**. Also: Interim Provost Brenda **Bass**, Associate Provosts Nancy **Cobb** and Kavita **Dhanwada** and Faculty Chair Tim **Kidd**.

Not Present: Aricia **Beckman**.

Guests: Dale **Cyphert**, Bob **Donley**, Lisa **Jepsen**, Bryce **Kanago**, Katie **Mulholland**, Dan **Power**, Paul **Shand**.

Gould: I’m going to call the meeting to order. Welcome to the first Senate meeting of the fall. We’ll have an exciting year ahead of us. The first thing I want to do is call for Press Identification. Next, comments from Interim Provost **Bass**.

Bass: Thank you Gretchen, (**Gould**) I am going to keep my remarks very short today because I know that the agenda is very packed. But I did want to say that I look forward to working with the Senate this year. I think it will be a great year. I did have one point of business that I just wanted to make the Senate aware of: It’s that time of year where we are working on student fees and then tuition proposal, so I wanted to just make the Senate aware that for the student fees, and IAG has been consulted both for the student services fees as well as any academic fees and they’ve given us their recommendations back already. And for the tuition proposal, the Board has suggested that we consider at 2% increase for tuition and so we’re currently examining those numbers and looking to put in our formal recommendation, our formal request soon. I looked at Bob (**Donley**) because I’m making sure that I...

Donley: You're right.

Bass: Alright. Just making sure. I'm not used to presenting that information with the Executive Directory **Donley** here.

Zeitz: Is that 2% right across the board, including Continuing Education?

Bass: Continuing Education, we're still running the numbers to see what that looks like because often that looks a little bit different. We're also taking a look at Graduate Education and what the Non-Resident tuition should be. But 2% right now that we're looking at, is for Resident Undergraduate and then trying to see how that fits with the other components.

Zeitz: Thank you.

Gould: Comments from Faculty Chair **Kidd**?

Kidd: I will always be brief. There's some Strategic Plan or Master Plan listening sessions coming up this week, I think Thursday or Friday. I recommend that you get involved either by going or by giving us some online information because this process has accelerated from what we initially anticipated from being a year thing to being done by October 1. So things are moving very quickly. Give input in as you can. Thank you.

O'Kane: If I could second that the Strategic Planning Committee really, really wants our input. We're wide open to listening to that, so please do take advantage of that.

Zeitz: I just wanted to get specifics as to when the meetings are.

O’Kane: Tim (**Kidd**), do you know? It’s Thursday and Friday right?

Kidd: I was going to send a reminder out. We got an email last week, but I believe it’s Thursday morning and Friday morning and Friday afternoon.

O’Kane: That sounds right.

Zeitz: Okay. Thanks.

Degnin: Hearing Dr. **Kidd** speaking, reminded me that the website needs some updating. Like Scott **Peters** right now is still listed as the Faculty Chair.

Kidd: On the Senate website?

Gould: We’ve been working on that. We are continuing to work on that.

Kidd: (laughter) Three years.

Gould: Yes. Thank you. I only have a couple of housekeeping comments right now. First item, is please speak up. We have new audio recording equipment back there, and new students, and Kathy, and also for those of you who are looking for the bathroom, they are straight back that way. Women’s is the first left; Men’s is the second left. Moving on, we need approval of the minutes from April 25th. Can I have a motion? So moved by Senator **Cooley**, seconded by Senator **Burnight**. Any comments or questions?

Campbell: Yes. I wasn't at the meeting, but something is unclear. On page 28 it said you approved a petition for priority registration for military and veteran students.

Gould: Yes.

Campbell: If you go to that petition, it says under Action: We would like to offer the same priority registration status to veterans on campus that we currently offer to other groups, including certain students with disability services. These groups are allowed to register on the day before their class begins to register. No students register on the day before their class begins to register. Certain students with disabilities register before any other undergraduates. And varsity athletes, the only other group with priority registration, register at the beginning of the day their class registers, one semester a year. What form of priority registration did you approve?

Gould: I do not have the minutes at my fingertips. Let me see if I can pull them up.

Campbell: The minutes say you approved the petition.

Gould: Right. Senator **O'Kane**, do you recall?

O'Kane: All I could add to that is... equivalent to..

Campbell: We would like to offer the same priority registration as other students—these groups—are allowed to register the day before class begins. That's not when the other students register, and the other students register at

different times. Certain students with disabilities register very early. Athletes are only register one semester a year. I did talk to Phil **Patton** and he intends...

O’Kane: Phil (**Patton**) was here when we talked about that, was he not?

Gould: I believe so. Yes. No. I don’t think so.

Campbell: I don’t think so as the minutes say you had talked to Phil and he wasn’t in the minutes.

O’Kane: Okay. That needs to be clarified.

Campbell: Phil **Patton** says he intends to implement it as the beginning of the day their class registers, one –every semester, as opposed to the one semester a year, which athletes have.

O’Kane: It sounds like you’re just asking for clarification.

Campbell: The minutes, as they’re written, are unclear as to what you’re asking for, although I think the petition is just advisory and the Registrar can do what he wants.

Gould: So should we amend the minutes?

O’Kane: We can approve the minutes as amended, as long as it’s okay, if you’re challenging the minutes, we consult with the Registrar and fix the petition.

Campbell: I don’t know the Parliamentarian is up to the proper procedure.

Gould: So all in favor of approving the minutes with the amendment/clarification?

Kidd: I don't know if there's any clarification to be had. It was the petition that was presented. It appears that you're correct. I believe that the thought was that the way disabled students and athletes had priority registration was the day in advance of their class. So if that's incorrect, then perhaps you could ask the Registrar to give clarification for how that would be done? Then, we could just approve the minutes as they are.

Campbell: Yes. I think you approved the petition, but the petition is unclear. It's not clear what you were asking for.

Gould: So, do I have a motion to approve the minutes from April 25?

Campbell: You already have that motion.

Gould: Yes. Sorry. Any discussion? All in favor, say "aye." All opposed say "nay." Abstentions, aye? Hearing none, the motion passes. Next on the agenda we have the emeritus requests, and I will say some emeritus requests were incorrectly added to the agenda and they will be withdrawn and handled administratively. So those requests that will be withdrawn are for Doris **Corbett**, Anthony **Stevens**, Theresa **Kouri**, Linda **Schneider** and Jean **Niebauer**. The emeritus request for Bill **Stigliani** will be withdrawn until more information is gathered. So the amended calendar item is emeritus request for Gerald **Peterson**, Mary **Herring**, William **Callahan**, Phyllis **Baker** and Martha **Wartick**. Do I have a motion to docket this amended item in regular order? So moved by Senator **Zeitz**. Seconded by Senator **Smith**. All in favor of docketing this item, please say "aye," all opposed, "nay," abstentions, "aye". Motion passes. Moving on to Calendar Item 1301, the 2017-2018 curriculum proposals for new majors and associated courses: The BA in

Physics, BAS in Technology, and the BAS in Managing Business [and] Organizations. We have a request to docket this at the head of today's order. Do I have a motion to docket at the head of today's order? So moved by Senator **McNeal**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. All in favor...any discussion? Sorry.

O'Kane: I have to object to this proposal. Last year...things have changed. We're now on a yearly cycle rather than a two-year cycle. Last year the Senate was constantly was dealing with proposals that were brought to us with this urgency to come to the head of the docket. It at least intimated to me that would be remedied. I really object to the University Community not having the full amount of time to look through these very, very important proposals. What it's beginning to look to me now is that this is going to be a regular phenomenon every fall. I would suggest, and it sounds harsh, I would suggest that we skip a year of having new proposals to get this back on track, so that this works properly so that it appears on the calendar. That the University Community has access to it. It's docketed. The University Community again has access to it. Then we discuss it. Then we vote upon it. That's my thoughts.

