

Contact: Diana Gonzalez

BIENNIAL FACULTY ACTIVITIES REPORT

Action Requested: Receive the report.

Executive Summary: The Faculty Activities Report is an important tool for accountability and communication among the Board of Regents, the Regent universities, and the public. It provides an overview of faculty responsibilities at the three Regent universities, describes the distribution of time spent on those responsibilities, and illustrates how the universities monitor the accomplishment of their diverse missions.

The key indicators of faculty activities include the following questions:

1. How are faculty responsibilities defined and how do expectations differ among the Regent universities?
2. What are faculty responsibilities and what do those activities contribute to students, the universities, the state, and society at large?
3. How do faculty members spend their work time?
4. Who teaches the students?
5. How do we know faculty are doing a good job?
6. How do we know our universities are doing a good job?

This report addresses the Board of Regents Strategic Plan priorities to provide “educational excellence and impact” as well as “economic development and vitality.”

- ◆ The 2013 faculty activities report, based on 2012-13 survey data, showed that the average number of hours worked per week by faculty at the three universities was 53.9 – 58.2; the weighted average of the three Regent universities was 56.3 hours. The average number of hours worked per week by faculty at the University of Iowa was 56.5; at Iowa State University, it was 57.2; and at the University of Northern Iowa, it was 53.9.
 - The 2011 faculty activities report, based on 2010-11 survey data, showed that the average number of hours worked per week by faculty at the three universities was 53.0 – 58.0; the weighted average of the three Regent universities was 56.4 hours. The average number of hours worked per week by faculty at the University of Iowa was 57.2; at Iowa State University, it was 58.0; and at the University of Northern Iowa, it was 53.0.
 - During the past 21 years, there have been only minor fluctuations in the average number of hours worked per week by faculty.
- ◆ The comparable national average in the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty was 55.5 hours for full-time faculty at public research universities and 53.3 hours at public comprehensive universities.¹

¹ Source: National Center for Educational Statistics.

- ◇ A significant faculty effort, for all ranks and faculty status, is teaching. The percentages of time spent on research/scholarship, service, and administrative duties mirror past results and reflect faculty rank.
- ◇ At the three universities, at least 49% of all undergraduate student credit hours are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty.

The following graphs display the allocation of hours by category (student instruction/advising; scholarship/research/creative work; clinical work; community engagement/outreach/extension; professional development; and administration/service) and faculty type (tenured; tenure-track; and non-tenure-track). It is clear that there is a difference in the allocation of hours by category and faculty type.

Table 1a – University of Iowa




Table 1b – Iowa State University





Table 1c – University of Northern Iowa



Background:

1. How are faculty responsibilities defined and how do expectations differ among the Regent universities?

The core missions of the Regent universities are teaching, research, and service; faculty activities are essential to fulfilling those missions. Faculty activities both define the nature of the universities and play the most central role in fulfilling their missions. While the three Regent universities pursue the same overarching tripartite mission, the Board charges the universities to “seek different areas of specialty and emphasis” so that each provides a unique educational and engagement opportunity within the state.” For this reason, faculty activities among the three institutions vary in specialty emphasis and distribution of hours, yet they are consistent in the nature of their responsibilities and their goal of excellence for the people of Iowa.

The three universities offer excellent undergraduate education in the arts and sciences as well as varying numbers of high-quality graduate and professional programs. The University of Iowa also conducts a large health care enterprise, professional education in law, and a full array of liberal arts graduate specialties, including its world-renowned creative writing programs. Iowa State University’s mission as a land grant university includes a special commitment to extension and outreach, and strong programs in agriculture, veterinary medicine, engineering and the biosciences. The University of Northern Iowa’s emphasis is on providing excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare teachers and educational leaders for service in Iowa and beyond.

2. What are faculty responsibilities and what do those activities contribute to students, the universities, the state, and society at large?

The public university in America has traditionally provided affordable, accessible education to its state’s citizens and others from outside the state; research and scholarship that extend the boundaries of knowledge and improve the lives of the public; and service to society that provides needed assistance and benefit to people and communities, as well as service to the

administration of the universities themselves and to the professions of which the faculty are a part. Over time, university missions have expanded to include such areas as creative endeavor in the arts and economic development, especially for the institution's home state.

In recent years, the lines between the teaching, research, and service missions have blurred with the recognition that these are not always discrete activities but rather interrelated components of the academic mission of a public university. For example, a faculty member's research usually informs the education he or she provides to students and often provides direct benefit to the public. In recognition of the interconnectedness of the university mission, a revised formulation of "learning, discovery, and engagement" was coined by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities in 2000, and it has gained support among higher education professionals over time. Today's faculty activities often reflect this interlinked concept of the university mission. Therefore, it is important to recognize that all activities are part of the greater whole of "learning, discovery, and engagement" in service to students and society. The faculty activities data demonstrate that each category of activity is multifaceted and that the activity will be distributed somewhat differently depending on the institution and even the individual faculty member.

It is clear that there is no "typical" faculty workload. Responsibilities differ according to discipline, departmental needs, and individual strengths. Moreover, each "category" of faculty work encompasses a wide variety of activities. "Student instruction," for example, involves many activities other than classroom teaching, such as preparation, grading and evaluation; working with students outside the classroom (independent studies, thesis work, internships, etc.); mentoring student research; and developing and updating courses. Also, teaching may take the form of online or clinical teaching. Many faculty members also conduct student advising activities. Scholarship, research, and creative work may encompass sponsored (grant-supported) and/or non-sponsored work, attending conferences and other scholarly meetings, and writing and preparing grants.

A number of faculty engage in clinical activities, which include both delivering clinical services and carrying out administrative tasks related to that work. Faculty members engage in a diverse array of community engagement, outreach, and (at ISU) extension activities, such as delivering educational programming throughout Iowa and beyond, providing technical assistance and consulting, and partnering with public and private organizations to advance community goals while enhancing teaching and research. Service activities can include institutional administration (committee work, chairing a department, etc.) or service to the profession at large, such as serving on a journal editorial board, serving as a grant reader, and serving a leadership role in a professional organization.

Even though specific faculty activities can vary widely, all faculty engage in all three core categories of teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and service. Through these activities, the faculty at the Regent institutions serve society by providing the best higher learning experiences for students, by conducting leading-edge discovery work, and by engaging with the public in service to the state's citizens and the public as a whole.

3. How do faculty members spend their work time?

Following the biennial Faculty Activities Report in August 2011, an inter-institutional team with representation from the Board Office and the three Regent universities undertook a collaborative, in-depth revision of the data collection process for the report. A new survey template was developed to collect significantly more detailed information that captures the variety and breadth of faculty work activities previously described.

a. Data collection process

The universities implemented the new survey for the first time over eight weeks in Spring 2013. Surveys were e-mailed to all eligible full-time faculty members, with 1/8th of those faculty receiving the survey in each of eight weeks over the semester, starting with the third week of classes. Faculty members were assigned their reporting week randomly. Surveys were not conducted during the week of spring break or the week prior. Faculty members on long-term disability, professional development assignments, or in phased retirement were not surveyed.

The three institutions developed and administered the following communications to faculty members:

- ◆ Five days before they were to start the survey, faculty members received an e-mail—jointly signed by the three provosts and three Faculty Senate presidents—asking them to participate and providing directions and a link to the survey.
- ◆ One day before faculty members were to start the survey they received a reminder e-mail from their institution’s Faculty Senate president.
- ◆ On the Monday following the survey period, SUI and UNI faculty who had not yet responded received a reminder from their Faculty Senate president, urging them to complete and submit the survey.
- ◆ ISU implemented a different communication and follow-up effort, according to its existing standard survey procedure. The difference in follow-up effort between ISU and the other two institutions allows for a comparison of the impact of the different methods on response rates and data reliability. Analyses to answer these questions are ongoing.
 - To facilitate accurate reporting, paper copies of the provosts’ letter and the survey—along with answers to frequently asked questions—were sent to each faculty member through campus mail, to arrive on Monday of the week for which data were being requested. Faculty members were encouraged to contact survey administrators with questions or if they encountered difficulty with the survey software.
 - E-mail reminders were sent to faculty at 10, 16, and 24 days after the designated survey week. After 24 days, staff attempted to contact non-respondents by telephone. One final reminder was sent near the end of the semester to those faculty members who had not yet responded.

