

**UNI Campus Conversation
2006 Report to Campus
May 1, 2006**

Background:

A “Campus Conversation” involving all UNI employees and students was initiated in fall 2004 to respond to two related questions:

- What makes UNI a great place to work? and
- What would make it better?

President Koob qualified those questions with the statement: “We are seeking answers to these questions which can be implemented to benefit not only individual employees, but can also contribute to the realization of UNI’s mission of offering a world class university education, providing personalized experiences, and a lifetime of opportunities to students and employees alike.”

The Campus Conversation was conducted under the auspices of the Campus Advisory Group, a group comprised of representatives of all campus governance groups, including faculty, professional & scientific staff, merit staff, and students, led by President Koob. Input was sought via Web discussion and campus meetings.

In fall 2005, task forces were named and charged with studying and identifying solutions to 11 topics surfaced in the course of the conversation. The task forces reported their results to the Campus Advisory Group in April 2006. The Campus Advisory Group and the Cabinet support both continuing the Campus Conversation and also moving forward to implement task force recommendations in fall 2006

Focus the UNI Strategic Plan:

The task force reports affirmed that UNI is a fundamentally good place to work and that employees in all categories hold positive attitudes about the institution. However, there remain areas where improvement can be made. The work of the task forces revealed that while the institution has consistently had the will to address these issues, the institution needs a formal mechanism to make real progress.

Further, the task forces noted that their areas of study flowed naturally from the Values and Goals in the current UNI Strategic Plan. Implementing recommended actions would focus institutional efforts and ensure achieving significant progress against the Strategic Plan, particularly with regard to the values of Excellence in all endeavors, Expansive awareness of multiple perspectives, and Appreciation of people with different backgrounds, and with regard to Goal 4 of the plan: Promote a University culture characterized by diversity, collegiality, mutual respect, organizational effectiveness, and shared responsibility.

Four areas for improvement surfaced consistently throughout the task force reports:

1. **Leadership** – establishing a common understanding of leadership as a relationship of influence not coercion and leadership acts as something all UNI employees can do; creating a vocabulary that encompasses and empowers all employees; providing education and skills training; ensuring accountability.
2. **Communication** – surrounding major campus issues, enhancing the flow of information and seeking feedback, improving tools for all to use; building awareness of identified initiatives.
3. **Diversity** – recognizing that diversity means appreciating the differences in all of us, creating even more opportunities for diverse exchanges
4. **Continuous Improvement** – understanding that improving is everyone’s job and a cultural expectation.

Next Steps

The Campus Advisory Group with Cabinet endorsement agreed to move forward in fall 2006 with implementing recommended actions to address the four identified areas.

With the endorsement of the Cabinet, a summary report of the Campus Conversation was sent to the Board of Regents.

All task forces noted that for substantial progress to occur in any area there needs to be both leadership buy in as well as consistent leadership support. Certainly leadership refers to the UNI administration (President and Cabinet), but just as significantly, it refers to leadership of the campus governance groups.

The Campus Advisory Group, including representatives of all campus governance groups, provides an excellent model upon which to build since it has been a highly functioning group over the past two years. The group is therefore a logical beginning point for implementation.

The Campus Advisory Group will be charged with the more formal responsibility of implementation in the fall, including but not limited to:

- picking a protocol or template based on the input of the relevant task forces;
- implementing an approach to permeate the campus on the identified topics, and
- establishing a measurement matrix.

For any of these concepts to become embedded in the culture of the University, the vocabulary and way of operating need to be seen, understood, and used by everyone.

The task groups understand that penetration of successful protocols throughout the campus is necessary for the changes sought to be fully effective. Such penetration is a long term effort requiring the ongoing support of campus leadership, and no doubt requiring many years to become fully adopted as UNI culture.

Executive Summaries of each task force report follow.

Four task forces addressed topics outside the areas noted above. The Campus Advisory Group resolved these as follows:

- **Faculty/Staff Gathering Place** – Current budgetary circumstances do not support pursuing such a gathering place at this time.
- **Student Employment** – Data on this topic were inconclusive. Financial Aid and Student Services will continue to evaluate.
- **UNI-Community Connection** – This subject will be referred to the Faculty Senate and potentially to United Faculty since actions in this recommendation may be subject to collective bargaining.
- **Perks** – This topic is out of consideration due to collective bargaining restrictions.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Leadership Task Force: UNI Culture & Recognizing Leadership Initiatives Subcommittee (*Embedding a Leadership Model at UNI*)

Executive Summary

Introduction:

The Leadership charge was encompassed by an overall task force and four subcommittees. The parent task force addressing UNI Culture and the subcommittee on Recognizing Leadership Initiatives experienced great overlap in content and approach. The work of these two groups is contained in this Executive Summary. The work of the other three leadership subcommittees (Employee Recognition, Diversity, and Process Improvement) is consistent and supportive of the overall direction expressed in this report.

