

2-10-1997

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 10, 1997

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1997 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

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



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 10, 1997" (1997). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1184.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1184

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

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

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Monday, February 10, 1997

1515

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of January 27, 1997, were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No members of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Haack. Items for the March 24th Senate meeting need to be submitted by March 12. The Dean of the Graduate College has proposed that incentive funds that had gone to PI's, departments, and other colleges go to his office. This will be discussed by the Graduate Council Thursday, February 13 at 3:30 P.M. in Seerley 3. Haack has collected published articles related to Representative Chuck Larson's interpretation of data regarding hours spent in classroom teaching. This material is available to any Senator. The next Board of Regents meeting is February 19-20 in Iowa City. The docket should be available by February 14.
3. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost's comments concerned the FY1998 budget review process now underway. She distributed a breakdown of the proposed distribution of the \$550,010 of "discretionary" distribution to Academic Affairs. There was considerable discussion about the process and the Provost encouraged faculty participation. The Senate's response to the proposed Academic Budget must be in her office by March 14. She also asked for suggestions for big-ticket, politically supportable items for the FY1999 Academic Budget.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

There were no calendar items.

NEW BUSINESS

- 640 Consideration of responses of College Senates to the proposed FY1998 Academic Budget for responses received by the Secretary of the Senate by March 4, 1997. De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to docket because of special circumstances as the first docket item for the March 10, 1997, Senate meeting. Motion carried. Docket number 566.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Faculty Chair Bozik distributed corrected minutes of the April 15, 1996, Faculty Meeting.
2. Presentation of documentation and request for approval of the nominations for the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards (636 562). Bozik/Cooper moved/seconded to move into executive session. Gable/Campbell moved/seconded to rise from executive session. Primrose/McGuire moved/seconded to receive and endorse the recommendations for the 1996-1997 Regents' Award for Faculty Excellence. Motion carried. After discussion and several motions, a motion to ask the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards Committee to provide the Senate with up to a half-page summary of each candidate's accomplishments, carried.
3. Gable asked Secretary De Nault to report on progress in acquiring of a copy of the Provost's remarks on faculty productivity given at the January Board of Regents Meeting. De Nault reported that Public Relations would send him a copy of the Provost's remarks when they had them.
4. De Nault raised the issue of benchmarks. After considerable discussion, De Nault/Isakson moved/seconded that the Academic Deans be requested to distribute (or redistribute) the Provost's Selected Strategic Plan Goals for 1996-1997 to their faculty. Motion carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 549 623 Request from Susan Koch to change the University Mission Statement in the current Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan to state "*The mission of the University of Northern Iowa is to prepare individuals to live a thoughtful, free, and responsible life in an increasingly diverse, complex, and changing world.*" De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to consider after Docket Number 542, Calendar Item 615 (Request to Establish an Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Develop Summer School Programming. This item is to be considered after Docket Number 551, Calendar Item 625). Motion carried.
-

-
- 551 625 Request from Senator Haack to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to collect and generate proposals for revision of the University Strategic Plan and to draft responses to proposed revisions that are generated by other constituent bodies. After discussion and several motions, the Senate adopted the following: Establish a standing faculty committee of eight members, with one member to be elected by the faculty of each of the colleges, one by the Graduate Council, one by the faculty of the Library, and one by the Faculty Senate. Except for the representative from the Faculty Senate, the terms would be for three years and staggered. A representative could serve for two consecutive terms. The Faculty Senate representative's term would be for one year. The charge of the committee would be to (1) collect and generate proposals for revision of the Strategic Plan from the faculty and (2) draft responses to proposed revisions to the Strategic Plan that are generated by other constituent bodies. These proposals would be forward to the Faculty Senate for consideration by that body.

ADJOURNMENT

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Haack at 3:15 P.M.

Present: Hans Isakson, Randall Krieg, Dean Primrose, Sherry Gable, Carol Cooper, Merrie Schroeder, Richard McGuire, Calvin Thomas, Jerome Soneson, Ken De Nault, Joel Haack, Suzanne McDevitt, Andrew Gilpin, Katherine Van Wormer, Barbara Weeg, Phil Patton, and Mary Bozik (Ex-officio).

