Criterion Two: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Overview

The University of Iowa has a strong resource base, a good strategic plan, and formal structures in place to tie the two to each other at all levels of the University. University leaders, aware of the need to plan for uncertainty regarding future revenues, have put budgeting models and processes into place that allow decision makers to make wise choices that will protect the University’s strengths and advance strategic priorities.

Through annual strategic planning progress reports, a regular cycle of program review, individual faculty reviews and promotion and tenure decisions, and in other ways, the University maintains an ongoing process of assessment. Each review provides an opportunity to determine whether actions continue to align with priorities.

Core Component 2a: The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.
Planning for Expected and Unexpected Change

As have public universities in most other states, in recent years The University of Iowa has dealt with diminishing growth in state support. According to the Grapevine project (an annual compilation of data on state tax support for higher education), state tax fund appropriations for higher education operating expenses in Iowa increased 13.0% from FY 1997 to FY 2007. Only one state (Colorado) experienced a lower rate of growth over that time. Only eight states experienced a lower rate of growth over the five-year period from FY 2002 to FY 2007.

At the time of the University’s last accreditation in 1997, state appropriations accounted for more than 60.0% of the University’s total General Education Fund budget. That percentage fell below 60.0% for the first time in FY 2002, and continued to fall to 45.5%—less than the percentage accounted for by tuition and fees (46.3%)—by FY 2007. In FY 2008, the downward slide has finally reversed; state appropriations will account for 46.7% of the General Education Fund Budget, and tuition and fees for 45.6%.

Figure I-3: General Education Fund Revenues from Tuition and from State Appropriations, FY 1970 to FY 2008

University decision makers must choose among worthwhile alternatives when investing the resources entrusted to us by our students and by the people of Iowa. It is crucial that we invest in areas that will advance our strategic priorities, preserve our strengths, and bolster emerging areas of distinction. As stated in the Planning Assumptions section of The Iowa Promise, therefore, the plan:

... does not capture all that the University wants to do; it is meant, instead, as a starting point, given our knowledge of the current environment, from which to focus the University’s efforts and make effective use of its resources. While a growing resource base will hasten progress toward a larger breadth of strategic goals, University leaders are committed to improving performance in strategic areas regardless of changes in the resource base.
The Iowa Promise and University leaders also recognize that many other environmental changes will affect the University, our students, and other constituencies, and how we perform the diverse aspects of our mission. The Planning Assumptions address expectations for other critical resources besides budget, including the clinical enterprise, administrative efficiencies, the student body, space, and technology.

Colleges and other units also monitor trends that affect their disciplines, plan for contingencies, and set expectations for the size and characteristics of their enrollments. Many academic units collect information about trends in their fields through participation in professional organizations, and some colleges and departments have advisory boards of professionals in the community who help perform that function. The Tippie College of Business, for example, has a Board of Visitors, composed of business leaders from around the country, that meets twice a year to advise the College on matters of strategic direction. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean’s Advisory Board, made up of College alumni, meets annually with the dean and other College administrators. Such boards also advise academic units on curriculum matters, a function described in greater detail in the special emphasis section of this self-study.

Peer Benchmarking

One important way that the University monitors its environment is through peer benchmarking. As mentioned in the general overview of the University, we are a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Big Ten athletic conference, and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). Because the members of the Big Ten and CIC differ from one another in a variety of ways—for example, some campuses have large health sciences centers, and others do not—we also use an “official UI peer group” that includes comparable campuses from various geographical regions of the country. The official UI peer group for benchmarking purposes includes:

- University of Arizona, Tucson
- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Indiana University, Bloomington
- University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
- University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- The Ohio State University, Main Campus
- University of Texas at Austin
- University of Wisconsin, Madison

Figures 1-4 and 1-5 illustrate that Iowa is the smallest institution among this group in terms of faculty size, and the second smallest in terms of enrollment.
In many reports, at the request of the Board of Regents, UI provides comparison benchmarking data for a 14-member "Regent comparison group" that includes all 10 of the Big Ten public universities plus the 4 non-Big Ten universities that are part of the official UI peer group (Arizona, UCLA, North Carolina, and Texas).

Enrollment Management

Among the “major strategic emphases” identified in the budget development process for FY 2008, the first is to manage enrollments in ways that support the strategic planning goals related to undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, diversity, and vitality. The University will seek to increase the enrollment of nonresident, well-prepared students; adjust residence hall capacity to meet demand; and provide additional budget support to colleges with enrollment growth.

As noted above, the University has undertaken its planning and actions related to diversity in the awareness that growing diversity among the general population and the continuing trend toward globalization will affect how our students live and work. Iowa’s population is becoming more diverse, though not as quickly as in many other states. The state’s population is aging, as well; the traditional college-age population (18–24 year olds) is expected to decline by 14.5 percent from 2000 to 2020.
Our efforts to recruit and retain a diverse, well-prepared student body are described in detail in the special emphasis section of this self-study. In general, as we strive to increase diversity and to maintain enrollments at current levels (and maintain revenues), we expect we will need to look more and more to sources of prospective students from out of state and to nontraditional students.