I. The Charge:

- A. To help each employee understand his/her job, how to do it better, and to feel appreciated for doing it well.
- B. Create a common understanding of 'leadership.'
- C. Establish an approach that is systemic to the University now and in the future as developing strong leadership is not a one-time initiative.
- D. Encourage a leadership mindset and approach in all UNI employees by recognizing and rewarding leadership initiatives whenever and wherever they occur.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Met twice a month from fall 2005 through the February 2006 Campus Conversation.
- B. Gathered and shared information from many sources related to leadership.
- C. Heard a presentation on UNI SOAR training.
- D. Discussed at length the current situation at UNI related to all employee attitudes toward their jobs, how leadership is included in those attitudes, barriers, etc.
- E. Tested thinking and sought input from others on campus.
- F. Established a working group to formulate a list of Employee Core Values.
- G. Gained and incorporated feedback from the Campus Conversation.

III. Findings & Recommendations - *Embedding a Leadership Model at UNI*

To establish an approach to leadership that is "systemic to the University," UNI needs to develop a leadership mindset with common concepts, language, and expectations. This document describes our approach and recommendations and consists of the following:

- A. Leaders & Leadership: Task Force View
 1. UNI operates on a distributed leadership model under which entrepreneurship and collaboration are encouraged.
 2. Leadership can result from the work of positional and non-positional Leaders.
 3. Leaders and followers are both active participants in leadership.
 4. Leadership is a relationship of influence, not coercion.
 5. Consider "leadership acts" as part of our leadership language.

6. Since all lead and all follow, we focused on empowering all employees to prosper in an environment of distributed leadership, shared responsibility, outcome decision making, thoughtful cycles of improvement, shared vision, responsibility and strong shared values.
7. Shared leadership requires shared understanding. Shared understanding emanates from a common vocabulary based on identified values consistently applied.

B. Qualities of a UNI Employee

HAVE:

Integrity
Positive Attitude
Pride

VALUE:

Each Other
Communication
Empowerment of Others
Continuous Improvement

ARE:

Collaborative
Action-oriented
Accountable
Inspiring
Collaborative

C. Leadership Concepts and Definitions for UNI

***Note:** To establish a leadership that is systemic and a mindset that recognizes a broad range of leadership initiatives (the subcommittee’s charge), the University must have a perspective on leadership that is broad and inclusive. The linkage of a “leadership mindset and approach” to “recognizing and rewarding leadership initiatives whenever and wherever they occur” is more likely to occur if the conception of leadership is a relational and process one.*

1. Leader

At UNI, a leader is someone who takes the initiative to point a direction or assist a group in developing a direction and engages with others in an influence relationship of integrity and shared responsibility for a common purpose.

2. Leadership

At UNI, leadership is an ongoing interactive process of being, thinking, and behaving, whereby leaders and others are engaged in an influence relationship of integrity and shared responsibility for a common purpose.

3. Leadership Act

A "leadership act" is any behavior that points out a direction. For example, a custodian could suggest using a different cleaning fluid for a window, or an academic advisor could draft a different set of criteria for assigning advisors, a team member could encourage a group to listen to another team member’s comments, or a faculty member could provide a department chair with ideas for increasing meeting attendance.

D. Preliminary Recommendations: Working toward a Culture of Empowered Leadership for All Employees - Embedding a Leadership Mindset at UNI

The Leadership Task Force is well aware that development of a leadership approach that is systemic is a long-term endeavor. A leadership mindset is the sum total of an institution’s

values, policies, procedures, behaviors, symbols, stories, etc. To accomplish the goal, UNI needs to be intentional in the creation of a leadership mindset and culture with all employees. The recommendations that follow reflect our thoughts so far on the strategies needed for this approach. The sub-points are intended to provide clarification of the concept not necessarily to be prescriptive.

1. Conceptual Foundations

Establish a conceptual foundation for a leadership mindset at UNI by doing the following:

- a. Create common concepts and a shared vocabulary for leadership. Engage the campus in a discussion to further define and refine the qualities and values of “leaders” and “leadership” for all UNI employees, including students.
- b. Develop a list of “qualities of a UNI Employee.”
- c. Develop a list of “a leader is” examples from UNI employees in all employment categories to clarify our belief that leadership is for everyone.

2. Policy Development

Establish an ongoing system of campus input and engagement.

- a. Develop a cross-campus advisory (or policy) board to continue the work of the Leadership Task Force. Staff support for this advisory group would reside with Human Resource Services.
- b. Develop subcommittees as necessary to address and carry out specific recommendations and activities, for example:
 - i. Orientation.
 - ii. Personal and professional development for all employees.
 - iii. Personal and professional development for group-specific employees (faculty, P&S, merit, students).

3. On-Going Campus Conversation

Continue to engage faculty, P&S, merit, and student employees in on-going discussion of Campus Conversation activities. Each group would be represented on committees. The ongoing discussion could take many forms, e.g.:

- a. Book discussion.
- b. Annual conferences.
- c. Panel discussions.