Smith: It seems that things are being perennially asked to be moved to the head of the docket. I would just guesstimate that in the last two or three years, close to 50% of the items, maybe more, but at least 50% have compelling reasons by the authors to move to the head of the docket. There's a reason we have regular order, and that has already been addressed. That is to give people time to think and consider and evaluate. Other than unique circumstances, it's possible that this should be moved to the head of the order, but it's almost like we don't have regular order, because we perennially move things to the head of the docket. I'm

not saying that this doesn't have good reasons to be, but everything has good reasons to be when the authorship group wants it moved to the head of the order. So I would just like for us to think about, do we actually believe in regular order where there's time to contemplate, to interact with peers and get additional input, or do we want to operate on a quasi-emergency basis, and just always have things presented and approved? I'm just asking for the Senators to just think about the substance of what we approve.

Kidd: I can't comment about the BAS degrees and that they're being asked to go to the head of the order. I don't know if the order really matters at this point because today we're having a Consultative Session at 4:15, so there's time anyway. The Physics degree I believe was pushed back due to some kind of Board of Regents new program and so it was actually looked at by the UCCC committee some time ago, so I'm not sure the reasons for the BAS degrees, but that's the reason for the BA degree.

Dhanwada: I did ask for this to be docketed early, and I understand and agree with many of your options and your reasonings, but let me just kind of clarify some of the reasonings of why I asked that it be docketed. I was fully prepared to be asked for it to be on the docket. I think the Faculty Senate was scheduled to meet on the first day of class. We didn't have a meeting, and so I was going to get that docketed then. The thing is, we have, we are speeded up in our curriculum because of the one-year cycle, and so if this, if all of the discussions for these programs happened last spring, so going through the regular order that we've always gone through, with passage through the College Senates, going through the Dean, then going through the UCC Committee in the fall. Now, we have to

take it because these are new programs, and these are changes that have to be approved by the Board of Regents, and so therefore, we have to move that forward. So the process for that is interesting because we have to actually get everything approved by internal governance on our end, before we can then go to submission to the Council of Provosts, and this is basically all the Provosts of the three Regents institutions that usually meet the night before a Board meeting. So we have that. After it goes to the Council of Provosts, it then usually at the following Board meeting, it then goes to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. Okay? So we're moving all of this along. Then additionally, after that, it gets approved, hopefully, by the full Board of Regents. So, we've got that going on. If we want to try to get this approved within our curriculum cycle, and have it appear in our catalogs for the following fall, so in this case it would be Fall of 2017, we kind of have to have all of this forward and approved by all of the processes, including, not only internal governance, but external stakeholders as well, such as the Board of Regents. In this case, these are new programs and so we also have to go to the Iowa Coordinating Council, so another stakeholder that has to go out, that's at least 20 days, if there's no comments on it. If there is some sort of comments or objections, it has to go at least 30 days. So all of this, I'm trying to kind of put in perspective. I guess the question that we want to ask is if faculty work hard on a proposal and it goes through the entire channel, and it was available on Leapfrog, okay? Again, I wanted to put it on the docket for that first meeting, but was unable to because you all didn't meet. We met at UCC. There was considerable discussion of the three programs. It was approved and so then I put it onto the Senate docket, asking that it be at the head of the order because of this timeline that I have put forth. If we want to get it into the catalog and have

it start in May or the summer or in fall, we kind of have to go through that timeline.

O’Kane: If I could ask a couple questions of the Associate Provost?

Dhanwada: Yes.

O’Kane: So it sounds like what you’re asking for is that at least in some years we are automatically going to be putting this in the front of the docket?

Dhanwada: I would like to ask that that be done because this the timeline. And again, these other things that have to go before the Board for continuous approval.

O’Kane: is having this done-- finished at the last meeting of the spring Faculty Senate meeting possible?

Dhanwada: Let’s see. So we say...

O’Kane: Move this up one whole meeting, so now everything’s copacetic.

Dhanwada: We could do that, but the problem is, it won’t have passed through the UCC, because remember in spring we’ve just gone through the College Senates, right? We will not have had gone through the UCC Committee or the GCC Committee, so that’s kind of the final order.

O’Kane: It just seems to me that we need a solution that allows this to go back as Senator **Smith** said, to a normal calendar docket situation. I don’t see the answer to that coming.

Campbell: It sounds like you have a new program which has an extra hurdle. You have to have it somehow start the process. This new annual catalog was not, as we said supposed to speed up the process, but allow us to update each year. So we could still have a two-year curriculum cycle if we wanted to, consistent with this. But, I do have one question: Is this the first approval of BAS programs or do we already have some on the books?

Dhanwada: We already have two on the books.

Campbell: Okay.

Dhanwada: So these are two more that actually, one of them had applied last year, but it didn't get through the UCC, and so they came back and put together a proposal.

Kidd: One thing that might be able to be done is if we get the petition up at the end of the spring term at least, and then whenever the UCC has made deliberations, their minutes could be added to the petition so that would be available over the course of the summer?

O'Kane: I think that's a great idea as long as it's really clear that everyone knows it's there.

Zeitz: As far as the existing situation, if we don't talk about it today, is that going to completely throw it out of sync?

Dhanwada: What happens then, is we can talk about it in two weeks. So, basically we're moving forward that process two weeks. I'll just put in a new wrinkle. Right now I'm dealing with we don't know when our Board meetings are going to occur because we have a change of schedule. They are thinking about uncoupling the committee meetings of which the Academic and Student Affairs meeting usually meets along with the Board. They're thinking of uncoupling that. We don't really have a schedule as to when the Council of Provosts will meet and then the Academic and Students Affairs Committee will meet and then the full Board would meet. So right now, I'm kind of dealing with that as well because I don't really know the schedule.

Zeitz: So actually you can't answer that because you don't know when it...

Dhanwada: Right.

Zeitz: But you did have this all prepared and ready to go two weeks ago? When school started, and we were supposed to have a meeting?

Dhanwada: Right. We had a pre-meeting on the first day for UCC. We had meeting on the first day of class because that's when the faculty are here. We had UCC meet two days later and had the discussion then. I tried to get it on that day but I had to kind of clean up and get all the minutes and I put it on as soon as I could.

Zeitz: And these materials have been available online someplace for people to look at?

Dhanwada: They have been on Leapfrog. We put them up September.. the Friday is that September 2? That was when I think they were on.

Campbell: Who was notified that they were available?

Dhanwada: I don't know. I just submitted my petition. I don't know how that goes. I don't know how that works.

O'Kane: I don't know, I don't know personally anybody except maybe our Chair and our secretaries who would basically even know what Leapfrog is.

Fenech: Isn't it a game? (laughter)

O'Kane: To assume that it's on Leapfrog and therefore we all had it available to us...I don't know.

Dhanwada: The minutes were available as well as my summary. That's all I can say. That's what I provided.

Gould: Any other comments? Questions? Discussion? So all in favor of docketing this at the head of today's meeting, please say 'aye,' all opposed [one opposed], abstention? Motion passes. Next we have New Business. Laura **Terlip** was our Secretary for a long time. She rotated off Senate at the end of last spring. Jesse **Swan** has indicated that he would be willing to serve as Secretary, but I can ask for other nominations. [Pause] Hearing none, I say we elect Jesse **Swan** as the Secretary in his absence. Next we have the Senate Representative to the University Budget Committee.

Smith: Are we going to vote or are you going to appoint? It's not important. Is it an election or an appointment, I just want to clarify.