The purpose of the survey was to determine faculty activity during a full work week; therefore, respondents who were not available for the entire week were removed from the analysis. Also removed were a small number of faculty members whose survey contained errors, or who did not complete the entire survey. With these respondents removed, the analysis that follows is based on survey results from 1,217 SUI faculty members, 1,111 ISU faculty members, and 410 UNI faculty members as shown in Table 2 on the following page.

Table 2 - Data Collection Summary

	SUI	ISU	UNI
Surveys sent	2,123	1,446	584
Surveys returned	1,385	1,226	491
Response rate	65.2%	84.8%	84.1%
Responses removed because respondent was not available for all or part of the week	155	98	20
Responses removed because of incomplete or irregular data	13	17	61
Total respondents included in the analyses	1,217	1,111	410

Response rates varied from approximately 65% at SUI to almost 85% at ISU and UNI. These rates are well above typical response rates for e-mail surveys. For example, a recent professional study comparing response rates across 39 e-mail surveys found that the average rate was 34%.²

b. Survey Results

Faculty members' responses to the activities survey are presented in summary form in Table 3.

The first column of the table lists the types of activities included in the new survey template. The remaining columns display the average number of hours per week each type of faculty member reported spending on each of the various activities at each institution. For example, the first cell in the upper left-hand corner of the table in the SUI column under "Tenured & Tenure Track" shows 10.35, meaning that tenured and tenure-track faculty members at SUI reported spending an average of approximately 10 hours per week on classroom teaching, preparation, and grading/evaluation.

The shaded subtotal rows in Table 3 show the total average number of hours faculty members reported spending per week on all of the activities in that section of the table.

Overall, the survey results illustrate the breadth and variety of faculty activities as described above; they highlight some of the differences in emphasis among the three Regent universities; and they demonstrate that faculty members are actively engaged, on a daily basis, in advancing "learning, discovery, and engagement" at Iowa's public universities.

i. Student Instruction

The first shaded subtotal row of Table 3 (Student Instruction: Total Average Hours) shows the average number of hours the different types of faculty members at the three institutions reported spending, per week, on various instruction-related activities.

² Shih and Fan.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members reported spending approximately 22 to 32 hours per week on these activities (21.8 hours at SUI, 24.9 hours at ISU, and 32.4 hours at UNI). Traditional classroom teaching, preparation, and grading represent about half of the time that these faculty members dedicate to teaching-related activities. At all three institutions, faculty members spent on average 1-2 hours per week on each of the following activities: guiding student internships and independent studies, mentoring student research, assisting students outside of the classroom, advising students on academic and career planning, and preparing new courses.

Non-tenure track faculty members at all three institutions spent substantially more time on instruction (34-35 hours per week at the three institutions). This is expected because these faculty members tend to be full-time lecturers who do not have significant research or service responsibilities.

Clinical track faculty members at SUI and clinicians at ISU devoted about 14 hours per week to student instruction, while research track faculty members at SUI spent just under three hours on these activities. This is appropriate given the specialized expectations for those positions. It should be noted that it can be difficult to isolate “clinical work” and “student instruction” for clinical faculty because much of the teaching these faculty members do occurs during the course of delivering clinical services.

ii. Scholarship/research/creative work

The second shaded subtotal row (Scholarship/Research/Creative Work: Total Average Hours) reports the average number of hours faculty members reported spending per week on scholarship, research, and creative work. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members at SUI and ISU, where expectations in these areas are high, reported spending 21-22 hours per week on these activities. At UNI, where relatively more emphasis is placed on instruction, tenured and tenure-track faculty reported spending an average of 11 hours each week on scholarship, research, and creative work.

Non-tenure track faculty members generally reported spending less time on scholarship, research, and creative work (7.5 hours at SUI, 6.1 at ISU, and 4.5 at UNI). While these faculty members may have research interests that occupy some of their time, their primary responsibility is almost always instruction.

Clinical track faculty members at SUI and ISU reported spending five hours and 11.9 hours per week, respectively, on scholarship, research, and creative work.

Finally, research track faculty members at SUI reported spending the majority of their time (44.9 hours) per week on these activities, which is to be expected given that research is their primary responsibility.

iii. Clinical work

The clinical work section of Table 3 confirms that clinical track faculty at SUI and clinicians at ISU are the most heavily engaged in this work (which includes both delivering clinical services and working on administrative tasks related to those services). The shaded row at the bottom of this section (Clinical Work: Total Average Hours) shows that these faculty members reported spending on average 26.3 hours and 17.85 hours per week, respectively, on clinical activities. Other types of faculty members spend relatively little time on clinical activities.