4. Education and Training

- a. Formulate new and reformulate existing UNI training and education to teach and reinforce leadership values and skill sets.
- b. Education/training could be for all employees as well as specific groups.
- c. Provide modular skills sessions in multiple formats, e.g., in person and on line, to meet development needs.

5. Structural Support and Responsibility

The literature on leadership and on change makes it clear that support from the top is critical to the success of a change initiative.

- a. The President’s office should continue to bear primary responsibility for the on-going Campus Conversation and policy development.
- b. The Leadership Advisory Group should report to the President.

6. Recognition
Provide ongoing and multiple recognitions for employees demonstrating the identified core values and leadership skills.
 - a. Work with existing employee recognition framework to identify elements specifically supportive of recognizing leadership.
7. Implement Structural and Policy Actions that Support and Encourage Embracing Effective Leadership Actions
 - a. Include appropriate language in job descriptions and hiring processes.
 - b. Reinforce core values in orientations for students and employees.
 - c. Include in annual performance evaluations for all employees.

Members of the Leadership UNI Culture Task Force

Carol Bodensteiner, Chair	Kelly Flege	Michael Hager
Michelle Byers	Angeleita Floyd	Sue Joslyn
Gwenne Culpepper	David Glime	Joe Murphy
Irene Elbert	Robin Gurien	Gerri Perreault
Tarek Fahmy	Leah Gutknecht	

Members of Leadership Subcommittee: Recognizing Leadership Initiatives

Garry Bozylinsky	Janelle Darst	Gerri Perreault, Chair
Steve Corbin	Robin Gurien	Sandra Harberts

Members of Qualities of a UNI Employee Ad Hoc Subcommittee

Brenda Buzynski	Tanjala Kole	Martie Reineke
Steve Carignan	Gerri Perreault, Chair	Mary Taylor

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Leadership Task Force: Recognizing Employee Contributions Subcommittee

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

Ensure that every employee feels valued for his/her contribution both through formal and informal recognition vehicles. Fully implement and raise awareness of the recently established employee recognition program.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Evaluated the effectiveness of the Panther First program through an assessment survey.
- B. Implemented minor, no-cost changes that will enhance the program.
- C. Proposed changes that will further increase the awareness and effectiveness of the program.
- D. Discussed the Years of Service program as well as other informal recognition efforts.
- E. Identified program gaps based on comments made during the Campus Conversations of 2005 and 2006
- F. With subcommittee consensus, made some additional recommendations.

III. Findings & Recommendations:

- A. The assessment survey conducted for the Panther First program provided clear direction on where minor changes could be made to improve the effectiveness of this program. Many positive comments were made with regard to this program via the Campus Conversation. Funding for Panther First supplies came from the Administration and Finance special projects account.
- B. Recommendations
 - 1. Continue the Panther First award program.
 - 2. With the extension of the program to the entire campus and the need to replenish and reformat supplies, we recommend \$500 annually to be budgeted for this program.
 - 3. Conduct the same type of assessment survey on the Years of Service program in Fiscal Year 2007, and on alternate years from there on, as the Panther First assessment.
 - 4. A committee composed of the Years of Service division coordinators or their designees could evaluate the assessments and make recommendations to the Cabinet if major changes or funding requests are needed.
 - 5. Further development of the existing recognition Web page accessible through a link from each division's Web page, including:
 - a. A resource link for supervisors and managers listing books and/or articles pertaining to employee recognition and a list of low cost/no cost ways to recognize employees.
 - b. This page could be developed by the Training & Development Coordinator in conjunction with the VPAF Technology Systems & Services students.

6. Market and deliver a two-hour training program on employee recognition to:
 - a. Raise awareness of existing formal recognition programs.
 - b. Communicate resources available for informal recognition opportunities.
 - c. Relay the importance and benefits realized from providing effective recognition of staff and their contributions.
 - d. Main elements of this program:
 - i. Volunteer facilitators from across campus would be trained on program delivery.
 - ii. Budget needed to administer this program once a month for one year would be approximately \$2,400.
 - iii. An alternative would be to administer the program once per quarter for two to three years or until interest has diminished, which would cost approximately \$800 per year.

Members of Leadership Subcommittee: Recognizing Employee Contributions

Michelle Byers
Lyn Countryman

Cynthia Coulter
Joy Thorson

Windee Weiss
Pat Woelber

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Leadership Task Force: Diversity Subcommittee

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

- A. Determine the needs of the campus, in the area of diversity.
- B. Determine what is behind those needs.
- C. Determine what solutions or actions to take to address those needs.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. The committee struggled to define diversity, and settled on the notion that differences separate all human beings and run the gamut from sexual orientation to race to ability to dietary needs.
- B. Based on preliminary information gathered, however, the committee determined that there are six distinct populations where the greatest concerns appear to exist:
 1. Race/ethnicity
 2. National origin
 3. Ability/disability
 4. Gender
 5. Sexual orientation
 6. Position/rank
- C. Collected a series of resources to determine the exact nature of concerns held by individuals of diverse and/or underrepresented populations.
- D. Viewed programming and offerings from other institutions.
- E. Read comments from the initial Campus Conversation session.
- F. Collected names of organizations/groups designed to address needs of diverse populations.
- G. Perused the recent Campus Climate Survey and the University Fact Book.