Gould: I put it as an election, so I guess all of those in favor of electing Jesse **Swan** as Secretary, please say "aye." All opposed, "nay." Abstain? Motion passes. So the next person is the Senate Representative to the University Budget Committee. Tim, Chair **Kidd** was our Senate Representative, but since he is now Faculty Chair we need somebody else to step up. Any volunteers?

Campbell: Question: Do we know when that committee meets?

Walter: Not yet, but we're working on it.

Gould: Not yet. Any volunteers?

Kidd: I'll help the transition.

Smith: Until we know the meeting time, could we wait for two weeks and select the member to be on the Budget Committee?

Gould: That's fine with me. We can wait for two weeks on that.

Smith: If someone volunteers and they have a class then there's a volunteer without any benefit.

Kidd: The meeting would be changed to accommodate class schedules I'm pretty sure.

Campbell: That's sometimes quite difficult.

Gould: We'll table that until the next meeting. Can I have a Senate volunteer for CETL Advisory Committee?

Zeitz: I've actually been that for quite a while. I'm already on there as an advisor anyway and so you said that I could do that as a Senator.

Gould: Any other volunteers? All in favor of Senator **Zeitz** serving as the Senate representative to CETL say "aye." All opposed say "nay." Abstain, "aye." Motion passes. The next one is the Senate Representative to the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee (IAAC). Any volunteers?

Campbell: The same question: Time?

Gould: They meet on...

Koch: I'm on the committee.

Campbell: Is that two hats allowed by the structure of their by-laws?

Gould: I think so. All in favor of Senator **Koch** serving as the representative to the Intercollegiate Athletic Advisory Committee say "aye." All opposed, "nay." Abstain, "aye." Motion passes. We need a Senate Representative to the Liberal Arts Core Committee. Any volunteers?

O'Kane: Do you have the details on that too, time and day?

Bass: Traditionally it's been Friday morning at 8:00 or 8:30.

Gould: Every other Friday morning at 8:15. Do we want to table this until the next meeting?

Burnight: I move we table this until the next meeting.

Gould: Okay. The next item is the Senate Representative to the University Writing Committee.

McNeal: When do they meet?

Gould: The schedule is flexible. I believe they meet--- they have been meeting on Thursday afternoons. Is that correct?

Cyphert: It changes by semester based on people's schedules. We certainly could accommodate faculty.

Fenech: With all due respect, what is the University Writing Committee? What their mandate?

Cyphert: Their mandate is to report back to the Faculty Senate their recommendations regarding writing instruction across the University.

Fenech: Thank you.

Cyphert: They've asked us various questions over the years and we've responded to their questions in various ways.

McNeal: How often do they meet?

Cyphert: That varies with whatever Faculty Senate has asked us to do in any given semester. Some semesters we've met only a couple of times. Other semesters we've met every other week with some online, Google Doc work in between that as well.

Gould: Do I have any volunteers? So should we table this? Okay. We will table this as well until the next meeting. Okay, moving on we will now talk about the Curriculum proposals for the BA in Physics. We're at the Consideration of Docketed Items now.

Dhanwada: Thank you again for being willing to listen and think about these three programs. We have the Physics BA program and I see we have a representative, Paul Shand. Do we want him to talk? He can talk about why this was a program that was closed and they are bringing it back for a number of reasons. Could we ask—Do you want to talk about this Paul (**Shand**) or should I?

Shand: Sure. I can talk about it.

Dhanwada: Okay. Maybe we can ask Paul to talk about the reasons for bringing it back. I will just say it is a BA degree and it is a 42-hour major that utilizes all existing courses. There's no new courses being generated for this. They will use the existing courses. But why the BA, because they currently have a BS in Physics and they also have a BA Physics Teaching Major as well? So, I'll let Paul..

Shand: Where should I stand?

Dhanwada/Gould: Close to a microphone.

Shand: Thank you for the opportunity to address this august body. I used to serve on it once many, many years ago. It certainly is a pleasure to be back amongst Faculty Senate members. So, we decided to bring back the BA in Physics as Kavita (**Dhanwada**) mentioned for two reasons: For recruitment—to boost the number of majors in our programs, and the second is for retention. Its viewed also as a retention mechanism. As you probably all know, Physics is a pretty small program

and one of my major mandates as head of the Physics Department is to increase the number of majors enrolled in our programs. That's of course also consistent with the goals of the University at this point. There are two pieces to this as I said: There is the recruitment piece and then there is the retention piece. And that recruitment piece involves having students who are primary majors in other sciences such as chemistry, or computer science, or earth science, take up physics as a second major. We believe that this would be an excellent complement for the students in these primary majors because there is mechanical, there is physical, there is mathematical, there is computational modeling and problem solving that goes into physics, that I think students in other majors would benefit very, very greatly from. One fact that is not that well known is that physics majors do best actually on the MCAT examinations, and so they do better than biology majors. They do better than chemistry majors. They do better than even biochemistry majors. And so I think if a biology major or chemistry major has a BA in physics as well, that will improve their chances of scoring well on the MCAT and it also enhances their chances of getting into a top notch medical school. So that's one thing. A second thing is: Imagine a computer science major applying to a place like Google or Apple. I think they would have a much, much better chance and I think Dan (**Power**) can speak to this, because his son works at Google or used to. Would stand a much, much better chance of entry into a high tech job like that if in addition to a computer science degree, they had a physics degree. I think it is more reasonable for students to take up a BA in Physics because the requirements, as Kavita (**Dhanwada**) mentioned are significantly less in terms of mathematical sophistication, and so a student would be able to complete a primary degree in math or computer science or chemistry, as well as the BA

without increasing their time to degree. That's of course very, very important to us, for parents and so forth. So, that's the recruitment piece of it. We think that with adequate advertising, we can draw in a number of students, mathematically-inclined students to enroll in our BA in Physics program. And actually already we have a fairly significant number of chemistry majors interested in pursuing this degree, so we're not actually starting from zero. Then as I said, there is a retention piece. Over the years, we've had students who have come in to do the BS degree in physics, and as some of you may have attempted a BS in physics, I don't know, but when it comes to the junior year and the senior year, the courses get extremely mathematically intensive, and there are some students who when they reach that point, they struggle a lot. Unfortunately for us, for our program and for UNI as a whole, some of those students actually drop out. So, I think if we have the BA, then these students who find themselves struggling with the mathematically-intensive courses at the junior and senior level would be able to divert themselves to the BA program and still manage to graduate with a really good degree, especially if they couple the BA as a stand-alone degree now with other courses from computer science, chemistry and so forth. I think in this respect this would help our recruitment measures. There are two things just in summary then, there is the recruitment piece which is looking to encourage students with primary majors to enroll in the BA in order to enhance what they're already doing, and then secondly as a retention piece, that would allow students who might be struggling a little bit with the BS to find a nice route to a degree that would be actually be useful to them when they graduate.

Gould: Thank you.

Dhanwada: I have a summary, but his summary was much more complete than my summary.

Gould: Any questions for Department Head **Shand**?

Degnin: I have a comment. First of all, I'm in support of it, too. I notice you commented about many of your students struggling in their junior year and so forth. One thing I know that math professors have told me is that it's almost as if it's a developmental thing, where it clicks at around age 20, but sometimes it's 21. Sometimes it's younger. Where it's not that they won't get the mathematics eventually, it's that it's just that that part of their brain hasn't clicked in yet. So to be able to finish this degree, it doesn't mean that they're not going on to a job where they're going to be able to do that mathematics; that higher level. It just means that part hasn't hit yet.