Table 3 - Survey Results

	Tenured & Tenure Track			Non-Tenure Track			Clinical Track / Clinicians		Research Track	DEOs/Chairs		
	SUI	ISU	UNI	SUI	ISU	UNI	SUI	ISU	SUI	SUI	ISU	UNI
Student Instruction												
Classroom teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation	10.35	12.06	18.12	19.18	19.44	21.30	3.70	3.59	0.46	5.53	5.51	10.13
Online teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation	0.61	1.02	1.78	1.55	1.66	1.62	0.67	1.36	0.00	0.79	0.18	0.52
Clinical teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation	0.74	0.40	1.17	1.59	1.30	0.93	5.40	7.17	0.00	1.06	0.24	0.15
Non-classroom teaching and instruction (independent studies, thesis work, internships, student productions)	2.03	2.02	2.38	0.90	1.73	1.39	0.37	0.34	0.13	1.97	1.89	1.98
Mentoring student research	2.54	3.16	1.22	0.41	0.64	0.32	0.29	0.36	1.36	2.13	1.74	0.91
Communicating with students outside the classroom (in person, by telephone, by email, etc.)	2.23	2.52	3.47	4.78	4.09	4.78	1.16	2.67	0.33	1.51	1.31	1.62
Developing new courses, updating existing courses	1.42	1.66	1.97	3.05	2.53	1.98	1.12	0.70	0.23	1.15	0.40	0.59
Student advising: helping students—in person, via email, etc.—with academic and career questions, writing letters of recommendation, participating in student orientations and training events, etc.	1.89	2.05	2.34	2.08	2.72	3.65	1.03	2.65	0.33	1.82	1.79	2.45
Student Instruction: Total Average Hours	21.80	24.89	32.44	33.54	34.13	35.98	13.74	18.86	2.83	15.96	13.05	18.35
Scholarship/Research/Creative Work												
Sponsored (grant-supported) scholarship/research/creative work	7.56	6.72	2.20	1.89	0.98	0.15	0.76	3.24	27.00	5.33	3.33	0.32
Non-sponsored (non-grant supported) scholarship/research/creative work	7.73	6.84	6.24	2.77	2.79	2.84	2.15	3.59	4.06	4.59	1.78	1.36
Attending conferences, seminars, workshops, etc., related to your scholarship/research/creative work	2.10	1.87	0.53	0.76	0.33	0.36	0.83	1.82	3.23	2.61	2.30	1.52
Writing/preparing grants	2.36	3.24	0.63	1.16	0.83	0.05	0.37	1.39	7.96	1.56	2.02	0.18
Keeping up to date with disciplinary research and activities	2.74	2.47	1.81	0.94	1.20	1.12	0.89	1.87	2.65	1.76	1.19	1.51
Scholarship/Research/Creative Work: Total Average Hours	22.49	21.14	11.40	7.52	6.13	4.52	5.01	11.91	44.90	15.85	10.62	4.89
Clinical Work												
Delivering clinical services	2.66	0.49	0.22	4.44	4.40	0.00	20.72	14.48	0.00	2.40	0.00	0.06
Working on administrative tasks related to clinical work	0.70	0.07	0.37	1.46	0.45	0.75	5.61	3.27	0.00	1.20	0.05	0.00
Clinical Work: Total Average Hours	3.36	0.57	0.58	5.90	4.85	0.75	26.33	17.75	0.00	3.61	0.05	0.06
Community Engagement, Outreach, or Extension												
Working on public or private partnership projects	0.47	0.58	0.61	0.57	0.50	0.61	0.36	0.98	0.08	0.46	0.68	0.32
Delivering presentations, workshops, seminars, performances, exhibits	0.47	0.65	0.52	0.32	0.37	0.41	0.22	0.25	0.03	0.40	0.18	0.36
Delivering online/webinar based programming	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.00	0.09	0.04	0.00
Providing technical assistance	0.09	0.29	0.12	0.08	0.39	0.05	0.07	0.41	0.23	0.27	0.15	0.13
Preparing, presenting and evaluating programming for stakeholders	0.10	0.35	0.13	0.18	0.23	0.01	0.12	0.20	0.00	0.26	0.26	0.09
Consulting (in person, by telephone, by email, etc.)	0.32	0.48	0.50	0.09	0.40	1.09	0.28	0.90	0.00	0.53	0.20	0.16
Developing new programs, updating existing programs (presentations, publications, etc.)	0.35	0.72	0.32	0.24	0.44	0.19	0.60	0.41	0.31	0.54	0.42	0.34
Community Engagement, Outreach, or Extension: Total Average Hours	1.81	3.11	2.22	1.48	2.34	2.44	1.67	3.19	0.64	2.54	1.93	1.40
Professional Development												
Participating in professional development activities for teaching, research, clinical work, or community engagement, outreach or extension (workshops, conferences, online seminars, etc.).	0.97	0.95	1.20	1.38	0.84	0.84	2.52	2.48	0.90	1.72	2.08	1.24
Professional Development: Total Average Hours	0.97	0.95	1.20	1.38	0.84	0.84	2.52	2.48	0.90	1.72	2.08	1.24
Administration/Service												
Serving the institution (department, college, university committees and meetings, task forces, faculty governance, etc.)	3.95	3.81	4.30	1.49	2.10	1.98	2.30	1.34	0.58	7.01	11.87	12.65
Serving the profession (such as serving on editorial board, etc.)	1.85	1.88	0.66	0.18	0.25	0.11	0.50	0.45	1.69	1.33	1.00	0.10
Administering centers/ institutes, department/ college/ university programs, research operations	0.87	1.19	0.83	0.42	0.49	0.17	1.28	0.55	0.50	10.10	15.52	13.96
Mentoring faculty	0.34	0.30	0.14	0.11	0.14	0.98	0.23	0.00	0.15	1.36	2.46	0.97
Assisting student organizations	0.12	0.31	0.31	0.34	0.50	0.75	0.19	0.32	0.08	0.04	0.47	0.25
Administration/Service: Total Average Hours	7.13	7.49	6.24	2.53	3.48	3.99	4.49	2.66	2.99	19.84	31.32	27.93
TOTAL AVG HOURS	57.57	58.16	54.09	52.36	51.76	48.51	53.77	56.84	52.27	59.53	59.05	53.87
MEDIAN HOURS	56.00	55.84	52.21	49.25	47.88	45.67	50.00	52.75	50.00	56.88	59.00	54.29
COUNT of responders	815	883	344	119	164	38	194	22	13	76	42	28

iv. Community engagement, outreach, and extension

The shaded subtotal row for Community Engagement (Community Engagement, Outreach, or Extension: Total Average Hours) shows that the different types of faculty members spent between 0.6 hours and 3.2 hours per week on these activities. ISU faculty members, many of whom have a formal Extension appointment, tended to spend somewhat more time on these activities than SUI and UNI faculty members. ISU faculty with Extension appointments carry out their extension activities as part of their teaching and research responsibilities.

Faculty members were instructed not to double-count their activities. Much of the teaching and research in which faculty members are engaged benefits the public and could easily be counted in the engagement category if it were not already counted elsewhere. Clinical service also is one of the universities' most visible and important forms of public engagement, as is student instruction through various forms of distance learning.

v. Professional development

The shaded row for Professional Development (Professional Development: Total Average Hours) indicates that most of the different types of faculty members reported spending about an hour a week on professional development activities. The primary exceptions were the clinical track faculty members at SUI and ISU, who reported spending more than two hours per week on professional development. A major reason for this is that the professional requirements of many clinical positions require significant continuing education.

vi. Administration/service

The shaded row in the administration and service section (Administration/Service: Total Average Hours) shows that among the various faculty types, tenured and tenure-track faculty members undertook most of the administration and service duties. At all three institutions, these faculty members reported spending approximately seven hours on these activities per week, while the other types of faculty members tended to spend around half that amount of time.

The data in this section also indicate that the majority of administration and service activities—for all faculty members—were in service to their institutions, with a relatively small amount of time spent on service to academic disciplinary organizations.

vii. Departmental executive officers/department chairs

The last three columns in the table show the average work hours reported by departmental executive officers (DEOs)/department chairs (chairs) at the three institutions.

DEOs/chairs are responsible for managing their departments, which takes substantial time - even in small academic units. These significant administrative duties are reflected in the survey results. The shaded subtotal row for administration and service (Administration/Service: Total Average Hours) shows that DEOs/chairs at all three schools reported spending far more time on these activities than any other type of faculty (approximately 20 hours at SUI, 28 at UNI, and 31 at ISU).

Even though DEOs/chairs must spend significant time managing their departments, they remain very involved in teaching and research. DEOs at SUI reported spending, on average, almost 16 hours per week on teaching activities, and 16 hours on research activities. At ISU, chairs reported spending about 13 hours per week on teaching activities and about 11 on research, while at UNI DEOs spent more than 18 hours on teaching and almost five hours on research. In total, DEOs/chairs reported working approximately 54 to 60 hours per week.

viii. Total hours at work

The total number of hours the various types of faculty members at each institution reported working per week, on average, is in the shaded total row at the bottom of the table. Faculty members at all three institutions reported working more than 40 hours per week, on average. At SUI, tenured and tenure-track faculty members reported working 57.6 hours per week, non-tenure track faculty 52.4 hours, clinical track faculty 53.8 hours, and research track faculty 52.3 hours. At ISU, tenured and tenure-track faculty members reported working 58.2 hours per week, non-tenure track faculty 51.8 hours, and clinicians 56.8 hours. At UNI, tenured and tenure track faculty members reported working 54.1 hours per week and non-tenure track faculty 48.5 hours.

ix. Summary

The new survey template was well-received by faculty, and the results tell a detailed story of how the faculty members at the three institutions spent their work time. According to the responses, the average faculty member spent more than 40 hours in activities that directly serve the tripartite mission of the universities: teaching, research, and service. This level of dedication is consistent with the fact that, through their work activities, faculty members are pursuing their intellectual passions.

4. Who teaches the students?



The following tables and charts show the number and percentage of undergraduate, graduate, professional, and total student credit hours (SCH) taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and graduate assistants at the Regent universities. All data are from Fall 2012.

- ◆ At SUI, 48.6% of all SCH and 45.0% of undergraduate SCH were taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty in Fall 2012. This represents a decrease of about one percentage point from Fall 2010.
- ◆ Non-tenure track faculty taught 39.3% of total SCH and 40.0% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, an increase of 3.8 and 4.7 percentage points, respectively, compared to Fall 2010.
- ◆ Graduate assistants taught 12.1% of total SCH and 14.9% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, a decrease of 2.9 and 3.7 percentage points, respectively, compared to Fall 2010.