Alternates: Russell Campbell for Paul Shand and Victoria DeFrancisco for Martha Reineke.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Gilpin/McGuire moved/seconded to approve the minutes of the January 27, 1997, Faculty Senate meeting as distributed. Motion carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for press identification. No members of the press were present.
2. Comments from Chair Haack.
 - Because of the Spring break, items for the March 24th Senate meeting need to be submitted to Secretary De Nault by March 12.
 - The Dean of the Graduate College has proposed that incentive funds that have been distributed to PI's (Principal Investigator), departments, and other colleges go to his office. This seems to be a disincentive to grant-seeking activity by faculty and contrary to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Grant Proposals. Interested faculty, especially current and former principal investigators on externally funded projects, are encouraged to attend and participate in the discussion to be held by the Graduate Council on Thursday, February 13 at 3:30 P.M. in Seerley 3.
 - Haack has collected articles from the Des Moines Register, the Cedar Rapids Gazette, and the Waterloo Courier related to Representative Chuck Larson's interpretation of data submitted to him regarding hours spent in the classroom teaching undergraduates at each of the Regents' institutions. This material is available to any Senator.
 - The next Board of Regents meeting is February 19-20 in Iowa City. It appears that there will be a full Board meeting on both days. The docket should be available on campus by February 14.
3. Comments from Provost Marlin. The Provost's comments concerned the FY1998 budget review process now underway. Great strides have been made this past year in decentralizing and opening up the process. The process will undoubtedly continue to improve. There are three items that need reaction. The first item is the University-wide distribution presented by President Koob last Monday. The spreadsheet presented by the President is on the UNI Home Page. The Cabinet has proposed \$550,010 of "Discretionary" funds for Academic Affairs for FY1998. Of this, \$186,010 has been allocated for Supplies and Services. The Provost has strongly argued that one of our greatest needs is for additional funds for supplies and services. We do not have the operational budget to do the wonderful things our faculty are expected to do. We are underfunded with respect to supplies, travel, and related expenses.

This \$186,010 represents the 3% increase in Supplies and Services presented by President Koob plus the buyout of course fees. An amount of \$200,000 is allocated to Information Technology Services (ITS) as a base for the purchase of equipment. In the past, ITS equipment has come from end-of-the-year funds. An amount of \$50,000 is allocated to "Iowa as our Campus" incentives. The idea of the Cabinet was to address the item in the Strategic Plan calling for an increase in outreach programs as "funds become available." The Cabinet has made funds available as incentives to support programs that really want to do more off-campus work. An allocation of \$50,000 for half-year salary and benefits for the Director of the Performing Arts Center. It is anticipated that by mid 1998 a director for the Center will need to be hired. The last item of "Discretionary" funds is \$64,000 for Grants and Contracts staff. This money is to increase funding to cover direct costs of the Grants and Contacts Office with both assisting in writing grants and in administrative processing of the grants. In addition, there are legislatively imposed items that are in the Governor's budget which will hopefully be approved. These items are \$131,000 for the Library to cover an 8.5% inflation on library materials and \$50,000 for the 2+2 program at Carroll. The Provost was pleased that the library was receiving recognition that inflation on library materials was far greater than the normal rate of inflation. The total legislatively designated funding going to Academic Affairs is \$181,000. In the President's spreadsheet, "reallocation" to the Academic Division is largely to cover the cost of the new telephone system and to complete wiring of all academic buildings to the campus network.

The second item to respond to is the Provost's memo on the academic budget model. This outlines the proposed distribution within Academic Affairs. Senate reactions to this proposal need to be forwarded to the Provost by March 14, 1997.

The last item is the FY1999 budget. The University will soon be submitting its proposals. The Provost welcomes items that faculty would like to submit for consideration for the FY1999 budget. She particularly encouraged large-ticket, politically supportable ideas.

Though the budgeting process may seem new to many faculty, it is in fact, a process that is undertaken every year. However, in the past the process has not been done so openly. In addition, the University is attempting to decentralize the process. The Provost reviewed the parallel response process now underway. Departments are to respond to their college senates, college senates are to respond to the University Senate, and the University Senate is to respond to the Provost. Department heads are to respond to their deans and the deans are to respond to the Provost.

Haack asked what base was used to determine the amount of replacement funds for laboratory fees.

Provost Marlin replied that the base would be the current collection of course fees. However, some fees will remain. For instance, if a student wants to take S.C.U.B.A., they will continue to pay fees. In addition, fees for items or materials that students keep will be retained. For example, a student taking a theater course who is required to attend theater productions, fees for theater tickets would be retained. The Provost will be eliminating small \$2.00 to \$4.00 fees. Examples of fees that will be eliminated would be a \$5.00 fee for darkroom chemicals and supplies for a photography course and a fee for a fetal pig in a biology course. Replacement funds will be based upon currently collected dollars. The Provost wants to get rid of course fees because they are a hidden cost to students.

Gable asked what empirical data were used to develop the proposed academic budget.

Provost Marlin replied that no empirical data were used.

Gable then asked what factors were used to develop the budget.

Provost Marlin replied that they used their knowledge and intuition of what it cost to run the programs.

De Nault asked if individual departments were going to get their budgets and be able to respond.

Provost Marlin replied that right now, we are to respond to the President's proposed distribution and the Provost's proposed distribution.

De Nault asked when departments were going to get their budgets.