Also described later are the activities of a group of representatives from the Office of the Provost, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), the Office of Admissions, Orientation Services, the Office of the Registrar, and the Academic Advising Center, who monitor application and admission activity beginning in March and continuing through the summer in order to identify courses that may run out of space for new students. Several years ago the Office of the Provost worked with CLAS to establish and implement a mechanism to fund the hiring of additional instructors in departments facing such a shortfall. If the number of new first-year students exceeds an established threshold, the Office of the Provost provides adequate resources to ensure full availability of course seats for new students.

Other University-Wide Planning Efforts

Campus Master Plan

In 2006 the University completed its Campus Master Plan, The Campus, the Buildings, and the Space Between. The plan adheres to a set of “guiding principles” meant to ensure a long-range perspective in the process of decision-making, and to encourage planners to think about the campus as a whole. The guiding principles are:

- Establish a unifying framework for the campus as a whole.
- Support the University’s educational mission.
- Demonstrate stewardship of buildings and land.
- Preserve and enhance the unique identity of the campus.
- Promote a pedestrian-oriented campus.
- Enhance the quality of the visual environment.

“Today’s challenge,” the plan states, “is to plan for continued growth while securing and enhancing existing character defining features of the campus.” The plan builds on and reaffirms the central concepts of previous plans, such as the “pedestrian-oriented campus.” However, as the plan notes,

- It does so . . . in a changing context of increasing urbanization and a growing awareness of the constraints imposed by the University's limited land resources. The need to use land wisely, care for and renew existing facilities, and manage physical growth will be critical planning endeavors if the University is to sustain the unique identity and integrity of its physical setting through the 21st century.

It is important to note that one of the guiding principles is support of the University’s educational mission, and that in preparing the plan Facilities Management staff met with University, college, and other unit leaders to ensure their understanding of academic needs related to space. The 2006 Campus Master Plan is the first in UI history to forecast growth by taking into account the academic needs of the colleges.
In 2007 the University prepared and distributed the first annual update to the Campus Master Plan. The update highlights completed construction, site selection for future development, and the beginning phases of new building design.

Energy Conservation and Management Strategic Plan

In February 2007, Facilities Management completed an integrated energy plan for offsetting rising energy costs. The plan focuses on increased efficiency and reductions in energy consumption per square foot. The plan sets objectives related to reliability, conservation, and sustainability, and outlines strategies for achieving those objectives. Facilities Management believes that executing the plan will have a significant positive impact by the end of 2013, including a 10% reduction in energy use per square foot and reliance on renewable resources for up to 15% of energy.

Critical Incident Management Planning

The University engages in campus-wide planning for critical incidents, or situations “that can cause deaths or significant injuries to faculty, staff, students, or the public; or that can shut down business, disrupt operations, cause physical or environmental damage; or that can threaten the institution’s financial standing or public image.” The University’s critical incident management plan is posted on the UI web site.

In 2006 the University focused on examining the University’s preparedness in the event of an influenza pandemic. A response plan was drafted and is also posted on the UI web site.

Campus IT Strategic Plan

In July 2007, the UI Information Technology Strategic Plan Planning Group completed the University’s first-ever Campus IT Strategic Plan. The plan is the result of a thorough and highly collaborative two-year process that started with a year of review and assessment and continued with a year of consultation and goal development. The Planning Group began with The Iowa Promise as their guide to the institution’s priorities. Then, to understand and assess the current status of IT on campus, the Planning Group engaged an external advisory group to complete an environmental scan; reviewed the final report of the 2005-06 Campus IT Review; solicited input on focused questions from targeted groups on campus; and sponsored faculty, staff, and student focus groups to gather perceptions about current and future challenges related to technology. The Group distributed multiple versions of the plan for comments as it developed.

The plan’s executive summary of the environmental scan highlights “trends with the potential to have the greatest influence” on policy implementation and use of IT at The University of Iowa, including:

The increased affordability of personal technologies, and the resulting higher expectations from students, faculty, and staff, as well as increased security issues

Increased public and regulatory attention on technology usage, and mounting pressure on institutions to be accountable for the security and reliability of their IT infrastructure

Emerging technologies such as e-learning, podcasting, virtualization and social networking web sites
Grant-funding agencies’ focus on increased collaboration between researchers, which will require easier electronic access to research data

The University also conducted a large-scale review of the state of electronic communications on campus, beginning in 2005. Implementation of the recommendations from that review, and from a mid-project self-study, continues. The goal is significant improvement in e-mail service for faculty, staff, and students.

Student Success Team

In fall 2006 the associate provost for undergraduate education and the director of the Office of Student Life created the Student Success Team, a large group of students, staff, and faculty with particular interest in undergraduate student success. In seeking to understand what keeps students persisting to their goals at The University of Iowa and what barriers they face, the group plans to identify action steps for creating conditions on campus that will contribute to greater student success.