The changes from Fall 2010 to Fall 2012 continue the trend of the last several years, and mirror changes at similar institutions across the country. AAU institutions that participate in the National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity report a similar steady decrease in the percentage of SCH taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty (from 52.9% overall in FY 2000 to 45.5% in FY 2011). These trends also reflect the change in faculty appointments at universities. At SUI in Fall 2012, non-tenure track faculty represented 32.7% of faculty FTE in instructional-related fund groups compared to 21.0% in Fall 2000.

Table 4a – University of Iowa

SUI	Undergraduate		Graduate		Professional		Total	
	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct
Tenured	111,267	36.2%	22,449	63.4%	17,900	45.67%	151,616	39.7%
Tenure-Track	26,958	8.8%	4,823	13.6%	2,217	5.66%	33,998	8.9%
<i>(T/TT Subtotal)</i>	<i>138,225</i>	<i>45.0%</i>	<i>27,272</i>	<i>77.1%</i>	<i>20,117</i>	<i>51.33%</i>	<i>185,614</i>	<i>48.6%</i>
Non-Tenure Track	122,916	40.0%	7,985	22.6%	19,074	48.67%	149,975	39.3%
Graduate Assistant	45,863	14.9%	130	0.4%	0	0.00%	45,993	12.1%
All Faculty	307,004	100.0%	35,387	100.0%	39,191	100.00%	381,582	100.0%





- ◇ At ISU, 58.0% of all SCH and 54.3% of undergraduate SCH were taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty in Fall 2012. This represents a decrease of about 4.5 percentage points from Fall 2010.
- ◇ Non-tenure track faculty taught 31.0% of total SCH and 33.5% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, an increase of 4.1 percentage points (in both cases) compared to Fall 2010.
- ◇ Graduate assistants taught 11.0% of total SCH and 12.2% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, an increase of 0.4 percentage points (in both cases) compared to Fall 2010.

The increase in the total teaching carried out by non-tenure track faculty from Fall 2010 to Fall 2012 reflects the changing profile of faculty appointments at universities across the nation. More important, the increase in non-tenure track faculty instruction reflects an institutional response to the enrollment growth ISU has experienced during the past three years. From Fall 2010 to Fall 2012, total enrollment increased by 7% from 28,682 to 31,040 students. Undergraduate enrollment increased by 9.6%, from 23,104 to 25,553 students, necessitating the rapid hiring of instructional faculty—most typically into the non-tenure track. At ISU, non-tenure track faculty represented 27.9% of faculty FTE in Fall 2012 compared to 24.8% in Fall 2010. ISU is working to increase its hiring of tenured/tenure-track faculty, while recognizing that the institution will always rely upon a mix of excellent tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty.

Table 4b – Iowa State University

ISU	Undergraduate		Graduate		Professional		Total	
	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct
Tenured	147,499	43.1%	22,398	71.8%	7,039	70.0%	176,936	46.1%
Tenure Track	38,550	11.3%	6,326	20.3%	857	8.5%	45,733	11.9%
<i>(T/TT Subtotal)</i>	<i>186,049</i>	<i>54.3%</i>	<i>28,724</i>	<i>92.1%</i>	<i>7,896</i>	<i>78.5%</i>	<i>222,669</i>	<i>58.0%</i>
Non-Tenure Track	114,633	33.5%	2,313	7.4%	2,164	21.5%	119,110	31.0%
Graduate Assistant	41,862	12.2%	165	0.5%	0	0.0%	42,027	11.0%
All Faculty	342,544	100.0%	31,202	100.0%	10,060	100.0%	383,806	100.0%







- ◆ At UNI, 77.7% of all SCH and 76.7% of undergraduate SCH were taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty in Fall 2012. This represents an increase of 9.0 percentage points (total) and 9.6 percentage points (undergraduate) compared to Fall 2010.
- ◆ Non-tenure track faculty taught 22.2% of total SCH and 23.2% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, a decrease of 8.2 and 8.9 percentage points, respectively, compared to Fall 2010.
- ◆ Graduate assistants taught 0.1% of total SCH and 0.1% of undergraduate SCH in Fall 2012, a decrease of 0.8 and 0.7 percentage points, respectively, compared to fall 2010.

The percentage of SCH taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty at UNI is now at its highest level in the past several years, a shift that can be attributed to the program cuts and restructuring that took place at UNI during that time period.

Table 4c – University of Northern Iowa

UNI	Undergraduate		Graduate		Professional		Total	
	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct	SCH	Pct
Tenured	83,595	62.0%	7,172	73.9%	0	0.00%	90,767	62.8%
Tenure Track	19,837	14.7%	1,767	18.2%	0	0.00%	21,604	14.9%
<i>(T/TT Subtotal)</i>	<i>103,432</i>	<i>76.7%</i>	<i>8,939</i>	<i>92.1%</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.00%</i>	<i>112,371</i>	<i>77.7%</i>
Non-Tenure Track	31,285	23.2%	772	7.9%	0	0.00%	32,057	22.2%
Graduate Assistant	141	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.00%	141	0.1%
All Faculty	134,858	100.0%	9,711	100.0%	0	0.00%	144,569	100.0%



5. How do we know faculty are doing a good job?

Faculty members spend years in graduate school in order to pursue careers that allow them to teach and do research in the areas that most deeply interest them. Being a professor is not so much doing a job as it is following a passion—which is why most faculty members work more than 50 hours a week. They look forward to their work, and provide excellent instruction to their students and produce valuable scholarship and community outreach.

However, not all faculty members can be equally passionate and dedicated to their careers. Some inevitably work harder than others, which is why the three Regent institutions have rigorous accountability procedures to regularly evaluate the work performance of individual faculty members. Though the procedures vary somewhat across the institutions, all are designed to monitor faculty job performance against agreed-upon standards and to provide constructive feedback and assistance to the few faculty members who fall short in one or more areas of their work.

a. Annual Review

All three institutions conduct annual reviews of individual faculty at all ranks, for the interrelated purposes of performance appraisal and faculty development. These annual reviews address teaching performance as well as productivity in research/creative activities, professional practice, and institutional service, as appropriate. Student evaluations are collected regularly to help monitor the quality of teaching performance. In some cases, annual reviews may include peer observation of teaching. Annual reviews provide the basis for faculty salary decisions (along with position responsibilities, market factors, equity considerations, and in the case of UNI, collective bargaining agreements), and allow departments to provide constructive, developmental feedback to faculty, including tenure-track faculty who are working toward meeting departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

b. Promotion and Tenure Review

Preparation for the promotion and tenure decision begins when faculty members are hired. During the probationary period, they develop the record of teaching, scholarship, and service that eventually serves as the basis for the promotion and tenure decision. Probationary faculty members receive feedback on their progress through annual reviews and through formal and informal mentoring. At the time of the promotion and/or tenure decision, faculty members undergo an extensive, rigorous peer review process that examines their entire probationary record. This multi-faceted peer review process involves evaluation by external reviewers as well as reviews at the departmental, college, and university levels.

c. Post-Tenure Review

In addition to annual reviews of tenured faculty by department heads, ISU and SUI conduct regular post-tenure reviews that include peer evaluation of teaching, research, and service. At SUI, tenured faculty members undergo a peer review every five years, according to procedures established by the colleges in accordance with the policy on Review of Tenured Faculty Members. At ISU, post-tenure reviews are conducted every five to seven years (as required by the Post-Tenure Review Policy), with the goal of ensuring that faculty members are meeting or exceeding expectations contained in their Position Responsibility Statement.

UNI uses a “triggered” approach to post-tenure review of tenured faculty, in which a department head, dean, or provost may initiate a rigorous, thorough review if concerns are raised about a faculty member’s performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service. These reviews ensure that all faculty members are performing satisfactorily in all areas.

d. Other

It should be noted that faculty members also undergo a rigorous form of “peer review” as they compete to have their work published; to present their work at regional, national, and international conferences; to obtain grants and contracts to support their research, scholarly, and creative work; and to form and maintain partnerships with community entities.