Provost Marlin responded that this was up to the individual deans.

Isakson asked what the time table was for the Senate's response to the Provost.

Provost Marlin stated that she needed everything by March 14th.

Isakson remarked that the Provost's letter did not address the allocation of the \$550,010 among the various colleges.

Provost Marlin stated that a method for allocating the \$186,010 for supplies and services has not yet been developed and it has not been determined which programs are interested in participating in the "Iowa as our Campus" incentives. The distribution of the rest of the \$550,010 has already been determined.

Isakson asked if faculty input was appropriate on these items.

Provost Marlin replied that it was.

Cooper asked about Price Laboratory School in terms of student credit hours.

Provost Marlin replied that Price Laboratory School is a unit of the College of Education but Price Laboratory School does not generate student credit hours.

Cooper asked how the cost of Price Laboratory School would show up in the budget of the College of Education.

Provost Marlin stated that it was up to the College of Education as to how they dealt with Price Laboratory School. The College may want to consider transferring credit hours generated in one part of the college to Price Laboratory School. For example, if a student took a course in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction but went down to Price Laboratory School to observe, the credit hours generated, or a portion of them, for the Curriculum and Instruction course could be credited to Price Laboratory School.

Cooper stated that because Price Laboratory School is an elementary school, a portion of its budget is set by state law and thus they have a different burden on the College budget than other entities.

De Nault asked how many students are served by the 2+2 program at Carroll.

Provost Marlin replied that she did not know.

De Nault stated that he had heard that there were 8 to 12 students enrolled in the program. Further, he wanted to know if it was true that we send a tenured faculty with full-professor rank to Carroll to teach these 8 to 12 students and replace that person with an adjunct to teach their normal on-campus class of 60.

Provost Marlin stated that she did not know. The administration of the Carroll Program was within the College of Education.

Haack stated that the Department of Mathematics was involved in the 2+2 program at Carroll. The Department was encouraged to send a senior faculty member to the Carroll campus. The Department had been reimbursed for the faculty member at the adjunct rate.

De Nault stated that if we are going to adopt the "Iowa is our campus" approach, we needed to look at how this affects the quality of our campus programs. If we have the I.C.N., why do we need to send faculty all over the state.

Haack added that they (Department of Mathematics) had been able to fulfill their commitment by instruction over the I.C.N.

Primrose stated that he was concerned with the academic model being based upon credit hours generated. He wondered how this was going to work when we get into experiential learning activities which may not generate any credit hours. The Strategic Plan calls for more of this. The President stated that future funding would be based upon adherence to the Strategic Plan.

Provost Marlin replied that each College defined operationally what counts as "experiential learning." All the identified activities are credit-bearing.

Primrose replied that this was not the case for Price Laboratory School.

Provost Marlin reiterated that the College of Education may want to consider allocating credit hours legitimately generated in Price Laboratory School to Price Laboratory School. This is an issue that needs to be dealt with by the College of Education.

Isakson asked if the salary for the Director of the Performing Arts Center would be carried forward in subsequent years.

Provost Marlin replied that the amount shown for FY1998 is the amount for the salary and benefits for half a year. This is an expense the Provost is responsible for. After the Performing Arts Center is operational, it will be generating funds through ticket sales, etc. Some of this money may be able to offset the Director's Salary in future years and part of this money could be retained for redistribution to other areas. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the history of performing arts centers. They are usually a deficit to the budget and need to be subsidized. Eventually the director's position will be assigned to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.

De Nault stated that in the Provost's memo to faculty, the Provost stated that funds for the following year would be based upon the college's success in meeting selected goals of the University's Strategic Plan. He asked what were the selected goals.

Provost Marlin responded that some of the goals she had selected from the Strategic Plan included a 2% increase in experiential learning, hiring an underrepresented faculty member in the college, and making every program have available an international opportunity. All of the goals were shared with the Deans at the start of the academic year.

De Nault asked who would be selecting these goals in the future.

Provost Marlin replied that she would.

Gable asked for amplification of the "Iowa is our campus" concept.

Provost Marlin replied that this would include I.C.N. and WWW-based courses. There may be a need to provide support for this. It takes an inordinate amount of time to do WWW-based stuff. To encourage this, there are these incentive funds. However, it has not yet been decided how these funds will be distributed.

Haack asked if there were any further questions. There being none, Haack thanked the Provost for sharing information about the budget process.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

There were no calendar items.

NEW BUSINESS

1. De Nault introduced Calendar Item 640, Consideration of responses of College Senates to the proposed FY1998 Academic Budget for responses received by the Secretary of the Senate by March 4, 1997.

De Nault/Gable moved/seconded to docket because of special circumstances as the first docket item for the March 10, 1997, Senate meeting.