Shand: I guess there's hope for me then. (Laughter)

Dhanwada: I'm going to...we do have a representative from one of the programs, but I'm going to take the two BAS programs together to kind of talk about them a little bit. The BAS degree as mentioned earlier, two of them have passed last year, so just to give you an overall background on this. The BAS, Bachelor of Applied Science, is a degree completion program, and so basically what we are doing is students that have an Associate's of Applied Science (AAS), and so many of these students are in career and technical areas, once they have this degree, they're able to actually apply for a BAS degree. Of course they have to meet the grade point average, okay, so there is that. But these are a number of students that the community colleges graduate, over 5,000 on a yearly basis in Iowa among our 15

community colleges. So, as I said, they're in the career and technical fields. And what happens is they are learning a lot of content, but they haven't had the Liberal Arts Core classes, and so that's one thing that they are going to be taken in this degree, in the second two years of the Bachelor's degree. It is 60 hours of coursework here at UNI, and we've divided that up, where we've got 30 hours of Liberal Arts Core classes, which includes courses from our Liberal Arts Core as well as six hours of professional communications classes, and then at least 30 hours of content courses in these specific areas. So the two that we have today are the BAS in Technology and the BAS in Managing [and] Business Organizations. So the BAS in Technology is basically what they are doing is these are for students that are working currently. Again, I guess I forgot to mention that who are the target audience for these degrees. They are AAS degree-holders, but many times they are place-bound because they are currently working and they're all across Iowa. So this program is online, so the courses that we are offering are all online so they are able to take these courses from wherever they are at this point. So, they are currently in jobs. For the BAS in Technology program, basically it's to think about they're in these technology-based, technology environments and they want to gain management and supervisory experience, which usually comes with that four-year degree experience. And so to move ahead in their careers, many of these folks who have been working for a long time in these positions want to get that four-year degree. So this is a sustainable chance or pathway to achieve that baccalaureate degree. So that's in the technology field.

In Managing Business [and] Organizations, again it's very much the same thing. A number of folks, whatever technical areas they want, they're not able to move up

because they don't have the four-year degree, and they lack the management and the supervisory experience. So both of these are, again, targeted toward those populations. The subject matter is a little bit different. So the technology degree: Currently we have a BA in Technology Management. That is in its third cohort, so they have actually a degree completion program with AAS students, but it's a BA, and so they are held to basically our Liberal Arts Core. All of their requirements, everything is the same thing because it is a BA degree. So Technology has the experience of offering online programs, offering these types of courses, and so they want to do this with the BAS degree. They want to see how this BAS degree proceeds, and are thinking of transitioning out of the BA in Technology Management Program, but they are going to offer the BAS in technology. There's no new courses being proposed for the BAS in technology because they have the courses in the technology management area.

With the BAS in Managing Business [and] Organizations, this is a completely new degree. They are actually proposing ten new courses and they are going through the Quality Matters process and the instructors are all being trained. That's a little bit different. They have new courses in there. One of the main things that we always talk about is costs. How are we going to pay for these new programs? Both of these programs, as they are both online degree programs, they're going to be run out of Continuing and Distance Ed. Basically when we have programs that run out of that division, or courses that go out of that division, basically they do not run unless we have a sustainable cohort. So it is a self-funded program. So we have provided the numbers if you have the...I think both programs estimate 30 students and with that, even with some attrition you have for one cohort, you

cover your costs. The costs are there, but we are covering the costs with the tuition revenues. We do have a representative from the BAS in Managing Business [and] Organizations. Did I cover most of what you wanted to?

Jepsen: Absolutely. Much more succinctly than I did. I am Lisa **Jepsen**. I am the Associate Dean for the College of Business and Associate Professor of Economics and I'm happy to answer questions.

Gould: Does anyone have any questions for Associate Dean **Jepsen**?

Hesse: What is the foreign language requirement?

Jepsen: It would be whatever is embedded in the Liberal Arts Core.

Dhanwada: There currently is an exit requirement for language and that is intact, so they do have to have the foreign language to get the degree.

Fenech: World language.

Dhanwada: World language. Thank you.

Hesse: If I'm not mistaken, UNI only offers Chinese online.

Dhanwada: Right, and so they can they also take these courses at another university if they're able to take those.

Burnight: Can they also take the Liberal Arts Core courses elsewhere, and count them?

Jepsen: No. It's approved, correct for the BAS LAC?

Dhanwada: Yes.

Jepsen: And in that, Kavita's going to be my fact-checker on this, the only classes that satisfy Category 1A, 1B, and 1C are eligible for transfer. But that is not specific to our major. That is specific to the previously approved BAS policy.

O'Kane: If I remember correctly, there's a minimum number of hours they have to take at UNI. Is that correct? They transfer some in. I don't remember...

Dhanwada: It's like 30 hours you have to complete at the end of your junior or senior year continuously. So you're only able to bring in 65.

Cooley: I have I think a philosophical question that I might as well ask at the Faculty Senate—nowhere else. If these degrees are granted primarily through Continuing Ed, and all of the coursework is done online through Continuing Ed, does the person who receives their diploma at the end of pursuing this degree get the same diploma as a person who goes to face-to-face coursework at UNI? That's not specifically and 100% in Continuing Ed? Is the diploma a different color or flavor or quality of paper?

Dhanwada: I don't believe it is. Precisely because we're sitting here talking about this program here at the Faculty Senate. All of these courses we have talked about have been approved through the internal governance process. They are being taught by UNI faculty and staff, so the mode of instruction is different. The mode of instruction is different, but currently we have students who take online classes and graduate, so I don't think it is a different 'flavor.' I think the modality is different, but all the courses, the instruction, they're from UNI and we have Two Plus Two degrees. So I personally don't think that it's different. It's running

out of Continuing Ed in the sense that they do all of the logistics. Okay? So you are going to have a degree that says “Bachelor of Applied Science” from the University of Northern Iowa. So I don’t think it’s different.

Zeitz: Our Master’s degree in Instructional Technology has been run completely out of Continuing Ed. For probably the last eight or ten years, and it’s a great program. I think it’s as rigorous as anything you’d see face-to-face. But it is a different modality.

Hesse: Keeping in mind the issue of cost, how many adjuncts will be teaching? What percentage of the faculty will be adjuncts?

Dhanwada: Right now, according to the documents in Technology Management, basically, we’ve got all faculty teaching it and it might be one or two if they’re on sabbatical or whatever it is. Currently it’s UNI faculty on staff teaching it. I believe it would be the Managing Businesses and Organizations that’s also going to be the same.

Jepsen: Yes. We’ve included in our costs, the cost of hiring an adjunct. But the adjunct is to pick up an extra section that couldn’t be covered by our regular UNI faculty member. Remember this impact is going to be a rolling impact and somewhat minimal in the sense that we have one faculty member who is teaching one BAS Managing Business and Organizations class per semester. So we have what I hope to be a manageable impact. So we would be looking to hire an adjunct to cover...Suppose I teach this class and I usually teach Intro to InfoSys class. We might need to have an adjunct cover one section of one InfoSys class.

Koch: Are there projections then as to anticipating how many people you expect to take these different courses? Do you have a sense of that?

Jepsen: Yes. We need a good target to allow for attrition to allow the program to be financially viable. and we're pegging that target right now at 30 students. And Kavita, that's in keeping also with the cohorts that are successfully running in the existing programs.

Dhanwada: It hasn't happened yet. They're getting advertising and marketing going on to start these cohorts.

Jepsen: But we're in the same neighborhood, right?

Dhanwada: Yes. Yes. They're all very similar because there's got to be a certain number in order for it to be sustainable.

Zeitz: You mean you're going to have 30 students in an online class?

Jepsen: At the beginning, depending on what...We'll be consulting with Distance Ed and having our faculty go through the Quality Matters training, and I understand that's a little bit high than...