SUI's faculty review policies and procedures are codified in [Section III-10](#) of the *Operations Manual*, in the [Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Decision Making](#), and in college- and department-specific guidelines established according to university policy. ISU's faculty evaluation and review policies are detailed in Section 5 of the [Faculty Handbook](#). At UNI, evaluation policies are specified in [Article Three](#) and [Appendix B](#) of the Master Agreement. Evaluation of faculty and efforts to promote faculty vitality at all three universities are addressed in greater detail in the [annual governance report on faculty tenure](#).

6. How do we know our universities are doing a good job?

The Regent universities monitor and submit annual governance reports on progress toward achieving the aspirations and goals articulated in their strategic plans. They also monitor and report on the goals and targets associated with the strategic plan of the Board of Regents.

The annual strategic planning progress report is one of many governance reports the universities submit each year to the Board of Regents—on topics such as budget, academic program review and student outcomes assessment, faculty activity and workload, faculty salaries, retirements and resignations, requests for professional development assignments, and many others—in order to meet their responsibility for accountability to the people of Iowa.

Selected institutional highlights

Below are selected examples of recent success and recognition at each of the three Regent universities.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

◆ Institutional Recognition

- *U.S. News and World Report* ranked the University of Iowa 28th among the nation's best public universities.
- *U.S. News and World Report* ranked 26 University of Iowa graduate programs and colleges among the 25 best in the country among all public and private schools. More than 82% of SUI graduate and professional programs are ranked among the top 30 such programs at public schools around the nation. Five SUI programs are ranked in the top 10.
- University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics has been ranked as one of *U.S. News & World Report's* "America's Best Hospitals" for 23 years in a row.
- SUI was named a "Military-Friendly School" by Victory Media for the fourth straight year.
- SUI was named a "Best Buy" by the *Fiske Guide to Colleges* for the eighth straight year.
- SUI Facilities Management received the 2013 Sustainability Award from the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA). The award from APPA recognizes the campus facilities management department that has integrated sustainable policies and "green" practices throughout all facets of the organization and embedded them within the educational institution.

- The large number of new incoming students (a record-breaking class of 4,557 first-year students in Fall 2010, another record of 4,565 in Fall 2011, and 4,470 in Fall 2012) and a retention rate at or above 85.5% for each of the last three years are particularly positive indicators of success.
- The University of Iowa was fully reaccredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association following the site visit in 2007-08.
- SUI is a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), a nonprofit organization of 62 leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada.

◆ **Selected Academic Strengths**

- Iowa's top-25 ranked graduate and professional programs include speech-language pathology (#1) and audiology (#2); physician assistant (#2); rehabilitation counseling (#2); physical therapy (#5); master's degree program in nursing (#11); health administration (#14); primary care in the Carver College of Medicine (#16); public health (#16); Pharm.D. (#17); clinical psychology (#18); and MFA in art and design (#22).
- Additional specialties ranked in the top 25 include the printmaking (#4) and painting/drawing (#16) specialties in fine arts; accounting (#24); higher education administration (#12), student counseling and personnel services (#13), and secondary teacher education (#19) in the College of Education; environmental engineering (#25); rural medicine (#9), family medicine (#14), and internal medicine (#17) in the Carver College of Medicine; gerontological nursing (#2), nursing service administration (#2), nursing anesthesia (#11), and pediatric nurse practitioner (#12) in the College of Nursing; and social psychology (#3).
- Six specialties in the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics are nationally ranked, including ophthalmology and visual sciences (#6), otolaryngology (#13), orthopaedics and rehabilitation (#26), cancer (#36), nephrology (#42), and neurology and neurosurgery (#44).
- The UI Writers' Workshop is world-renowned and frequently recognized as #1 in the nation. The university's many other writing programs also are recognized for excellence, and have helped shape SUI's reputation as "the writing university"—which in turn helped to cement Iowa City's designation, in 2008, as the world's third UNESCO City of Literature.
- Through its Cluster Hire Initiative, SUI is building exceptional multidisciplinary strength in six areas that address "grand challenges" of the 21st century: water sustainability, the aging mind and brain, obesity, genetics, public digital humanities, and public digital arts.

◆ **Student Success**

- One-year retention and four- and six-year graduation rates remain close to record levels.
 - The record for one-year retention was 86.0% for the entering class of 2009. The retention rates for the classes of 2010 and 2011 were 85.6% and 85.5%, respectively.

- The six-year graduation rate for the entering class of 2005 was a record 70.8%. The six-year graduation rates for the entering classes of 2004 and 2006 were also above 70.0%.
- For 76 doctoral programs over 10 years (entering 2001-2005, completed 2007-2011):
 - Composite median time to degree decreased to 5.3 years;
 - Composite degree completion improved to 57%;
 - Doctoral initial placement was 20% tenure-track academic, 50% non-tenure track academic, 19% nonacademic, and 11% unknown.
- Every first-year student will live in a living-learning community beginning in 2013.
- First-year resident undergraduate enrollment is up 2.3% from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012.

◆ **Contributions to Iowa Leadership**

- SUI has educated
 - 79% of Iowa's dentists
 - 50% of Iowa's physicians
 - 48% of Iowa's pharmacists
 - Teachers and administrators in all of Iowa's K-12 school districts
- FY 2013 was the fifth year in a row that SUI researchers brought more than \$400 million in external research funding to the university and state.
- SUI is co-leading the Southeast Regional STEM hub, with Kirkwood Community College.
- SUI has established degree completion programs with all 15 Iowa community colleges.
- The Iowa Flood Information System has improved floodplain maps in 88 of Iowa's 99 counties.
- SUI's College of Nursing led the statewide Future of Nursing Action Coalition and coordinated multiple task forces working on implementation of recommendations in the IOM report *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health*.
- The Iowa Initiative for Sustainable Communities (IISC) has partnered with several Iowa towns and cities to address a variety of economic, environmental, and social-cultural issues, and thereby to build a more sustainable future for those communities. A two-year partnership with the city of Dubuque culminated at the end of the Spring 2013 semester. In 2013-14, the IISC will partner with the cities of Muscatine, Cedar Rapids, Cedar Falls, and Washington.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

◆ Institutional Recognition

- ISU is designated a Carnegie Foundation Doctoral/Research Extensive university, a classification reserved for universities with comprehensive degree programs and a strong commitment to graduate education and research.
- ISU is a member of the Association of American Universities, an association of 60 of the leading public and private research universities in the United States and two of their counterparts in Canada.
- Rankings of the university and its programs indicate the university's stature as a land-grant research university among its national peers. The latest *U.S. News & World Report* (2013 Edition) ranked Iowa State 46th among public national universities-doctoral. The ISU College of Engineering was ranked 39th among all ABET-accredited programs nationally and 22nd among public universities. ISU also received national recognition for its learning community program.

◆ Selected Academic Strengths

- ISU has several nationally ranked programs (by *U.S. News & World Report*, 2013):
 - Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering – 3rd nationally;
 - Aerospace Engineering - 17th among publics
 - 29th in Chemical Engineering - 17th among publics
 - 31st in Materials Engineering - 21st among publics
 - 31st in Industrial/Manufacturing/Systems Engineering - 24th among publics
 - 32nd in Civil Engineering - 20th among publics
 - 36th in Electrical/Electronic/Communications Engineering - 21st among publics
 - 41st in Computer Engineering - 25th among publics
 - 44th in Mechanical Engineering - 24th among publics
- The following were ranked by their respective professional associations and publications:
 - Undergraduate architecture program ranked 9th nationally among accredited undergraduate architecture programs in the U.S., and first in the Midwest.
 - ISU graduate architecture program ranked 18th nationally.
 - ISU landscape architecture program ranked among the top 11 in the nation.
 - Based on internationally prominent research programs, other strengths at ISU include biorenewables and the bioeconomy, and in the broader biological sciences, information sciences, nanosciences, social sciences (as they apply to understanding rural America), and excellent scholarship in the arts and humanities.