De Nault stated that this item was introduced so that college senates would be notified of the Senate's timetable for consideration of college responses to the proposed FY1998 Academic Budget and to place discussion of these responses as the first docket item for the March 10, 1997 meeting. In order to distribute information to Senator's in time for the March 10, 1997, De Nault needs the material by March 4.

Cooper asked how late on the 4th could De Nault receive material.

De Nault stated that he needed to have Senator's packets to the Mail Center by 7:30 A.M. Wednesday morning (March 5). He did not care what time material was received on the 4th.

Isakson asked who will be responsible for communicating this information to the individual colleges.

Haack responded that he was.

Motion that consideration of responses of College Senates to the proposed FY1998 Academic Budget for responses received by the Secretary of the Senate by March 4, 1997 be docketed because of special circumstances as the first docket item for the March 10, 1997, Senate meeting carried. Docket number 566.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Faculty Chair Bozik distributed corrected minutes of the April 15, 1996, Faculty Meeting. (Faculty wishing copies should contact Faculty Chair Bozik.)
2. Presentation of documentation and request for approval of the nominations for the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards (636 562).

Bozik/Cooper moved/seconded to move into executive session.

Gable/Campbell moved/seconded to rise from executive session.

Primrose/McGuire moved/seconded to receive and endorse the recommendations for the 1996-1997 Regents' Award for Faculty Excellence. Motion carried.

Soneson/Isakson moved/seconded that all those who are nominated for the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards write a one-page summary about what they consider most important about their teaching, scholarship, and service. This summary would be used by both the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards Committee and the University Faculty Senate. In addition, the Regents' Faculty Excellence Committee shall present their reflections on each candidate. The Committee's reflection on each candidate shall be one page or less.

Soneson spoke to the motion. He stated that this would take care of any questions the Senate might have.

Haack remarked that the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards Committee is not a Senate committee so that the best we could do was to make a recommendation.

Campbell stated that he had problems asking the Committee for justification. The cover letter written by each candidate should tell the Senate whether the candidate is qualified.

Soneson stated there was a distinction between how an individual candidate sees their own candidacy and how people who review the documents view the candidacy. From what we understand, the Committee does a great deal of work, both in going through individual candidate's files and in discussing the candidates. We are not asking for justification as much as clarification, particularly, why these particular people were chosen.

De Nault objected to the first part of the motion. He was troubled by asking someone we are honoring why we should honor them. If this is an honor, we should be able to ascertain whether the individual should receive the honor or not. It seems almost insulting to state to someone that we want to honor you but would you please write us an essay on why you should receive this honor. All he would like to see would be a paragraph on each candidate written by the Committee stating why the individual should receive the award.

Gilpin/De Nault moved/seconded to divide the question.

The motion to divide the question carried.

Soneson spoke in support of the first part of the motion. The Committee already asks each candidate to write a one-page summary of their teaching philosophy so that this request would be no additional burden to the candidates.

Bozik remarked that the essay is not just of teaching, but the role of a faculty member.

Soneson remarked that the candidates have fulfilled the first part of the motion, specifically to write a one-page summary about what they consider most important about their teaching, scholarship, and service.

Bozik stated that the one-page essay on the candidate's philosophy is completely different than a one-page summary of the candidates credentials.

Thomas stated that the request is to receive and endorse the recommendations of the Committee. The Senate should look at information provided by the Committee and not information provided by the candidates' themselves.

Isakson asked if letters of support are written to the Committee by deans and department heads.

Bozik stated that some candidates do have such letters of support and other candidates do not.

Grosboll stated that she had served on the Committee and had seen the range of material that is sent to the Committee. There is a lot of variety in what is sent for each candidate. A half-page summary from the Committee to the Senate on each candidate would be the most helpful to the Senate for their review.

De Nault stated his support for Thomas's remark that the Senate should examine what the Committee provides.

Schroeder called for the question.

The motion to require each candidate nominated for the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards write a one-page summary about what they consider most important about their teaching, scholarship, and service, did not carry.

Haack stated that debate would now be on the second part of the original motion.

Campbell asked for clarification. He was not sure whether the Senate wanted a summary of the Committee's deliberation on each candidate or the Committee's justification for each candidate.

Haack asked De Nault to read the motion.

De Nault stated that the motion was to ask the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards Committee to provide the Senate with their reflections on the qualifications of each candidate. The Committee's reflection on each candidate shall be one page or less.

Soneson/McDevitt moved/seconded to substitute for the motion on the floor, to ask that the Regent's Faculty Excellence Awards Committee provide the Senate with up to a half-page summary of the highlights of the candidate's file.

Motion to substitute carried.

Soneson/Van Wormer moved/seconded to amend the motion by substituting "summary of each candidates accomplishments" for the clause "summary of the highlights of the candidate's file".