Zeitz: That's more than a 'little bit' high unless all you're going to do is lecture.

Jepsen: I've heard that the target is more in the mid-twenties for an optimal, but we would absolutely be consulting with Kent **Johnson** and Belle **Cowden**.

Zeitz: Really. Having 20 is a good place.

Cooley: As part of these initiatives, I'm guessing we've thought about and discussed how this may or may not impact the accreditation of our institution? These are a totally different breed of degrees, BAS degrees. Does anybody know about the implications for when the Higher Learning Commission?

Dhanwada: The Higher Learning Commission application was put in for the last BAS. There haven't been any issues. We haven't heard there are issues. I don't expect this to affect our accreditation.

Cooley: Just a small follow-up question: Is there a built-in way to evaluate teaching with these programs?

Dhanwada: I think that we're going to do teaching evaluations just like we do. For example, the Managing Business and Organizations, as well as the technology, they are going to try to---they are part of their accreditation. When they go up for accreditation they will be doing that. So, you have a whole host of evaluations that must be completed for that.

Cooley: I only asked because I have delivered online coursework through Continuing Ed and I have not had an evaluation.

Dhanwada: That...Evaluations are always planned. I couldn't speak about a specific course but that has always been...

Jepsen: They are available from Distance Ed. That's a service. I believe they work with other options with the faculty member.

Zeitz: You can opt in or opt out.

Jepsen: But to speak to the accreditation specifically for the College of Business, we are accredited by AASB International, and that is why we must offer 25% of the credits of the degree through the College of Business, and that's why we have 30 hours in the major and not 27 or 24, and then we are also hoping and strongly recommending, but not requiring, that the students use the Introduction to Economics class to satisfy Liberal Arts Category 5. That's a little bit of a buffer.

Gould: In the interest of time, I'd like to see if we're ready to make a motion to approve these curriculum proposals? Do I have a motion?

Degnin: Are we going to vote all at once or one at a time?

Gould: I was going to do all three, but I could do one at a time if that's easier. Do I have a motion to approve the BA in Physics curriculum? Motion by Senator **Burnight**. Seconded by Senator **O'Kane**. All in favor of approving the BA in Physics program, please say "aye." Opposed "nay?" Abstain, "aye?" Motion passes.

Gould: Can I have a motion for the approval of the BAS in Technology? Moved by Senator **Fenech**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor say "aye." All opposed say "nay." Abstain? [two abstentions] Motion passes.

Gould: Can I have a motion to approve the BAS in Managing Business Organizations?

Jepsen: A point of clarification: It's Managing Business and Organizations.

Gould: Okay, Managing Business and Organizations. Moved by Senator **Skaar**, seconded by Senator **McNeal**. All in favor say "aye." All opposed say "nay." Abstentions say "aye." [Two abstentions] Motion passes. Thank you. Now I would like a motion to move into Consultative Session.

Campbell: So moved.

Gould: Moved by Senator **Campbell**, seconded by Senator **Burnight**. All in favor say "aye." All opposed say "nay." Abstain, "aye." We are now in Consultative Session to talk about the Presidential Search. We have Regent Katie **Mulholland** here as well as Executive Director Bob **Donley** and Professor Dan **Power** who is the Co-Chair of the Search Committee. I will open it up to them and let them fill you in.

Mulholland: Thank you for having us and I must say it was good to listen to the discussion because one of the steps through the process as it comes to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, which I Chair, so to hear the discussion and hear the questions---very good. And I do know that information about physics and the MCAT. And if all the kids who take the MCAT know that, then maybe then they'd skew it some other way. I don't know. But thank you. It was a very informative discussion. I appreciate that. What I am doing, and I'm about four short, is I'm passing out copies of the Presidential Qualifications. You may already have them. These are ones that we will use, the Regents will use those as we interview the final three candidates or so that the committee sends us. So that's a more detailed list. The second thing that I'll pass around is the posting that went

in the publications. It will be in the September 23rd Chronicle, but is already up on Higher Ed, isn't it?

Donley: Inside Higher Ed, yes.

Mulholland: Inside Higher Ed. It's already up and it will be going to a number of sites so if you don't have a copy of that, please help yourself. And then the last thing that I'm passing around is the timeline and we are pretty much finished up to today's date which heralds the official start of the Presidential Search so I'm passing that around if you don't have a copy of that please take one. If you know a place to post. I put it on one page so people didn't have to flip up. So we're here, my esteemed Co-chair Dan (**Power**) and I and Bob **Donley** and we're here primarily to... We would rather start with answering questions and see the knowledge base you already have rather than take a lot of your time by saying things you may already know. Is that fair, Dan?

Power: Yes.

Gould: Questions?

Mulholland: Questions? Comments? Just a real quick: I'll tell you the three things that we're doing differently---the Search Committee. First of all, we made a commitment to get as much input as possible, but keep the timeline reasonable, so beginning May 23 through the 30th of August, we had a number of listening sessions, as did AGB when they were here on the 24th and 25th. Our best estimate, we counted and it's been over 500 people we've had that have provided assistance. So when you see that long list, that you can tell we squeezed onto one

page, that represents the summary of all the input. Now, the promise that we have made is when the new President is named, he or she will get all of the notes from the sessions so they can see what the details look like. The second thing that is different is we will be, the Board of Regents, typically only the Search Committee gets access to the site where the applications are, and the resumes and the CV's. We are including the Board of Regents who are not on the Search Committee to be able to see what it takes in highly qualified candidates. So they have a picture of how it gets selected down by the committee. So that's the second different thing. The third different thing is we are bringing the Search Committee to the Board of Regents in a closed session to discuss the interviews and the campus visits and to present the strengths of each candidate that they have received feedback on and that they perceive as being viable. That will be in a closed session on Monday, December 5th and then on Tuesday, December 6th the Board of Regents will interview the candidates who have made the campus visits. So that's kind of really, really condensed down. The campus community will know who the candidates are 24 hours before they come to campus, and we do that and we have a very short window of them having been exposed, especially with the kind of candidate that we're hoping to get, because they're probably very highly engaged at their university and we want to not have them out for a very long time if they're not selected.

O'Kane: Thank you. You covered most of what I was going to ask. I guess I do have one remaining question and that is: Is there any chance, or is it possible that the Board of Regents could ultimately choose someone who is not on the list that the Search Committee puts forward?

Mulholland: No. It would be choosing nobody.

O’Kane: It would have to be choosing nobody.

Mulholland: Correct. No. They would have to come through the process. The commitment is very tight, especially when it comes to nominations. Nominations go to Dan (**Power**), me, or the two consultants. Dan and I are going to treat them like hot potatoes and pass them right on to the consultant. So if the consultant makes a contact, and that person has not gone through the formal application process, they are not considered.

O’Kane: Just a comment: Many of my constituents look at what happened recently with Iowa, to be frank. So far, just so you know, things are looking good and people are looking at what you folks are doing and saying, “Yeah, this looks pretty transparent.” But there’s as you can imagine, a certain amount of doubt. A certain amount of, “this is all cosmetic.” I don’t know if anything more needs to be said along those lines, but you should know that many, many people think what you’re doing is purely cosmetic.

Mulholland: I don’t think that we have any other expectations except to do the best that we can do and be who we are in getting it done.

Power: Steve (**O’Kane**), the only thing I’d say: Given how hard I’m working, and how hard I see everybody else working, if I thought it was cosmetic, I would quit the committee immediately.

O’Kane: Good. Thank you, Dan (**Power**).

Campbell: Do the Board of Regents approve the finalists, or only through their membership on the Search Committee?

Mulholland: The Committee recommends the finalists to the Board of Regents.