- ISU continues to build exceptional academic programs at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels. Many undergraduate programs contain components of research experiences for undergraduates, a distinguishing feature of the research university.

◆ **Student Success**

- ISU educates more Iowans than any other college or university.
- The majority of ISU students (65.2%) were in the top quarter of their high school graduating class. When asked for their reasons for attending Iowa State, 74% indicated that it is the good academic reputation of the university. One of the questions in the latest National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) asks students to evaluate their entire educational experience at the institution. At ISU, 90% of the first-year students and 86% of the seniors rated their experience as good or excellent. When asked how often they had been challenged to do their very best at ISU, 95% of first-year students and 92% of seniors had a response of some or most of the time. Further, 91% of the first-year students and 85% of the seniors indicated that if they could start over again, they would probably or definitely still attend ISU.
- The six-year graduation rate is a good measure of student success. That rate at ISU stands at 70.3%, more than four percentage points higher than four years ago. The one-year retention rate for ISU first-time freshmen is 85.8%, up from 83.5% five years ago. ISU also had the highest graduation rate for student-athletes (65%) in the Big 12 in 2011-2012.

◆ **Contributions to Iowa Leadership**

- ISU faculty are increasingly influential in the development of economic activity in the state. A current example of that influence is the role that ISU faculty and staff play in the state in the development of the bioeconomy and its potential impact on Iowa.
- As a land-grant institution, ISU has a well-known and effective Extension and Outreach program. Each year, nearly a million people benefit directly from ISU Extension and Outreach educational programs. The Center for Industrial Research and Service (CIRAS) worked with 1,600 Iowa companies last year, adding or saving 5,600 jobs, and generating \$389 million of total economic impact. More than 94,000 youth participate in 4-H programs which equates to one in five Iowa school-age youth.
- The amount of sponsored funding is another measure of faculty success in discovery. The amount stands at \$326 million for fiscal year 2013.
- Finally, the success of the university in the 21st century will be measured by the prominence of our faculty and graduates in emerging disciplines such as the biorenewables and bioeconomy, and food safety and security. As evidenced by the current research and scholarship in these critically important areas, ISU faculty are already advancing the university as a leader in the state, nation and the world.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

◆ Institutional Recognition

- *U.S. News and World Report* continues to rank the University of Northern Iowa 2nd among Midwest regional public universities.
- *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* ranked the University of Northern Iowa among the "100 Best Values in Public Colleges" for 2013.
- UNI was recognized by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as a "Top Producer" of U.S. Fulbright scholars.
- UNI was named a "Military-Friendly University" by Military Advanced Education, and named a "G.I. Friendly School" for the third straight year by Victory Media.
- UNI's Study Abroad Capstone program in Southern Italy was named a Top Short-Term Program by Abroad101.
- UNI is recognized as one of the most environmentally responsible colleges in North America by *The Princeton Review*. UNI has a gold sustainability rating from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education.
- The University of Northern Iowa was fully reaccredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association following the site visit in Fall 2010. UNI is also nearing the completion of its participation in the HLC's Assessment Academy.

◆ Selected Academic Strengths

- UNI's College of Education has a 98% placement rate; graduate programs in the College of Education rank among the best in the nation according to *U.S. News and World Report*.
- UNI's College of Business Administration has the highest accreditation, from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, which is a distinction earned by fewer than 5% of business schools in the world. The pass rate on the CPA exam for UNI Accounting students is more than 5 times higher than the national average.
- UNI's Physics Teacher Education program was cited as one of 11 outstanding programs in the nation in a national report by the American Physical Society.
- Students in UNI's Counseling program continue to have a 100% pass rate for both the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive exam and the National Counselor Exam. The Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program was the first accredited program in the nation.

◆ Student Success

- The four-year graduation rate in 2012 increased one percentage point to 37.8%, which is more than double the national rate for public comprehensive universities; UNI's six-year graduation rate was 66.3%, compared to 50% for peer institutions.
- The first-year retention rate for minority students increased to 84.3%, and the time-to-degree for all students dropped to 4.47 years, the lowest rate recorded.

- UNI's academic clubs are consistently ranked at the top in the country; the Marketing Fraternity has been named top in the nation three of the past five years, and UNI's Chemistry students received the Outstanding Chapter Award by the American Chemical Society.
- Every first-year student will be enrolled in either the Cornerstone first-year seminar or a first-year only section of a course in the Liberal Arts Core; all of these offer access to peer mentors.
- ALEKS mathematics proficiency exams were administered to all new students; the pass rate for new students in Calculus I increased significantly.

◆ **Contributions to Iowa Leadership**

- Approximately 25% of all teachers in Iowa have a degree from UNI, and 33% of Iowa's superintendents and principals are UNI graduates.
- UNI is on the President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll again, for the fifth straight time.
- UNI houses the Northeast Iowa STEM Hub.
- UNI's Admissions Partnership Program with all 15 community colleges helps ensure students can transfer seamlessly into any degree program at UNI.
- UNI's Economic Development Outreach extends to all 99 Iowa counties, and aids more than 200 start-up businesses.
- UNI's Center for Social and Behavioral Research has conducted over 680 funded research studies in the areas of public health, crime/safety, environment, education, and housing. Most are designed to assist public agencies in the state to assess the impact of public programs and policies.
- The Iowa Waste Reduction Center (IWRC) at UNI offers free technical assistance to small businesses in the state to help them maintain regulatory compliance and reduce material waste. The IWRC also recently started a food waste reduction project, which provides resources to citizens across the state to help them divert food waste from Iowa landfills.

Appendix: Selected Faculty Profiles

The faculty profiles included on pages 23-31 describe the commitment of faculty members at the Regent universities to the missions of teaching, research, and service.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Kathleen Stewart, Ph.D.
Bringing data to life to solve real-world problems

Historically, flood prediction has been as much art as science. Weather forecasts, soil saturation reports, topographic data, and historical information had to be read like so many tea leaves to forge an idea of when rivers would flood and how they might impact surrounding communities.

Iowa's flood of 2008, which was especially devastating to the University of Iowa campus when the Iowa River flooded, made it clear a better prediction system was needed. Kathleen Stewart, an associate professor of Geographical and Sustainability Sciences, rose to the challenge.

Professor Stewart worked with a team of her graduate students and members of the Iowa Flood Center to create a real-time Web-based flood prediction tool for the UI campus called HawkEVAC that helps campus leaders determine when and in what order to evacuate buildings. HawkEVAC proved indispensable last spring, when the Iowa River again breached its banks.



Professor Stewart's specialty is geographic information science, which examines the use of digital geographic data. In addition to developing flood-modeling systems, she's developing methods to extract useful location-based data from news Web sites and social media feeds to give a glimpse into the evolution of different events including natural disasters and severe weather.

"The opportunities for collaboration at the University of Iowa have been great," she says. "I really appreciate being able to work with so many talented members of the university community on a range of projects where geographic information gets to play an important role."

Colleague Marc Armstrong, UI Professor of Geography, said Professor Stewart's reputation reaches far beyond the United States. "Kathleen is internationally recognized for her work in modeling objects and people in space-time. Her work is theoretically grounded and informs the latest generations of mapping technologies as they transition from conventional, static views to dynamic representations."