Motion to amend carried.

The motion to ask the Regents' Faculty Excellence Awards Committee to provide the Senate with up to a half-page summary of each candidate's accomplishments, carried.

Bozik stated that she would place the Senate's request in the Committee's file and inform them next year.

3. Gable asked Secretary De Nault to report on progress in acquiring of a copy of the Provost's remarks on faculty productivity given at the January Board of Regents Meeting.

De Nault replied that at the last Senate meeting the Provost had stated that her remarks would be on file with the Office of Public Relations. De Nault had contacted this office and they had told him that they should receive a copy of the minutes of the January Board of Regent's meeting by this Friday. They would send him a copy of the Provost's remarks when they had received them.

Cooper stated that the Provost's remarks had been filed with the Board's agenda after the meeting was over.

De Nault responded that he only knew what had been told to him by Public Relations.

Cooper asked if the Provost was going to be bringing faculty to the next (February) Board of Regents Meeting to talk about what they do.

Haack stated that the Provost has received permission from three faculty members to talk about their individual portfolio of assignment at the February Board of Regents Meeting. Haack will also be speaking as Head of the Department of Mathematics to explain what the effect of the portfolio approach has been within the Department of Mathematics.

4. De Nault raised the issue of benchmarks. He had sent each Senator a copy of the progress on benchmark selection that was distributed to department heads in his college by the Dean of his college (Natural Sciences). He asked why this information had not been shared with the Senate by the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Faculty at the last Senate meeting since the information had been distributed on January 23, 1997, the Wednesday before the last Senate meeting.

Haack responded that a progress report was presented.

De Nault continued that this was very important. He wondered why the faculty leadership had not reported the details of the benchmarks being discussed. He further remarked that though the Strategic Plan was an important document, it was apparent that the benchmarks were going to be far more important. Some of the proposed benchmarks, like 25% of the curriculum committee be composed of non-faculty members, did not seem to be based upon the Strategic Plan whereas other items that were in the Strategic Plan, such as reducing class size to a level where meaningful interaction can take place between student and instructor, were not in the benchmarks. These benchmarks are going to govern what is operationally important in the Strategic Plan and where money is allocated.

Haack stated that he had intended to distribute this information following the last Senate meeting but he could not locate his e-mail communication.

Cooper asked why faculty in the College of Natural Sciences had been informed and faculty in other colleges had not. If De Nault had not distributed the information, she would not have known what was going on. She was concerned that this information was not distributed to faculty in all colleges.

Gable asked how much time was spent discussing each item at the Leadership Conference. She had heard that it was from 30 to 60 seconds.

Bozik responded that was correct. In some cases, there was no discussion. The curriculum proposal, for instance, was not discussed.

Haack stated that the Conference lasted about 4½ hours and was followed by the electronic balloting described in the information distributed by De Nault.

Bozik stated that the process was very odd. It was the first time she had been involved with something like this. President Koob stated that based upon the voting, he was going to pick some benchmarks to share with the Regents. The whole thing was vague and obscure. Nothing was said about what to do about the benchmarks or what was going to happen to them. She was as much in the dark as was the Senate.

De Nault remarked that the Chair of the Faculty and the Chair of the Senate were present at the meeting, they knew that benchmarks were being discussed, they knew that voting had taken place, and they knew the results of this voting. He asked if the leadership had an obligation to inform the Senate.

Bozik replied that she did not feel any obligation to inform the Senate.

Haack stated that he understood the point and felt that greater information should have been given to the Senate.

Cooper asked what role the Senate might have once these benchmarks are in place.

Bozik stated that she did not think these were the benchmarks based upon the process that took place. Some of the benchmarks are way off the wall. Some were not even discussed. She could not take this too seriously.

Haack asked De Nault to share response from the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee.

De Nault replied that Haack was the Chair of the Reconciliation Committee. However, no matter how bizarre people may feel the selection process was, it was his understanding that President Koob was going to be presenting benchmarks to the Board of Regents next week.

Bozik stated that we do not know what the benchmarks are.

Haack stated that President Koob had asked that the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee in its second role of devising a process by which the Strategic Plan can be revised in the future, that whatever that procedure is, it might be tested out on the benchmarks yet this year. However, he did not know the status of the proposed benchmarks.

Schroeder asked whether President Koob planned to give the Board of Regents benchmarks or the process for determining benchmarks.

Haack stated that he did not know President Koob's plans.

Gable stated that Schroeder's question was critical. These benchmarks were critical because they are going to influence the allocation of funds. We are selecting benchmarks with no discussion, input or information. She could not believe that an institution of our size and budget was going to operate with this kind of procedure.

Bozik stated that she thought the President would report that the process of delineating benchmarks was under way. She could not believe that these would be the benchmarks.