III. Findings & Recommendations:

The committee found that often minorities and those who do not consider themselves part of the mainstream culture tend to feel isolated, unheard and left out when it comes to planning, making decisions, and guiding the institution. The committee was unable, in the time allowed, to determine specifically why that sense of isolation occurs.

A. Campus Conversation Feedback

Two major themes emerged:

1. Participants did not want the idea of diversity “watered down.” They believe that if the definition of diversity becomes too broad, issues of power and equality will be ignored.
2. Participants believed it imperative for the University to make some effort, at any level, to bring together people with varying backgrounds, races, abilities, etc. This could be done socially, or through structured workshops and education opportunities.

B. Recommendations

1. Hosting separate focus groups, one for each of the areas named previously.
 - a. Once focus groups are completed, the committee members hope to have gained a full picture of issues facing these populations, and
 - b. Will begin the process of suggesting areas where change might best be facilitated.
2. Looking into the worth of a University ombudsman to address non-EEO/AA issues.
3. An amendment to the exit survey to include questions about diversity experiences.
4. An annual minority caucus or faculty colloquium.
5. Coordination of current diversity efforts on campus.
6. A mentoring program for new faculty and staff.
7. Development of a Diversity Web Page (already underway, via Compliance and Equity Management).
8. Greater/better communication about cultural events, with support/encouragement from “the top” about attending or supporting such events.
9. Easily accessed educational opportunities on varying diversity topics; feedback suggested some of these should take place during orientation, so all employees start “on the same page.”

Members of the Leadership Subcommittee: Diversity

Gwenne Culpepper, Chair
Deepak Chhabra
Susan Etschiedt

Susan Etscheidt
Cheryl Roberts

Lydia Perez Roberts
John Somervil

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Leadership Task Force: Process Improvement Subcommittee

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

- A. Examine the culture of process improvement on campus.
- B. Identify areas or methods for improvement.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Met bi-weekly from fall 2005 through the February 2006 Campus Conversation.
- B. Identified processes that had been reviewed within the last three to five years and what could be gained from these completed process reviews.
- C. Evaluated existing communication systems for information distribution and collection, including the applicability and currency of such information.
- D. Discussed at length mechanisms to embed an environment of continuous review in the campus culture.
- E. Compared numerous process review techniques and how they could be implemented on campus to review processes from departmental functions to campus-wide processes.
- F. Sought and gained feedback from the Campus Conversation.

IV. Findings & Recommendations:

- A. The subcommittee believes the success and ability to generate a culture of continuous process review at UNI is dependent on the following key elements.
 - 1. Championed at our highest level – the President and his Cabinet.
 - 2. Current documentation and easy access is mandatory, as is a mechanism for regular feedback and dissemination of information.
 - 3. An expectation that students, faculty, and staff take advantage of available tools for the betterment of their position/duties or activities on campus.
- C. The Process Improvement Subcommittee realizes the creation of such a system is a long-term commitment and requires continual effort.
- D. UNI needs to be intentional in the creation of a continual process review mindset and culture.
- E. Recommendations
 - 1. Use Diagnostic Approach to Determine What Needs to be Improved
 - a. Encourage all departments to generate and solicit a tool for feedback of processes. Possible mechanisms to gather data could include:
 - i. Survey to “customers”.
 - ii. Focus groups.
 - iii. One-on-one discussions.
 - iv. Targeted meetings with established groups.
 - b. Establish expectation for all departments to engage in diagnostic activity.
 - c. Groups evaluating procedures should include representation from all practical impacted groups campus-wide.

- d. Training in process improvement should be provided minimally at the dean/director/department head (DDDH) and vice president levels. Training methods could include:
 - i. Formalized training in process management (Lean, Kaizen, Six Sigma).
 - ii. Practical application as part of other training programs.
- e. Perform assessment of process changes, i.e., measurement of success.
- 2. Evaluate Existing Committees and Their Structure, Particularly Those with Broad Impact
 - a. Establish ongoing need for existing committees and determine that representation is appropriate and broad based.
 - b. Encourage “term” appointments with rotating membership to continually infuse new ideas and provide opportunity for participation to a larger number.
- 3. Improve Dissemination of Information, Particularly Items Significant to Performing Our Duties
 - a. Share information widely with focus on impacted and relevant groups.
 - b. Consider the creation of a single University calendar with all University events.
 - c. Determine mechanism to continually solicit feedback on suggestions and provide output, to include rationale for decisions made and not made. (Refer to recommendation for on-going campus conversation from Leadership Task Force - UNI Culture: Embedding a Leadership Model at UNI.)
- 4. Embrace the Idea of Continuous Process Review at All Levels of the University
 - a. Part of evaluation system/process.
 - b. Consider as part of candidate review, record of self-initiation and career improvement.
 - c. Leaders have responsibility for asking the questions of staff, i.e., better, easier, faster.
 - d. Employees have the mandate to suggest ideas.
 - e. Publicize “success stories” and promote benefits of process review.
 - f. Share resources across departments/divisions.