About Professor Stewart: Professor Stewart grew up in Ottawa, Canada, and completed a Bachelor of Arts in Geography at McMaster University, a Master of Science in Geography at the University of British Columbia, and a Ph.D. in Spatial Information Science and Engineering at the University of Maine's National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis. She is the Director of Graduate Studies for the Department of Geographical and Sustainability Sciences and is an associate editor of the journal *Computers, Environment, and Urban Systems*.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

William Hedgcock, Ph.D. Exploring the science of decision-making and self-control

People who get frustrated are said to “lose their cool.” It’s just an expression, but there’s also some truth to it. Brain scans by neuroscientist and marketing expert William Hedgcock, Ph.D., assistant professor of marketing in the Tippie College of Business, suggest that people actually have a limited supply of patience and self-control; once it’s depleted, a person has a harder time staying calm when faced with a tough situation.

Professor Hedgcock is at the forefront of the emerging field of “neuromarketing,” and his work has implications not just for mental health, but for the marketplace, which tries to predict consumers’ decision-making behavior so it has more success selling products and services. He also examines the physiological and neural reasons for cognitive decline in senior citizens, which can make them susceptible to scams and bad financial decisions.

He says the University of Iowa provides rich opportunities for work and collaboration across disciplines. “Professionally, the university has a long history of collaborative decision neuroscience research between the marketing and neuroscience departments and many people here do research with seniors.”

Kameko Halfman, a Ph.D. student and advisee of Professor Hedgcock’s in the Neuroscience Graduate Program, says she has worked with him on a range of research projects related to decision-making and the elderly. “Not only is he able to provide guidance, but he is clearly enthusiastic about his research and a fun person to work with on projects. He makes the research exciting and, coming from his background in marketing, he definitely provides a unique perspective for a student like me who comes from a psychology/neuroscience background.”

About Professor Hedgcock: Born and reared in Waukesha, WI, Professor Hedgcock moved to the Twin Cities to earn a Ph.D. in business from the University of Minnesota’s Carlson School of Management, after earning Bachelor of Arts degrees in economics and psychology from Macalester College. Hedgcock and his wife, Megan Marquardt, a special education teacher at Northwest Junior High in Coralville, have a 2-year-old daughter and are expecting a boy in September. In their free time, the couple indulges in turtle sundaes at Whitey’s in downtown Iowa City and, to burn off the calories, participates in sprint triathlons and half marathons.



UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Rachel Miller, MD Helping make transplant surgery safer for everyone

Dr. Rachel Miller grew up near Hospers, Iowa, the daughter of a farmer and an elementary school teacher. From an early age she had an interest in medicine but never envisioned a career as a physician, let alone as someone working in the complex field of organ transplantation and infectious diseases.

Today, Dr. Miller does just that as a clinical professor in the Carver College of Medicine Department of Internal Medicine's Division of Infectious Diseases. She is the primary infectious diseases consultant for solid organ transplant candidates and recipients and is actively involved in evaluating and treating pre- and post-transplant infections at the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics. She also works closely with the hospital's transplant teams to develop methods for improving pre-transplant screening and infection prevention.

She states, "My personal background fosters my deep connection to the UI Hospitals and Clinics patient population, particularly those from rural areas of the state. Helping these patients through the journey of organ transplantation and other complex illnesses has been one of the greatest rewards of my career."

Dr. Miller's work has garnered considerable recognition over the years: a Teacher of the Year Award in 1993, inclusion among the *U.S. News & World Report* Top Doctors in 2012 and Best Doctors in America since 2007, and two UI Hospital Above & Beyond the Call of Duty Awards: one in 2001 and one in 2005.

Peter Densen, M.D., Executive Dean Emeritus of CCOM and Professor of Medicine in the Division of Infectious Diseases, was one of Dr. Miller's early professors in medical school at Iowa and has followed her rapid progress through the academic ranks. "I can state unequivocally that Dr. Miller is one of UI Hospitals and Clinics' most accomplished and respected clinicians, garnering internal and national recognition for her teaching and patient care. Her approach and dedication to patient care has had a lasting impact on hospital programs."

About Dr. Miller: Dr. Miller earned her Bachelor of Science Degree from South Dakota State University in Brookings, S.D., and her Doctor of Medicine degree from the University of Iowa. She's had several publications in peer-reviewed journals, most recently in the journal, *Transplant Infectious Diseases*, as lead author of "Communication gaps for solid organ transplant transmitted infections among infectious disease physicians; an Emerging Infections Network survey," and as co-author of "A multicenter study of histoplasmosis and blastomycosis after solid organ transplantation." She and her husband, Dr. Francis Miller, a professor of internal medicine specializing in cardiology at the UI Hospitals and Clinics, have three children.



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Jodi Sterle, Ph.D.

Jodi Sterle, Ph.D., Eldred and Donna Harman Endowed Professor in Teaching and Learning, is making the rapidly expanding undergraduate program in animal science, literally, come to life.

Sterle, an associate professor in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences' Department of Animal Science, and coordinator of its undergraduate program, teaches introductory classes designed to spur undergraduate students' interest in the discipline. She also designed a popular new course, *The Art and Heritage of Livestock*, which explores how animals have influenced the development of culture throughout the world.

Her commitment to undergraduate education has not gone unnoticed. Sterle has received numerous teaching awards during her career, as well as honors related to industry outreach, student counseling, and extension. She was named a Wakonse Fellow in 2012, representing ISU at the Conference on College Teaching.



Sterle is also active with her students outside the classroom, serving as a faculty adviser to ISU's Block and Bridle Club, one of the largest student groups on campus (the club's 2013-2014 officers are shown in the photo above). She also serves as adviser to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences Student Council, the upcoming Bacon Expo, and is active in the peer mentor program.

Sterle's service includes numerous positions both inside and outside ISU. She is active in departmental and college committees, including the Academic Affairs, and Transfer and Articulation committees. Sterle participates in numerous Extension and Outreach programs through the Iowa Pork Industry Center. She has held several leadership positions with the National Pork Board, and is a sought-after media source on the subjects of pork production.

She states, "I am extremely excited to be part of a program that is dedicated to the advancement of both agriculture and our students' role in improving the quality of life of Iowans and around the world. Our students bring energy, enthusiasm, and new ideas together to create innovative scientific solutions to complex problems. Their diverse backgrounds and sound scientific education will help us meet the demands of a growing society."

Sterle earned her Bachelor of Science in animal science from Michigan State University in 1993, and master's and doctorate degrees in swine reproductive management from the University of Missouri in 1998. She began her career at Texas A&M University before joining ISU in 2011.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Scott Grawe, Ph.D.

Scott Grawe, Ph.D., engages his students both inside and outside the classroom. *Way* outside the classroom.

Grawe, assistant professor of supply chain management and information systems in the College of Business, recently organized a 10-day live case study so students could see Target's entire supply chain.



The trip began with a visit to a Target store and distribution center in Cedar Falls, and ended at a factory in China that supplies many of Target's products. Grawe and his students also visited ports in California and China to see how the products were loaded and unloaded from large container ships.

Grawe managed supply chains in both manufacturing and retailing before beginning his academic career, and wanted his students to gain the same valuable experience and perspective. He states, "As consumers, we don't often think about *how* the products we use every day get to the store shelves. But as business professionals, we need to understand each link in that supply chain, so we can make the process as reliable and cost-effective as possible. There are very few *seasoned* supply chain professionals who have seen their supply chains from this perspective. These students are certainly getting a head start in their careers."

Students appreciate his perspective as well. Grawe teaches several classes at ISU, including International Logistics, Demand Planning and Management, Supply Chain Management, and the international live case study.

"He does a great job of engaging the class and relating things to real life experiences," wrote one former student. "He keeps class interesting by having guest speakers and projects that are extremely hands on.

Grawe is also an excellent researcher, examining logistics innovation, inter-organizational relationships, performance measurement, and integration. He continues to leverage his time in industry, building relationships to ensure his research addresses challenges organizations are currently facing.

Grawe's work has been published in numerous leading supply chain, logistics, and transportation journals. He also serves on the editorial review board for the *Journal of Business Logistics*, the editorial advisory board for the *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, and is a member of the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals.