De Nault interjected that the President last Monday stated that specific benchmarks had been selected.

Weeg stated that the Provost had pointed out specific goals she had selected, such as experiential learning and international learning opportunities, these are included under Subgoal 1A. These goals do mean something.

Haack clarified that the Provost's goals are for this fiscal year (1997). The questions is what will be the goals tied to the FY1998 budget.

Soneson stated that he had trouble understanding what benchmarks mean, particularly when reading the list presented. He wondered how this list could be conceived as a guide for developing academic programs or used to assess what is going on. He was also discouraged by the means by which these benchmarks were selected. Fifty three people gathered for three or four hours pouring over a list of 75 to 100 items where each person had 20 votes to cast either singly or in any combination of a block, did not impress him. Any item receiving 15 or more votes would make the list. This way, anyone could put an item on the list by simply casting 15 of their 20 votes for the item. This seemed like a crap shoot. There was no discussion of what they mean, what value they have, what influence they may have on the University as a whole. He wanted to voice his concern over the method by which they were chosen and the method by which they are stated.

Haack asked Soneson if this was just a first step, would this be a valid first step.

Soneson replied that if this was a step on the way toward clarification, refinement, and further discussion, then this would be acceptable and these items would be worth discussing. However, if these items are now decided, he would have great reservations.

Campbell stated that he could not comprehend the benchmarks as presented. He thought that surely something more refined would be brought to the Senate for reaction.

Haack stated that it would be desirable for the Senate to be better informed.

McDevitt stated that she could not understand the benchmarks because there was no way to measure them. This was just a list of things. Clearly, these are not the benchmarks. How can you make a decision on something that is so poorly defined.

De Nault stated that it was his understanding that benchmarks will be the specific measure by which the University will assess its progress in attaining goals in the Strategic Plan. For instance, the proposed benchmark that 25% of the Curriculum Committee be made up of non-faculty can be easily measured by ascertaining the percent of non-faculty on the Committee.

Soneson interjected that the 25% non-faculty on the Curriculum Committee was the only quantitative benchmark.

De Nault disagreed and mentioned the benchmark to increase the number of programs and courses offered on the I.C.N. in off-campus locations. This was measurable. However, one of his concerns was the Provost's earlier remarks that she will choose what selected portions of the Strategic Plan will be used to judge allotment of funds for the following year. He thought that faculty should have input on what portion of the Strategic Plan is important and would be used to judge the allotment of money. He further remarked that the efforts of the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee were being undermined by a benchmark selection process that has an obscure relation to the Strategic Plan. This was further subverted by administrators selective selection of portions of the Strategic Plan, which make the process even more obscure and remote. He thought that faculty should be involved in decisions affecting the academic area.

Bozik stated that Senators should be aware that one person at the Leadership Conference could have put

15 markers on one item and thus placed it on the final list. She thought that the Senate should be proactive on how the benchmarks are decided and that the Senate should have the opportunity to review the benchmarks before they are finalized.

Haack stated that the Senate did choose representatives to the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee and this committee will be working on the process for both revising the Strategic Plan and for setting benchmarks. It would be appropriate for the Senate to give these representatives input and direction.

Gable asked for a review of the faculty membership on the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee.

Haack responded that the Senate's representatives were Gilpin, De Nault, and Cawelti. The Senate alternate was Gable. Haack, who is chair of the Committee, serves on the Committee as a representative of administration (Department Head).

Isakson stated that the main concern is what takes place after approval of the Strategic Plan that affects the budget. The benchmarks appear to be smoke and mirrors. No one understands what role benchmarks play in getting us from a Strategic Plan to a budget. This should be a major concern of the Senate because it influences the distribution of funds. The Senate needs to have input in this process.

Haack stated that at the Leadership Conference, President Koob did some teaching. In his (President Koob's) view, benchmarks take on one of three attributes. Benchmarks can be something quantitative that you want to maximize. Whatever it is, for this kind of benchmark the numerical increase each year is a measure of progress. The second benchmark is also quantitative, but not necessarily a measure you want to maximize, rather it would be a measure one would work toward. It might be some balance point, such as a certain percentage. In this case, exceeding the mark might be bad. The third kind of benchmark is a process benchmark. The process benchmark is something that would say that by such-and-such a date we intend to have in place this part of the process and be moving toward a specific goal.

Haack continued that it is true that a number of items proposed at the Leadership Conference are not benchmarks, but are suggestions for revising the strategic plan. In any case, the President did attempt to educate the group on the benchmark process. It appears that he was not totally successful with his teaching.

Gilpin stated that we do not want to lose track of the fact that these benchmarks, no matter how they are defined, are going to be used to compare different units with the end result that someone is going to get money and someone is not going to get money. The nature of a benchmark is intrinsically a comparison process. Whether or not we are going to maximize these, they are going to be dimensions that are used to compare in the future.