Members of Leadership Subcommittee: Process Improvement

Kelly Flege, Chair
 Diane Headington
 Eric Lange

Drew Lietzkow
 Dean Shoars

Frank Thompson
 Mike Zwanziger

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Effectiveness of Campus Communication Task Force

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

Increase the effectiveness of communication at UNI to ensure the campus community is adequately informed of, and has input about, important issues, including but not limited to: parking, conservation, and safety.

Goal: Develop a culture of intentional, accountable campus communication that fosters personal and organizational health and growth.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Researched current channels available for on-campus communication.
- B. Studied current communication strategies/effectiveness as they relate specifically to parking issues, maintenance and safety, and Gilchrist displacement.
- C. Surveyed employees' acceptance and trust levels toward internal channels of communication.
- D. Reviewed 1999 Study of UNI Communication completed for Constituency Relation Management Group (CRMP).
- E. Created a tentative model/template for effective communication.
- F. Participated in and reviewed the comments from the Campus Conversation follow-up sessions February 17, 2006.

III. Findings & Recommendations:

- A. Communication at UNI is not broken. While campus communication efforts can always be improved, much is being done to effectively communicate every day.
- B. Survey results show a majority of employees read and trust information in UNI Online. However, people want UNI Online to be more personalized, convenient, and searchable.
- C. Campus feels opportunities to give feedback on major campus issues are limited.
- D. Face-to-face communication is the best.
- E. Supervisor/subordinate communication patterns and trust levels (reality and perception) vary dramatically.
- F. We have no formal structure to assure accountability in communication efforts.
- G. Divisions/larger departments would benefit from communications systems that are reliable, timely, and targeted.
- H. There is a need for varied types of communication for different groups on campus. Students, merit staff, administration, professional & scientific staff, and faculty all have different sociological needs and wants that require different types of communication to provide them with relevancy and context.

I. Recommendations:

1. Employee orientation, leadership development, and staff training should include elements that recognize and emphasize that intentional and open communication is a core University value.
2. Education on best practices communication models and related training should be included in this focus on communication.
3. An effort to cross-pollinate communication between different employee groups and students should be considered. Attendance at faculty, student, and staff governance meetings by ex-officio members of other employee groups would improve communication and understanding.
4. Current online communication channels should be reevaluated and retooled to become more personalized, interactive, and convenient. This could include:
 - a. Redesign and retooling of UNI Online.
 - b. Development of an effective process for scheduling on the University calendar.
 - c. A discussion forum for feedback on major issues.
 - d. Analysis of current e-mail communication policy and process to groups, list serves, and campus.
 - e. Homogenization of campus e-mail and software.
5. Regular face-to-face “Town Hall Meetings” led by the President and Cabinet.
6. Focus groups to determine students’ communication needs, both on and off campus, should be considered.
7. Formation of Communication Council with diverse campus representation to:
 - a. Serve as a listening post and clearinghouse related to key communication issues and policies.
 - b. Serve in an advisory role to the Cabinet, similar to the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee.

Members of the Effectiveness of Campus Communication Task Force

John Goossen, Chair
Pat Beck
Dale Cyphert

Lindsay German
Sandy Law
Tim McCue

Phil Patton
David Pruin
Catherine Zeman

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Student Employment Task Force

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

Maximize the opportunities for students to work on campus and regardless of on- or off-campus to link their work to their academic program of study whenever possible.

II. Approach to Task:

Determine the state of on- and off-campus student employment at UNI and recommend meaningful and practical ways to link their work experiences with academic programs.

III. Findings & Recommendations: (See also Tables in Attachment A.)

- A. The percentages of incoming students who *expect* to work while attending UNI have remained constant since 2000.
- B. The number of hours they *expect* to work while attending UNI have also remained constant.
- C. The percentage of students who *actually* worked for pay on or off campus was less than half.
- D. The number of hours *actually* worked was less than expected and *has gone down*.
- E. A separate survey of students in 2004 indicated that 80% of students working on campus worked 1-15 hours per week. Among students working off campus, 28.5% worked 1-15 hours/week, 46% worked 15-25 hours/week, and 25% worked 25+ hours/week.¹
- F. Among students who work on and off campus, the average number of hours worked per week was 15.
- G. Most students who work *recognize it takes time from their studies*.
- H. Since 2001-02, the cost of attendance at UNI has grown by \$3,506 or 30%.
- I. The cost of attendance not covered by Gift Assistance has grown from \$9,620 in 2001-02 to \$12,497 in 2004-05.
- J. In the same period, the *average annual undergraduate student loan amount has grown* from \$6,020 to \$7,121.
- K. *Average debt loads* upon graduation have also grown from \$16,716 in 2002-03 to \$20,239 in 2004-05.²
- L. *Federal Work-Study funds* available to UNI have plummeted from \$1,010,391 in 2002-03 to \$675,192 in 2005-06.
- M. As a result, the number of UNI students with Federal Work-Study Jobs on campus has dropped from 750 in 2002-03 to 460 in 2005-06, necessitating more work off campus.