Campbell: Does the Board of Regents have to approve the list before people come in for campus interviews?

Power: No. The Search Committee will determine it. We will have away interviews where we’ll interview six maybe seven people and then we will determine a pool to bring to campus. But there are four Regents on the Committee. They will have input, but we will not get clearance from the Board on who to bring to campus.

Campbell: Right.

Power: But we always need to remember the Board ultimately hires. All we do is search and screen and give them good information on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates.

O’Kane: I assume that you folks will put forward, say a list of, an unranked list of three, four people?

Power: And as the list isn’t even put forward. For the first time, we’re going to have them actually meet face-to-face with the Board and discuss the candidates that we are recommending that they interview the next day.

O’Kane: So you will then have the ability to answer questions from them along the line of strengths and weaknesses?

Power: In terms of the criteria and we will use those criteria when we evaluate the online materials and we are going to do that on October 26th, so we’ll have a meeting and right now we’re scheduled for four hours. There are a number of people on the Search Committee sitting here: Kavita (**Dhanwada**) and Gretchen (**Gould**) and Tim (**Kidd**). So we’re planning an extended session to look at the resumes and materials and then we will come up with a semi-finalists pool.

Mulholland: And understand the pool that we choose, the person when they receive the call say, “I’m not going to do it.”

Power: It’s possible. It is two-way. We have to persuade people that they want to come here and interview and they want to take the job, but they have to persuade us that they meet our qualifications.

Zeitz: Did I hear you say that what you’re going to do is you’re going to meet with the Board of Regents and discuss the three candidates who you said they will interview the next day. Are they going to interview all three candidates?

Power: Yes.

Zeitz: Okay. Thank you.

Power: And three is an arbitrary number right now.

Zeitz: Sure.

Power: It could be four. It's possible it could be two. We're hoping that it will be...

Mulholland: We hate having two.

O'Kane: You like having three?

Mulholland: Yes.

Power: And the only reason it might be two is if somebody withdraws.

Mulholland: After they do the campus visit and say, "It's not a match for me."

Degnin: Just a clarification question: "A terminal or doctorate degree is strongly preferred," Why "strongly preferred" and not required? And secondly, how would you envision someone without a terminal degree---since that's only preferred? Also, what definition of "terminal degree" are you using?

Mulholland: I would say as you look at the aggregate of all of the qualifications, you will see that there is so much that meets only Higher Ed criteria that as I work through the list, and we talked about If we made two or three things required and then the Committee made a choice on a person that didn't meet one of the things, then that starts the person out in the hole. So the whole list, if you look at it together, really indicates a strong Higher Ed background and experience. So that's what I would suggest---looking at the thing as a whole. Dan?

Power: I would say you need to look at it through the eyes of your faculty colleagues and other colleagues who are on the Search Committee. So the terminal degree allows for someone with an M.F.A., which is looked at as a terminal degree, or a Medical Doctor or a lawyer to be acceptable. But somebody who has a B.A. or B.S. or an M.B.A. would not be terminal degrees. Now, it says

“strongly preferred” because there might be something that would sway the Committee to think that this person was capable, given other things there. I don’t know what it is. I have no idea what that could be. So in my own mind, “strongly preferred” is the same thing as required, but it gives the Committee the chance to look at the entire portfolio---the work of the individual, if there are strong things in their favor.

O’Kane: I think this question can only be answered by either you or Katie (**Mulholland**), or Bob (**Donley**) or both and that is, it’s of course no secret across the nation that President **Ruud** left pretty quickly after coming on board. I would think that the applicants might, I don’t know, I suppose it’s ethical, would call him and say, “Is there any concerns?” And I’m curious and others are curious –how do I phrase this--- If his answer to that question would cause some people that we’d really like to come here, not to come here?

Donley: That’s a tough question. It’s a fair question Steve (**O’Kane**).

O’Kane: I ask because nobody knows why he left. There might be a couple of people who know, but I don’t. Nobody knows why he left. I’m asking if the answer from him would possibly reduce our pool of really good people?

Donley: The only way I would approach that answer is what he’s already said factually and publicly. He has said that this decision was made by he and his wife. Now, remember when this decision obviously had to be made months before it became public in May. The Board was going to evaluate him at the June meeting. We normally do this August but we moved it up to June, probably about a year or so ago, because it falls in line with more of the academic year then. We had every

expectation that he would have been evaluated. I don't think we need to say anything further than that. He made a decision. There are a lot of things that go into that decision-making process as you know. He had some health issues, and this is public, it's not confidential, he was very transparent about it--- He had some health issues, and so I'm sure that that factored into his decision-making process. I don't know anything much more than you do about Marietta College. So, I wouldn't use the...a lot of people weigh the decision, "Well this is a much smaller school and it's out in...again...I actually may have thought it was in Georgia, but it's in Ohio, I know that. I tried to look at their 990 returns to see if what the salary was. The best I could find was one that was public several year ago where the package for the president was about \$350,000. I'm talking five or six years ago, so it looks to me that the salary packages may be better than it was here. It's no accident that we all know that by the very nature of what we do, our business is all public. That begins to weigh on people. It fatigues people. The expectations are much higher. The stress is much higher. There's no question that in he was a strong advocate for the institution. A lot of people see the public face of him. So, again I think the question can only be answered by him. We were surprised. I was surprised.

Mulholland: We found out in the same email that was sent out to campus on May 18th. Seriously.

Donley: The first expectation that people are going to have is that there's something sinister here, and I can't prevent that from happening.

O’Kane: No. I appreciate your fair answer. I didn’t know if you guys knew because it is a fair question.

Mulholland: We’ve heard that, but the same communication you got on the 18th is what I got. I was like, “Oh, my goodness.”

Donley: You could raise whatever questions you want to. These positions are very challenging. I don’t think that the public really understands. Certainly, many of you do, and there’s no perfect president. I’ve worked with 12 different presidents, 13 different presidents in the Florida system. I’ve worked with four presidents here. Everyone has their own unique qualities and every one at one time or another will have ‘foot in the mouth’ disease. It happens. It just happens and they move on, and you look at the whole person and make a determination. Again to your question, I’ll just answer with this: I think it is fair and perhaps I would do that and AGB also raised that issue, because it’s not anything new. You would naturally call to see, “Hey, what am I getting myself into here? How is the Board? How is the political climate?” You just don’t know. I read in the Chronicle this morning that someone who I know, he’s a state senator in the Florida system who has been somewhat controversial, who is forwarded as candidate for the University of West Florida. The Provost is in that search. We all know what happened at the Florida State search. This happens around the country. You saw what happened with Mitch Daniels being governor. That stuff is going to be there. I wish I had an answer for it. I don’t. He was very gracious and that last time I got to see him he told an audience, and Katie (**Mulholland**) was there, that it was a decision by he and his wife and the family to do this, and it was a really good opportunity for him as his last assignment. Take it forward.

O’Kane: Thanks for your answer.

Walter: Following up on Steve’s (**O’Kane**) question, to be honest, I frankly think we could use a little stability around here to say the least. I recognize the UNI Presidential Candidate qualifications as pretty much cast in stone. Looking at the first item, “Develops and instills vision for a top performing national comprehensive university.” And then the item which is actually number 12 starts with the word “champions the historic mission of the University.” Can you distinguish between those two? Because we would like a little stability but we want to be able to grow into what I think many, if not all of us agree that a national comprehensive university is really what we’re going toward here, and you keep bringing up history and then down here, “Understands UNI’s history of first class facilities and... UNI’s history again. I’m kind of wondering about separating those two.

Mulholland: You know that again, if you’re single-authoring something, you’re able to handle all of that. That document that you’re looking at represents all of the listening sessions and all of the points of view. Doing the double check represents the nuances in each. So “Championing the historical”... What does it say?