De Nault agreed. He added that President Koob stated last Monday that money was going to be given to units trusting that they were going to accomplish their goals. At the end of the year, units were going to have to report their progress. If you did not attain your goal, you were not going to be trusted with money the following year. Therefore, benchmarks are going to be very important in the future. This year there is only about \$21,000 allocated for strategic plan initiatives. However, this is sure to grow in the future. In addition, the formula approach proposed by the Provost only accounts for 2% of the proposed FY1998 budget. However, formulas have a great appeal to administrators because it relieves them from making decisions. As the budgeting process unfolds, he is concerned that in the future curriculum will be driven by the Strategic Plan rather than curriculum driving the Strategic Plan.

Isakson stated that he was bothered by the flavor of the benchmarks. There is a focus on an incremental approach, for example what can we do with the extra money we are getting next year. With this process, we can lose sight of how we are managing all the rest of the budget. This is of great concern because there is no benchmark on how well we are educating students we matriculate each year. One would think that this would be the most important benchmark. Our priorities are being obfuscated in this process.

De Nault asked Chair Haack and Faculty Chair Bozik what the time line was for the benchmarks and would it be appropriate to invite President Koob to discuss them with the Senate.

Cooper asked who does President Koob consider to have the responsibility to explain the benchmarks to faculty. Was it deans, department heads, the Chair of the Senate, or the Chair of the Faculty? She was

concerned that the faculty did not know what benchmarks President Koob was going to take to the Board of Regents next week. There are some fighting words in the benchmarks presented.

Haack stated that it would be appropriate to invite the President to discuss the benchmarks with the Senate.

De Nault stated that there were two issues. One issue was the process by which the benchmarks are developed and the second issue is the actual benchmarks. The issue of the process will apparently be discussed by the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee. The issue of the operational benchmarks for FY 1998 is critical because these are going to be used to measure success and the President has stated that success will be rewarded and failure will be punished in the following year's budget. Furthermore, there is no time for any lengthy review process for the FY 1998 benchmarks.

Cooper reiterated her concern with what may be presented to the Board of Regents based upon the documents that had been distributed.

Haack stated that the benchmarks used for 1996-1997 (FY 1997) will be the selected strategic initiatives chosen by the Provost. These will be used by the Provost to judge future funding in the Academic Affairs Division.

Gable asked if every college had been informed of Provost Marlin's Strategic Goals for FY 1997. The deans had been sent this information but she did not think that the deans had informed faculty of these goals.

Cooper stated that she did not think faculty in her college were aware of them.

Haack stated that they were discussed at the C.N.S. Department Heads Meeting, but he did not know if they had been distributed by all department heads to their faculty.

Gable stated that it was critical that the Provost's goals be disseminated to all faculty. It was pointless to try to involve faculty when they do not have all the information.

Cooper added that their faculty was meeting tomorrow and it would be important for them to be aware of the Provost's goals.

Haack reiterated that the deans had received this information last Fall.

Gable stated that because the Provost had communicated her goals to the deans, it was the deans responsibility to communicate them to their faculty.

De Nault/Isakson moved/seconded that the Academic Deans be requested to distribute the Provost's Selected Strategic Plan Goals for 1996-1997 to their faculty.

Cooper stated that some deans had distributed this information last Fall and suggested a friendly amendment to insert "or redistribute" after the word "distribute".

The mover and seconder agreed to the friendly amendment.

Motion that the Academic Deans be requested to distribute (or redistribute) the Provost's Selected Strategic Plan Goals for 1996-1997 to their faculty, carried.

CONSIDERATION OF DOCKETED ITEMS

- 549 623 Request from Susan Koch to change the University Mission Statement in the current Working Draft of the University Strategic Plan to state "*The mission of the University of Northern Iowa is to prepare individuals to live a thoughtful, free, and responsible life in an increasingly diverse, complex, and changing world.*"

De Nault/Soneson moved/seconded to consider after Docket Number 542, Calendar Item 615 (Request to Establish an Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Develop Summer School Programming. This item is to be considered after Docket Number 551, Calendar Item 625). Motion carried.

- 551 625 Request from Senator Haack to establish a standing committee of the Faculty Senate to collect and generate proposals for revision of the University Strategic Plan and to draft responses to proposed revisions that are generated by other constituent bodies.

Weeg/Soneson moved/seconded to establish a standing faculty committee of eight members, with one member to be elected by the faculty of each of the colleges and the Library, one by the Graduate Council, and one by the Faculty Senate, with the charge of (1) collecting and generating proposals for revision of the Strategic Plan from the faculty, and (2) drafting responses to proposed revisions to the Strategic Plan that are generated by other constituent bodies, which would then be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration by that body.

Gable remarked that the length of service on the committee was not specified.