¹ Source: Jana Chmelar and Tim Baluka: An Assessment of Student Employment

² Undergraduates. Does not include parent loans.

N. Recommendations:

As a result of conversation with several UNI faculty, staff and students, the following suggestions and recommendations were raised:

1. The high percentage of incoming freshman who anticipate working while enrolled at UNI reflects students' and *parents'* concerns about paying for college and the degree to which students will be responsible for the costs of attendance.
2. There is a need for consistent, standardized, and annual collection of data about student employment. Opinions differed about the appropriate time, place, and sampling mechanism to gather this data, although some suggested returning to the collection of data among students at commencement.
3. There is confusion among some staff, faculty, and students about the differences between cooperative education and off-campus work-study opportunities.
4. Off-campus work study seems to be underutilized. Although thousands of UNI students qualify for the program, only 30-40 took advantage of the program in 2005-06.
5. There are no campus-wide guidelines or forms for off-campus student work experiences that are used for internship and practicum experience. Some departments require advisor or department head signatures to register for internship/practicum credit, others do not. One suggestion is draft standard practices for enrolling in paid off-campus internships, practica, and experiential learning credit.
6. The willingness and ability of professors to make off-campus work experiences meaningful are mixed. By "meaningful," most participants in the campus conversation indicated ways to link the work experience with the student's major and academic and career goals. This is related to the notion that attending a university should some how be a transformative experience and that working (on or off campus) can be a valuable part of that transformation. (Some faculty felt strongly that the University already places too much emphasis on "experiential learning" and that providing academic credit should not be provided for work not directly related to the major.)
7. One final recommendation is to establish a central office to coordinate and promote off-campus internships, practica, and work study experiences. In effect, this may mean a dramatic expansion of the role, mission, and staff of the cooperative education office.

Members of the Student Employment Task Force

Mark Grey, Chair
Adam Butler
Cynthia Bancroft

Chris Denison
Carol Fletcher

Lauren PelleyOUNTER
Barb Shepard

Attachment A

Table 1: Percentage of New Students Who Expect to Work While Attending UNI³

2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
84%	86%	85%	87%	89%	86%

Table 2: Percentage of New Students Who Expect to Work 1-10 Hours Per Week While Attending UNI

2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
33%	34%	31%	34%	32%	36%

Table 3: Percentage of New Students Who Expect to Work 11-20 Hours Per Week While Attending UNI

2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
38%	39%	40%	37%	41%	40%

Table 4: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working On Campus for Pay⁴

2000	2001	2003	2004 ⁵	2005
46.4%	46.8%	31.7%	49%	43.7%

Table 5: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working Off Campus for Pay

2000	2001	2003	2004 ⁶	2005
46.9%	48.5%	36.3%	46%	38.5%

Table 6: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working On Campus 1-10 Hour per Week

2000	2001	2003	2005
22.3%	22.3%	16.7%	13.5%

Table 7: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working On Campus 11-20 Hours per Week

2000	2001	2003	2005
20.7%	21.6%	13%	19.4%

Table 8: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working Off Campus 1-10 Hours per Week

2000	2001	2003	2005
13.1%	13%	12.1%	9.4%

Table 9: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working Off Campus 11-20 Hours per Week

2000	2001	2003	2005
21.2%	22.9%	13.3%	16.7%

Table 10: Percentage of Students Who Reported Working “Takes Some Time” or “Takes Lots of Time” from School Work

2000	2001	2003	2005
57%	59%	57%	52%

³ Source: ACT Class Profile Reports

⁴ Sample of Students: Snapshot Data from the College Student Experience Questionnaire
No data available for 2002

⁵ Source: Jana Chmelar and Tim Baluka: An Assessment of Student Employment

⁶ Source: Jana Chmelar and Tim Baluka: An Assessment of Student Employment

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
UNI-Community Connections Task Force

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

1. Look at the involvement of UNI faculty, staff, and students in the community and pinpoint strategies for supporting and furthering these connections.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Review of comments solicited during the initial Campus Conversation in February 2005.
- B. Focus group session in January 2006, drawn from the approximately 30 people (faculty, staff and students) who had expressed a strong interest in community connections.
- C. Inclusion of questions on community connections on a campus wide survey, the results of which we were unable to utilize due to collective bargaining concerns.
- D. Solicitation of comments from faculty, staff, and students during the second Campus Conversation session in February 2006, and through subsequent e-mail contacts.
- E. The committee structured its discussion around the following central questions:
 1. Values: How can UNI articulate values that support community engagement?
 2. Communication: How can UNI promote effective communication on/off campus about opportunities for involvement?
 3. Incentives: How can UNI offer incentives that demonstrate a serious, university commitment to engagement?