Grawe earned a bachelor's degree in finance from ISU in 1998, an MBA in supply chain management from the University of Minnesota in 2005, and a doctorate in supply chain management from the University of Oklahoma in 2010.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Jonathan Webb, Ph.D.

Jonathan Webb, Ph.D., a professional interpreter since the age of 17, understands the “mental somersaults” involved in interpreting and translating sounds into signs and vice versa.

Webb, a lecturer in the Department of World Languages and Cultures, began teaching ISU’s first ASL course in 2012.

Webb’s research interests include language acquisition of deaf children born to hearing parents, cross-cultural interpretations, and translating auditory-based into visual-based spiritual practices.

“I am particularly interested in how infants who are deaf acquire language,” he notes.

Webb spends 60 percent of his time on teaching and program development, and the remainder providing interpreting services through Student Disability Resources. He also serves as adviser to ISU’s new ASL Club, and is a frequent advocate for the Deaf community.

As a faculty member, Webb especially enjoys mentoring students.

“I have found mentoring to be an enjoyable experience,” he says, “whether the individual is looking to hone language skills or is preparing for national certification.”

Webb works with students not only on the basics of ASL, but also helps them understand the cultural differences in communicating with deaf family, friends, or classmates. His biggest advice is simply to be patient.

“Using audible communication, we can communicate very quickly, even when we can’t physically see the person we’re communicating with,” he notes. “Communicating with deaf individuals requires that we be truly present in the moment, and engage them face-to-face.”

Webb earned an associate’s degree in Deaf Communications from St. Louis Community College, a bachelor’s degree in liberal arts from Utah State University in 2001, a master’s in deaf education-early childhood intervention from Utah State in 2002, and a doctorate in metaphysics from the American Institute of Holistic Theology in 2010. He joined ISU in 2012 after serving in both tenure-track and adjunct positions in interpreter programs.



Photo: Megan Wolff/Iowa State Daily

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Susan Etscheidt

Susan Etscheidt is a professor in the Department of Special Education at the University of Northern Iowa. She teaches courses in the area of behavioral supports, educational management, and special education law and policy. Her research interests include legal and policy analyses with qualitative content analysis methodology. In addition to her involvement in the teacher and leadership preparation programs at UNI, Dr. Etscheidt has served as an administrative law judge for special education appeals in Iowa since 1991.

Dr. Etscheidt received her Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota, and has presented papers at invited international, national, regional, and state conferences. She serves on the editorial boards for several journals, including *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities* and the *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*. She serves as a policy consultant for school districts, and offers seminars for teachers, administrators, and support staff.



She has published several books, including her latest *Special Education Law & Practice in Public Schools*, with Prentice Hall. Other books include *Successful Inclusion for Educational Leaders*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall, and *Inclusion: Are we abandoning or helping students?* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. She has also published book chapters and numerous journal articles. Her recent publications reflect her research genre, disability policy issues, and include "Truly disabled?: An analysis of LD eligibility issues under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*; Parental refusal to consent for evaluation: A legal analysis with implications for school psychologists; Promoting reflection in teacher preparation programs: A multi-level model. *Teacher Education and Special Education*; A complacency with access and the aggregate? Affirming an Individual Determination of Educational Benefit Under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*; Peer-reviewed research and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs): An examination of intent and impact. *Exceptionality*, Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEA 2004]: The peer-reviewed research requirement. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 21(1), 29-39.

Dr. Etscheidt is a recipient of the Board of Regents State of Iowa Award for Faculty Excellence, and was also the recipient of the Winterstein Memorial Award for Meritorious Achievement in the Field of Special Education, presented by the Iowa Council for Exceptional Children. She has also received awards for teaching (University of Northern Iowa College of Education Excellence in Teaching Award; University of Northern Iowa Outstanding Graduate Faculty Teaching Award) and service (Outstanding Service to Behavioral Disorders Award, Iowa Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders).

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Elizabeth Sutton

Dr. Elizabeth Sutton is assistant professor of Art History at the University of Northern Iowa. She specializes in Early Modern European art and African art. In addition to research on Dutch visual culture of the Atlantic world, her research interests include student engagement in art history. Dr. Sutton's case studies in art history pedagogy have been published in *FATE in Review* and *TRENDS: Journal of the Texas Art Education Association*.



She began teaching at UNI as a visiting professor in 2009, and was hired as assistant professor of art history in 2010. Sutton feels UNI is a good fit because she is able to balance teaching undergraduates and serious research. Her students have collaborated with UNI WADE (West African Drum Ensemble). Other advanced students of hers have written didactics for objects from the UNI Permanent Collection, helping them expand their writing skills in a practical assignment that showcases them as the top-notch students they are, and that raises the visibility of UNI's art collection and gallery. Two of Dr. Sutton's students presented art history research papers at the regional Midwest Undergraduate Conference for the Humanities (MUCH), and another will be presenting a paper at the national Southeastern College Art Conference in Greensboro, North Carolina, in October 2013. Her art history students have done internships and gotten jobs at local and regional arts organizations, including the Grout Museum in Waterloo, the Cedar Falls Historical Society, the Cedar Falls Hearst Center for the Arts, Vesterheim Museum in Decorah, Iowa, and the Waterloo Center for the Arts, as well as at the Cedar Rapids Museum of Art.

Dr. Sutton has earned a pre-tenure fellowship from the Provost's office, as well as two summer research fellowships from the graduate college since she has been at UNI. Two of these fellowships from 2011 helped her complete her first book, *Early Modern Dutch Prints of Africa*. In the summer of 2012 she had externally-funded fellowships to pursue research in special collections at the University of Minnesota James Ford Bell Library (the Reese Fellowship) and New York State Library in Albany, New York (the Quinn Fellowship). This research is for her next book project on Dutch trading company maps. She has used another summer fellowship awarded from the graduate college in 2013 to write three book chapters this summer, and she recently submitted a book proposal to the University of Chicago Press. Dr. Sutton has also been invited to discuss her current research at the New Netherland Symposium this October.

University of Northern Iowa

Nick Roos

Nick Roos is an adjunct instructor at the University of Northern Iowa. He is in his sixth year teaching in the Department of Languages and Literatures, and is an alumnus of UNI. In his first semester at UNI, he started writing for the Northern Iowan and working as a tutor in the writing center. Both experiences shaped the course of his life, but he has never loved anything the way he loves teaching—a passion that has played a leading role in the successes he's enjoyed across 25 sections of College Writing and Research, four sections of Introduction to Literature, two sections of Beginning Fiction Writing, two sections of Cornerstone, and one section of Writing Enhanced Introduction to Literature.



When teaching, Nick focuses on synthesizing the strengths of professors he had during his time as a student at UNI, modeling himself after their best lessons and seeking to incite thought and stoke discussion rather than disseminate information. He constantly seeks student ownership and feedback to help shape both present and future courses. For example, his students create the rubrics for their essays and speeches anew each time via individual drafting. This leads to committee drafting, which leads to public referendum, and after all opinions have been stated and votes tallied, ratification of the agreed-upon rubric. Nobody in the room leaves confused about how the course will proceed. Nick believes that real learning is an experiential phenomenon, so his day-to-day focus is on creating lesson plans that will be absorbing and challenging to his students, while his semester-by-semester focus is outlining a grand, inviting arc toward big thinking and better writing that he can point to and use as a guide for the class throughout the year.

Nick recently modeled this experiential learning approach for the faculty teaching Cornerstone, UNI's first-year seminar. To do so, he created and led a professional development seminar on teaching close reading and critical thinking during a summer workshop. He built upon ideas learned from other UNI faculty, synthesizing his own ideas about how students read with approaches used by others to demonstrate how we can help students prepare to write more effectively. Nick has served on the assessment committee for Cornerstone, and has evaluated writing assignments across all 21 sections of the course. He argues that if we can teach reading so that the focus remains on thinking and connecting multiple thread of information to create meaning, our students will improve even the resting rhythms of their minds.