Cooper/Gable moved/seconded to amend the main motion by inserting "The term of service shall be for three years. A representative could serve for two consecutive terms."

Primrose/Campbell moved/seconded to amend the amendment by inserting "and staggered" after "three years."

Campbell asked if the starting dates for the staggering needed to be specified.

De Nault stated that the Committee on Committees should take care of this.

Motion to amend the amendment by inserting "and staggered" carried.

Motion to amend the main motion by adding that "The term of service shall be for three years and staggered. A representative could serve for two consecutive terms," carried.

Soneson stated that there may be a technical problem in that Senators are elected for three-year terms. It might not be appropriate for the Senate's representative to have a three-year term.

Cooper stated that it would be appropriate for the Senate's representative to be appointed for a one-year term.

Soneson/Cooper moved/seconded to amend the main motion so that the representative from the Senate serve for a one-year term.

Tom Romanin, Associate Vice President for Student Services, stated that when considering the length of terms, Senators should keep in mind that the University is on a three-year planning cycle. It would take a committee member about a year to understand the process.

Cooper asked if Romanin was referring to the staggering or the length of term.

Romanin replied that the staggering made sense but that it would take a person at least three years to be involved in the total budget process for one fiscal year.

De Nault stated that the representative of the Faculty Senate did not have to be a Senator. This is simply the Senate's representative.

Cooper stated that there was nothing prohibiting reelection of the same Senate representative for an indefinite number of times.

On a division of the house, the motion to amend so that the representative from the Senate serve for a one-year term, received 10 yes and 6 no votes. The motion to amend carried.

De Nault asked for clarification of the Senate's intent concerning the number of terms the Senate's representative could have.

Haack stated that, as the motion now read, there were no limits on the number of terms of the Senate's representative.

Gilpin stated that he was skeptical about the proposed committee because of his perception of the flux characterizing the whole strategic plan review process. The proposal is to create a committee that in effect reports to the Senate and helps shape the response the Senate is going to make to whatever other mechanism is involved in the Strategic Plan. He was not sure that he understood what role the Senate is going to play in this process. He was not sure what type of guidance the Senate would need from the proposed standing committee. He requested clarification from the proposer.

Haack stated that there were a lot of faculty and others on campus who would like to make revisions to the current Strategic Plan. At present there is no mechanism in place for revising the Strategic Plan. The

Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee has been asked by President Koob to consider the development of a process for revising the Strategic Plan, but this process would be from a general University point of view. What Haack envisioned was a faculty group that could collect, consider, and then recommend to the Senate proposed revisions to the faculty portion of the Strategic Plan. Last year the Senate had an *ad hoc* committee consider the Strategic Plan. This proposal provides the faculty with a permanent mechanism for considering and presenting proposed revisions to the Strategic Plan.

Gable asked what procedures and mechanisms are being considered by other constituent groups across the University.

Haack replied that he was not aware of any at this time.

Soneson asked if it was correct that the representatives on the committee would be elected by the constituent faculty bodies but the committee would report to the Senate.

Haack stated that was correct.

Bozik asked for clarification about the Library. She wanted to know if the Library faculty were part of the College of Education.

Weeg replied that they were not.

De Nault asked how many faculty are included in the Library.

Weeg stated there were about 28.

Patton stated that there should be clear understanding about the term Library. As presently stated, "one member to be elected by the faculty of each of the colleges and Library," would be interpreted that the representatives from each college will be voted upon by faculty of the Library. He understood that the sense of the Senate was for faculty in the Library to vote for one representative to represent the Library.

De Nault/Isakson moved to amend the motion on the floor by striking "and the Library" and inserting after "Graduate Council" the following ", one by the faculty of the Library,".

Motion to amend carried.

Cooper asked how this committee would interact with the Senate's representative to the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee.

Haack stated that the Strategic Plan Reconciliation Committee had been asked by the President to consider the mechanism for revision of the Strategic Plan. The proposed committee was to provide a mechanism for faculty input on changes to the Strategic Plan.

The motion, "to establish a standing faculty committee of eight members, with one member to be elected by the faculty of each of the colleges, one by the Graduate Council, one by the faculty of the Library, and one by the Faculty Senate. Except for the representative from the Faculty Senate, the terms would be for three years and staggered. A representative could serve for two consecutive terms. The Faculty Senate representative's term would be for one year. The charge of the committee would be to (1) collect and generate proposals for revision of the Strategic Plan from the faculty and (2) draft responses to proposed revisions to the Strategic Plan that are generated by other constituent bodies. These proposals would be forward to the Faculty Senate for consideration by that body," carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Primrose/Cooper moved/seconded to adjourn. Motion carried. The Senate adjourned at 5:16 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth J. De Nault, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

Approved February 24, 1995