III. Findings & Recommendations:

- A. The committee agreed on common definitions to frame the UNI-Community Connections discussion. These include:
 1. Experiential Learning: Supervised opportunities for students to apply knowledge and skills to "real world" settings.
 2. Service Learning: Community service that is incorporated directly into academic instruction.
 3. Public Scholarship: Faculty research agendas that address community issues
 4. Volunteerism: Voluntary contributions of time and talents on behalf of the community.
 5. Faculty and Staff Service: Service to the campus through departmental, college or University committee work.
 6. Community: "Community" may be defined flexibly, according to the interests of individuals and departments, to include the Cedar Valley, Iowa, the nation, or the global community.
- B. Recommendation One - Developing:
 1. Establish a Center for Community Engagement to:
 - a. Serve as UNI's "front door," connecting communities to UNI programs.
 - b. Promote the integration of community engagement into UNI core activities.
 - c. Foster multi-disciplinary and cross-unit initiatives that further community engagement.

- d. Encourage and sustain discussion on the practical implementation and community engagement across campus.
 - e. Identify barriers to engagement that affect core activities at all levels.
 - f. Support the strategic investment of resources for engagement through development initiatives (private and public funding).
 - g. Work closely with University Marketing & Public Relations to advance a clear message about community engagement through multiple media on and off campus.
 - h. Partner with an advisory board composed of community members and University representatives
2. Incorporate into faculty and staff development opportunities to learn about community engagement and how to implement experiential and service learning in their courses.

C. Recommendation Two - Creating Institutional Incentives

1. Offer regular institutional messages by senior administrators, deans, and department heads that attest to UNI's core commitment to community engagement.
2. Target resources within departments and colleges for promoting community engagement among faculty and staff.
3. Commit development staff to seeking and disseminating information about funding sources for community engagement both locally and nationally, including public and private funding sources.
4. Support community engagement within units by drawing clear distinctions among categories of service. For example, "community engagement" should be distinguished from departmental or campus-based "service." Activities with direct links to professional assignments at UNI should be distinguished from community volunteerism.
5. Encourage individual units to incorporate their commitments to community engagement into departmental evaluation processes over which they have control.
6. Create community engagement awards for faculty, staff, and students in order to formally acknowledge the value attached by the University to community engagement.
7. Identify ways in which experiential and service learning opportunities for students may be developed within the Liberal Arts Core courses and/or major courses.
8. Explore focused discussions about community engagement among staff. Questions for discussion might include:
 - a. How can staff be more fully supported and encouraged in community engagement initiatives?
 - b. What structures and processes of support could be developed that would facilitate greater community engagement among staff?

Members of UNI-Community Connection Task Force

Allen Hays, Chair
Mary-Sue Bartlett
Lucas Casey

Stacey Christensen
Darnell Cole-Taylor
Bob Frederick

Charles Johnson
Martie Reineke
Jessica Webb

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning Task Force

Executive Summary

I. The Charge:

- A. One of the priorities identified at the spring 2005 Campus Conversations was the re-establishment of a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL).
- B. Develop a purpose/mission/vision for such a center and a job description for a center director, should the task force decide that the CETL should be pursued.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Consideration of the CETL was assigned to the Faculty Senate.
- B. In April 2005, a Senate-appointed task force was convened to determine whether or not a center should indeed be re-established at this time.

III. Findings & Recommendation:

- A. CETL should not be developed at this time. (See the full report at <http://www.uni.edu/senate/misc/index.pdf>)
- B. Recommendations:
 1. Faculty Senate should revisit the question of creating a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in three to four years, once the new president and the new provost are established and familiar with UNI.
 2. Initiate (and sustain over at least the next three years) an ongoing interdisciplinary faculty discussion about student learning and effective teaching.
 - a. Discuss/define just what quality teaching is and how it is assessed, beyond the basic tenure and promotion process.
 3. Faculty and the administration need to engage in the process of determining clearly to what degree teaching excellence truly matters here at UNI.
 4. Assuming that true teaching excellence is indeed still of central importance, then the faculty and administration need to develop mechanisms of genuine support and reward that communicate in a concomitant manner the actual importance of teaching excellence.
 5. The University should develop a systemic and systematic approach to mentoring and ongoing improvement in teaching and professional development. This approach could grow out of:
 - a. The faculty discussions suggested in Recommendation 2.
 - b. The process described in the conclusions of this report.
 - c. Some other appropriate mechanism.
 6. This report should be made available no later than January 15, 2006, to all faculty either through electronic distribution or an announced posting on the Faculty Senate Website.
 7. This Task Force should be disbanded.
- C. On January 23, 2006, the Faculty Senate accepted the Task Force report and agreed to begin operationalizing these recommendations.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Faculty Staff Gathering Place Task Force

Executive Summary

II. The Charge:

Establish a gathering place for use by faculty and staff that provides dining and meeting options.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Determine the elements of a faculty/staff gathering place.
 - a. Review UNI history of University luncheon and Royal Oak Room costs and program.
 - b. Determine what other institutions have for programs, services, and costs.
- B. Determine faculty and staff interest in supporting the concept via survey, focus group, and Web feedback.
- C. Prepare cost estimates to reflect campus vision and format of the club.