Walters: “Historic mission of the University. Preparing educators to teach,” et cetera.

Mulholland: It speaks to teaching and UNI has one of the largest number of graduates in teacher education than any other university across the nation.

Walter: So these are not exclusive, they're all-inclusive?

Mulholland? Correct, and again that's designed to be really holistic but to pick up the nuances that people shared through the listening session, and we had a working group of six of the Committee Members help us really get down to fine tuning, and it means if you can look at it and talk to people you can, I think the interpretation will probably become pretty standard on history.

Walter: Thank you.

Cooley: Thank you for distributing these materials. I am looking a bullet point Number Two on the sheet that has a long list of bullet points says, "Possesses a strong academic background and documented research that can meet the qualifications for tenure in an academic department." Does the Search Committee anticipate that this person will be granted tenure in an academic department at UNI?

Mulholland: It says "can." Original document, after I finished off the first set of listening sessions, I had the word "will" in there, and as we fine-tuned it and passed out, I don't know how many... five or six drafts, the suggestion was to change the "will" to "can" because it might imply an automatic tenure and we think that's a relationship.

Power: One thing on the campus visits, that if the person is interested in tenure, we would have them meet with the department they would be tenured in. And the other thing that was brought up to me is that given that some people who become President choose to return to the faculty, that salary would be structured differently if they were going to be granted tenure. They would have an academic nine-month salary, a summer salary plus an administrative stipend. If they returned to the faculty, that the administrative stipend and the summer stipend would go away. That's something to be negotiated, right, and talked about is tenure? So it's not precluded, but tenure carries certain responsibilities to the department if the department feels a person is a good fit and that we prepare for the possibility that they might actually return to the department.

Campbell: My question was really the same. I was going to phrase it as "anticipate" he will be given tenure, which is really stronger than, you know... and you're really not going anywhere as it is an option, neither expected nor precluded.

Mulholland: It's interesting because I would anticipate we would hear some conversation about that when the Committee comes to the closed session of the Board in terms of the three candidates and so again, trying to keep this as open and as transparent as possible, not making anything an automatic on the list.

Degnin: First of all, let me just comment that I think a lot of people, while some people, still are suspicious about the window-dressing. People are as a whole much more optimistic about the search because of the way you're conducting it here. Let me ask a question slightly differently to clarify things so I can go back

and tell people, “Yes, this was said.” One of the worries about the University of Iowa search was that all the other groups were against this person and the Board of Regents overrode them. Certainly, someone should not be hired that the Board of Regents isn’t happy with. I would heartily agree with that. At the same time, will the Board of Regents only consider applicants who are also considered acceptable to the larger committee groups as well?

Mulholland: Yes. Otherwise, the search has failed.

Degnin: I just wanted to be able to say that clearly because that will really help people to feel more comfortable.

Mulholland: And that being said, I would counter with that’s why the campus visits are so incredibly important. That UNI’s best foot is put forward. The campus and everybody shines because even if it’s not a favored candidate that visits, that person knows someone who knows someone who knows someone. And so it’s a chance to say if we go back to your question, candidates they’ll probably talk to. And it may or may not, we don’t know what will be said, but the point being coming to campus is how people will know what UNI is like and the positive, and that’s what I say. We need to have as much positive out there from here on out. Today’s the official start that will bring applications from the people that we want to have here.

O’Kane: I don’t think I’m breaking confidence with President **Ruud** because he’s told any number of people this in all of the faculty leadership last year. I think if he’s asked by one of these candidates, about a negative point, I’m absolutely

certain he will tell them, “I didn’t get tenure.” I know he told me himself that that hurt, and that he was very, very upset about that. Just so you know.

Mulholland: And you know what? That was part of the initial negotiation at the start.

O’Kane: I’m just telling you.

Mulholland: I got it. That was part of the initial negotiation.

Donley: And neither did Steve **Lee** when he came in, and he had tenure at his former. So you know, I mean it’s the posture of the Board at the time. As you recall, when I first got here, maybe a couple of years after, a lot of legislators don’t really understand what tenure is and they don’t like tenure.

O’Kane: Right.

Donley: So the first thing out of everyone’s mouth was, “We need to do away with tenure.” I’m here in the middle of the flood, just getting here you know, and what I said the Board leadership at the time and Katie (**Mulholland** wasn’t Board leadership) but, “Let’s do this.” I know a couple of folks who could probably come in and educate the Board and everyone else in the legislators, anyone who wants to hear about the pros and cons of tenure can come in and listen. I read lots of material from Bill **Tierney**. You’re probably all familiar with him, and a professor I think he’s still at Southern Cal now, but anyway, we brought him in and at the end of that discussion, I never heard another word about problems with tenure. It was gone.

Mulholland: And then when we started up the Academic & Student Affairs Committee, it kind of bubbled up a little bit, so we asked the University folks, the Provost, to bring forward their tenure process and the post-tenure process and we played it out again. So it's one of those messages probably every three or four years we'll have to keep playing out and saying, "This is how people have to advance through the faculty." And that it is a rigorous process and that they do get followed up on and even post-tenure. I anticipate he got it. Then the Committee started up, what in 2012? So, four years later so I'm anticipating that we're going to hear it again during this election season so we'll ask everybody to pull out that little folder and say, "Come and give your report" again.

Donley: I'll just call Bill (**Tierney**) again. [laughter]

Gould: We have a couple more minutes. Any last questions?

Koch: Is the process similar to what we did for--- the process that selected President **Ruud**? You said the process was about the same, and it was really open last time.

Mulholland: With the three additions that I mentioned, but otherwise, your research Dan (**Power**) was...

Power: Everything we did in 2012 we're doing, and then we've added the meeting with the Board of Regents. We made sure that we comply with all of the AAUP Search Guidelines, and we did the listening sessions, and that was a huge commitment, bringing so many Regents on campus. All we did was add enhancements although I don't want to claim credit for the listening sessions.

Mulholland: No. The people who came should claim credit. That was a real big commitment.

Koch: I found that listening session very valuable.

Gould: Any dying, last questions, comments, concerns?

Power: I would like to comment that Kavita (**Dhanwada**) has agreed to Chair the On-campus Visit Committee, so she's going to...

Mulholland: So help her.

Dhanwada: Somebody shook my hand before I knew I was going on.

Power: There are no take-backs [laughter]. But we will also have a subcommittee of that group that will put together the open forums. That's going to be important. I think we've got a good group of volunteers both on the Search Committee and off that are going to work with Kavita (**Dhanwada**). The hope is by the 26th of October that we'll have a tentative plan from that working group and that we'll finalize it during the Semi-finalists Interviews on November 10 through 12th so that we know exactly who they're going to meet with, and when they're going to arrive, and everything that's going to happen. And we have to do the same thing for all the candidates and we need some questions for the open forums that we'll ask of all the candidates. So it's a lot of work and Kavita (**Dhanwada**) is a good sport, but it is a lot of work. Kavita, thank you.

Gould: Well thank you so much for coming and talking with us and answering our questions and concerns. I need to have a motion to move out of Consultative

Session. So moved by Senator **O’Kane**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**. I now need a motion to adjourn. So moved by Senator **Campbell**, seconded by Senator **Zeitz**.

5:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Sundstedt
Administrative Assistant/Transcriptionist
UNI Faculty Senate

Follows are three addenda:

- 1. UNI Presidential Search Committee Timeline**
- 2. Presidential Search Advertisement**
- 3. UNI Presidential Search Qualifications**



**BOARD OF REGENTS, STATE OF IOWA
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE TIMELINE**

Date	Task
August 22	First day of classes
August 24*	Consultants meet/call Board of Regents members, both on a Search Committee; discuss confidentiality Consultants meet with Board Executive Director/CEO and of
August 25*	Listening sessions at UNI and with community (Cedar Falls)
August 26*	Listening sessions at UNI and with community
August 29*	Search Committee meets Charge delivered; confidentiality discussed Review of search process/timeline discussed Position attributes/requirements discussed Communication/advertising plan discussed
August 29 (1:00 AM)	University opens Web site for search Work begins on advertisement
September 5	Search Committee, Executive Director/CEO receive draft ad profile
September 7-8	Board of Regents meeting (University of Iowa)
September 9	Search Committee and CEO complete advertisement review
September 12	Presidential search launched Online advertisements placed for immediate posting Communication plan enacted
September 23	Print advertisement in <i>The Chronicle of Higher Education</i> (9/12 deadline for 9/23 issue)
October 13	Search Committee/Regents receive pre-deadline access to a
October 19	Deadline for applications (best consideration)
October 19-20	Board of Regents meeting (University of Northern Iowa)
October 26* (3 PM)	Search Committee meets Selection of semifinalists; questions developed
October 28- November 10	Consultants conduct listed reference checks
November 11-12*	Search Committee meets Neutral site interviews with semifinalists (TBD) Finalists are identified



Cedar Falls, Iowa

PRESIDENT

The Iowa Board of Regents and the University of Northern Iowa community invite nominations and applications for the position of President. The Board of Regents has charged the presidential search and screen committee to identify a mature leader with proven skills in innovation, entrepreneurship, fiscal management, and creative problem solving.

UNI serves a student population of over 10,100 undergraduate and 1,810 graduate students. Founded in 1876, the university is guided by an outstanding faculty, staff, and administrative team numbering 1,800. The university budget is \$340 million; the campus comprises 916 acres. A vibrant living and learning environment invites students statewide, nationally, and globally to be part of a university that strives to enhance the economic, social, cultural, and sustainable development of the State of Iowa.

EXPECTATIONS

The University of Northern Iowa seeks an enthusiastic, energetic, and engaging new President. She or he must bring a can-do attitude to a university rich in tradition and motivated to enhance excellence in academic programs, student achievement, and student success prior to and after graduation. The President should be an advocate of UNI's focus on being a leading comprehensive public university that provides a robust liberal arts focus while championing the historic mission of preparing educators to teach in and serve PK-12 schools. The new President must be a statesperson, skilled in listening carefully, assessing fairly, and acting decisively. It is critical that the President be prepared to carry out the university's new strategic plan with vigor, insight, and vision. His or her vision must be realized through demonstrated trust and empowerment of the faculty, staff, and administrative teams to attain exceptional performance at all levels. Likewise, the President must work collaboratively with all organized university groups, including faculty and staff unions. A students-first attitude should be fostered in enrollment management, academic programs, athletics, and campus stewardship.

CHARACTERISTICS

The successful candidate should possess the following characteristics:

- Significant senior-level executive experience in an academic institution;
- Strong academic background with documented, relevant research;
- Earned doctorate or terminal degree appropriate to the discipline (strongly preferred);
- Sustainable and proven strategies for student recruitment methods, retention, and enrollment management;
- Experience in fiscal management, resource generation, and effective fundraising;
- Respect for faculty and staff contributions, professional development, and recognition of academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance practices;
- Commitment to developing and supporting a diverse, multicultural, inclusive university culture at all levels of the campus community;
- Ability to be both UNI advocate and partner in a statewide team, working with the Board of Regents, colleague university presidents, and the special schools;
- Excellent communication skills, written and spoken, with a transparent, open-door, and open-mind style; and
- Ability to interact effectively with diverse constituencies, including the state legislature, PK-12, alumni, professional organizations, business, and the university foundation.

The candidate must be able to make complex decisions for the common good. She or he is expected to be the dignified face and voice of the university, to build consensus, and to demonstrate unquestioned integrity. The new President will build partnerships and collaborate for the well-being of the university, the Cedar Valley community, and the State of Iowa.

NOMINATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

Nominations are invited. To assure best consideration, applications should be received by October 19, 2016. The application should include a letter of interest of not more than three pages; a current résumé (or curriculum vitae); and the names of five professional references with each person's position, office or home address, e-mail address, and telephone numbers.

Applications will remain confidential through the semifinalist stage to the extent permitted by law. References will not be contacted without prior authorization from the applicant. Following campus visits by finalists, the Iowa Board of Regents will conduct interviews and make the final selection. The new President will assume office by or before July 1, 2017.

The search is being assisted by James H. McCormick, Senior Consultant, AGB Search. Nominations and applications should be sent electronically (MS Word or PDF Format) to unipresident@agbsearch.com. Additional university information may be found at www.uni.edu. The consultant may be contacted at 651-238-5188 or jhm@agbsearch.com.



It is the policy of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa to provide equal opportunity in employment and all aspects of Regent operations to all persons without regard to race, creed, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, veteran or military status, or any other status protected by state or federal law.

UNI Presidential Qualifications

- Develops and instills the vision for a top performing, national comprehensive university that is shared and owned by the campus community, and which advances the direction of the University's strategic plan and academic master plan.
- Possesses a strong academic background with documented, relevant research in his/her field, that can meet the qualifications for tenure in an academic department.
- Has successful executive experience including leadership and administration in higher education; strategic planning; communication excellence (listening, speaking, writing); building a productive and collaborative leadership team; and effective fiscal oversight/management responsibilities.
- Exhibits collaborative focus on academic excellence, student achievement, student engagement, student well-being, and student success after graduation
- Is committed to developing and sustaining a diverse university community, and culture that is embedded with respect for all persons evidenced throughout the campus by action, interaction, and inclusion where students, faculty, and staff can excel.
- Provides leadership in fundraising, based on successful prior experience, and collaborates with the Advancement staff in strengthening outreach engagement and programs designed to increase gifts.
- Employs a mission-focused, transparent decision making process with integrity, consistency and appreciation for the effort of others.
- Establishes trust through empowering faculty, staff, and administrative teams to perform optimally in attaining the best results for students and the university.
- Exercises proactive, innovative, and creative approaches and solutions to challenges that face the University.
- Is a compassionate and engaging leader who builds relationships with all campus members, the local community, alumni, Foundation, state, businesses, and other officials such as legislators and leaders of professional organizations.
- Values and promotes faculty and staff excellence
- Champions the historic mission of the university: preparing educators to teach and serve PK-12 schools.
- Promotes and recognizes innovative teaching and scholarship in the colleges and departments.
- Expects implementation of sustainable and proven strategies for student recruitment, enrollment growth, and retention.
- Has experience with policy and legislation and their long term impact on the university.
- Advocates for academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance.
- Works collaboratively with all organized University groups including faculty and staff unions.
- Strengthens and strategically grows the University's academic programs at the graduate/professional levels while retaining the commitment to a strong liberal arts core for all undergraduate programs.
- Is committed to working with the Board of Regents and its structure including Iowa's public universities and special schools.
- Recognizes that the heart of the university is life-long learning by encouraging and supporting professional development for faculty and staff.
- Represents the University and is its primary advocate within the University community as well as in the Cedar Valley and across the state of Iowa, regionally, and nationally modeling the importance of community engagement for faculty, staff, and students.

Additional preferences include: a terminal degree, comprehensive campaign fundraising experience including scholarship funding, appreciation for intercollegiate athletics and the university performing arts groups, understanding of UNI's history, and recognition of how first class facilities (e.g. Gallagher-Bluedorn, UNI Dome) serve the community and the state as well as the University.