III. Findings & Recommendations:

A. History

A review of the history of the University Club luncheons, the Royal Oak Room, and other University clubs indicates that this proposal is not likely to be self-supporting financially

- 1. Daily average participation was less than 100 persons.
- 2. To meet annual operating expenses, membership dues, University subsidy, external funding sources, or a combination of these will be required.

B. Key Survey Results

- 1. A total of 26% reported that a university club should be created even if membership fees (15 %) or University subsidy is required (11%).
- 2. A total of 46% reported that a university club should be created only if members do not need to pay a fee to join (21%) or the University does not need to subsidize (25%).
- 3. 24% reported that UNI should not pursue a university club.

C. Campus Responses

(16 persons attended four group sessions and 1 person provided feedback via email to the Web report):

- 1. There was general acceptance that a gathering place would connect the University community, facilitate exchange of ideas, and increase communication.
- 2. The financial viability of this proposal generated concern. Suggestions to create opportunities within existing facilities for more private dining were given.

D. Cost Estimates

- 1. A rough estimate based on approximate square footage and food service construction costs to renovate the Continuing Education Services building to a university club is \$645,000. This does not include dollars to create outdoor dining/gathering areas.

2. Annual operational costs not covered by payment for services are estimated to be approximately \$210,000 for an academic year only operation.
3. A member dues rate of approximately \$830/year for 255 members would cover the deficit. This could be reduced by revenues from catering, departmental memberships, social events, public access during certain hours, and University subsidy.

E. Recommendation

1. A University gathering place can play a vital role on campus in providing opportunities for faculty and staff to communicate, collaborate, and build collegiality and community.
2. Providing a great experience will build support, enthusiasm, and patronage.
3. The Campus Advisory Group should give strong consideration to supporting this concept.

Members of the Faculty/Staff Gathering Place Task Force

Mona Milius, Chair
Dr. Carlin Hageman
Dr. James Kelly

Louise Sandvold
Diana Smith

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Menu of Perquisites Task Force Report

Executive Summary

Introduction:

In September of 2005 the Menu of Perquisites Task Force was established to respond to the suggestions brought forward in the February 2005 Campus Conversations that a variety of perquisites might be appealing to employees, and thus further enhance the idea that UNI is a great place to work.

II. The Charge

- a. Recognize that what makes one employee feel valued may not be the same for another employee.
- b. Establish a menu of perquisites from which faculty/staff could select items that would respond to individual needs and interests.
 - a. Employees were the ones that should express what “perks” were important to them.
- c. Determine costs associated with providing those perks so that decision makers would not only know what was important to employees but also have an estimate of cost implications associated with implementation.

II. Approach to Task:

- A. Gather suggestions from constituents as to what perks would be of interest, including:
 - a. Individual conversations.
 - b. Queries at department meetings by task force members.
 - c. Queries made over e-mail to various constituencies.
 - d. Contact all those who indicated they wanted to be a part of the perks task force conversation (i.e., names provided by the Campus Conversations group).
- B. Generate a list of possible perks for review by the task force, task force chairs, and the larger Campus Conversations group.
- C. Develop a survey to gain input from all full time employees (benefit eligible) as to what perks would be most important to the broadest number of employees.
- D. Survey draft was approved by Campus Advisory Group, cognizant of the requirements of the Collective Bargaining Process.

III. Findings & Recommendations:

- A. A survey was distributed in January 2006 with a response rate of approximately 44%.
 1. Questions were raised by United Faculty relative to the ability to do any survey and thus the responses to all areas of perquisites, except parking, have been restricted.
 2. The task force could not solicit input at the February 17, 2006, Campus Conversations meeting.
- B. Without benefit of survey results, the Menu of Perquisites Task Force cannot make further progress.

C. Recommendations:

1. Should the legal questions be resolved in a timely manner, and the data become available, the task force should be reconvened to complete their work which would answer the following questions:
 - a. What (if any) perks have broad-based support among staff? Faculty? Both?
 - b. What perks do not have broad-based support among staff? Faculty? Both?
 - c. Of those perks that have broad-based support, what are the associated costs for implementation?
2. A final report would be drafted that included details on the entire process, including survey construction, data collection, results, and recommendations.

Members of the Menu of Perquisites Task Force

Jan Hanish, Chair
Jan Flick
Molly Hackenmiller

Curt Hanson
Margaret Holland

Kim MacLin
Dave Zarifis