The large group meets twice per semester and communicates via a listserv between meetings. A 10-member executive committee meets more frequently to set direction for the group. In summer 2007, the group held its first annual retreat, with the goal of generating a project list for the next 12 to 18 months. That list evolved into an action plan, and several committees have been formed to begin work on various initiatives, some of which are referenced in the “Initiatives for Progress” section at the end of the special emphasis section of this self-study.

Ad Hoc Task Forces

Both the Office of the President and the Office of the Provost occasionally commission task forces to investigate cross-cutting issues and make recommendations about how to address them. The Diversity Action Committee, mentioned earlier, was one such task force, and its work resulted in a series of specific recommendations that the University is implementing. The University also is taking action on the recommendations of a task force on gender equity. This task force, charged with taking a broad look at the status of UI faculty women, submitted its final report in spring 2006.

The Intercollegiate Task Force on the Organization of Research and Education in the Life Sciences is another example of a cross-cutting task force created to help the University respond to emerging environmental changes. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and other funding agencies have made clear their focus on facilitating cross-disciplinary research in the life sciences, what they call “team science,” and on the translation of research to clinical applications. In a competitive funding environment, we must find ways to position ourselves for success with regard to those priorities without compromising our institutional priorities, and without upsetting the critical balance between applied and basic sciences. The life sciences task force, completing its work in fall 2007, is examining ways the University can focus the knowledge and expertise of its many strong life sciences departments on cross-disciplinary projects. These efforts are intended to make the University more competitive for research funding and improve the overall quality of UI life sciences research and education.

These trends have also been taken into account in the budget development process, which has identified as another “major strategic emphasis” the need to manage the research enterprise in the face of declining federal NIH support. One component of this effort will be increasing the competitiveness of faculty and research facilities such as the
Iowa Institute for Biomedical Discovery and the new College of Public Health Building (see “Physical Resources,” below).

**Core Component 2b:** The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

**Sources of Revenue**

The University of Iowa’s budgeted revenues for FY 2008 total $2.4 billion, $533 million of which constitutes the General Education Fund (GEF), the centrally managed fund that supports the teaching, research, and service missions of the University. The University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics represent the largest single source of total budgeted revenues, at $712 million (29.2%).

GEF budgeted revenues come almost entirely from three sources: state appropriations ($258 million, or 46.7%); tuition and fees ($252 million, or 45.6%); and indirect cost recoveries or facilities and administrative (F&A) costs, which, when combined with the small amount of income from other sources, total $42 million or 7.7% in FY 2008.

In FY 2007 UI faculty, together with staff and students, set a new institutional record of $382 million in grants and contracts for research, education, and service. According to the most recent National Science Foundation (NSF) survey (2005), UI ranked 18th among public universities in federally financed expenditures for research and development. In the National Institutes of Health (NIH) 2005 report, UI ranked 13th in NIH awards among all public universities.

In 1999, the University of Iowa Foundation launched the Good. Better. Best. Iowa! campaign. More than 128,000 individuals and organizations contributed more than $1.05 billion over the course of the campaign. These funds provided for more than 500 new student scholarships and more than 150 new chairs, professorships, fellowships, and deanships; 13 new and renovated campus buildings; and more than 120 new research funds.
As of September 30, 2007 the market value of the combined University of Iowa and University of Iowa Foundation (UIF) endowment stood at $994,104,491. As the smallest public institution in the Big Ten, UI has the smallest endowment of the Big Ten universities. However, according to an FY 2006 survey by the Council for Aid to Education, the combined UI/UIF endowment ranks fourth among public institutions in terms of endowment-per-student.

Undergraduate resident tuition and fees for 2007-08 total $6,293, the lowest in the Big Ten and third from the bottom among the members of our official peer group.

Table I-5 compares tuition/fees and state appropriations revenues per student FTE at The University of Iowa and at peer institutions that also have colleges of medicine on their main campuses (because the rate of state support per student is significantly higher at schools with colleges of medicine than without). The comparison demonstrates that UI’s resources are just below the median of the peer group.

Table I-5:
Revenue Per Student FTE at The University of Iowa and Selected Peer Institutions, FY 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Student FTE*</th>
<th>Tuition and Fees**</th>
<th>State Appropriations</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>24,053</td>
<td>$195,882,460</td>
<td>$440,070,173</td>
<td>$635,952,633</td>
<td>$26,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles</td>
<td>34,834</td>
<td>$297,434,000</td>
<td>$582,727,000</td>
<td>$880,161,000</td>
<td>$25,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
<td>38,043</td>
<td>$590,656,000</td>
<td>$318,903,000</td>
<td>$909,559,000</td>
<td>$23,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>41,034</td>
<td>$413,416,472</td>
<td>$554,679,039</td>
<td>$968,095,511</td>
<td>$23,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>24,814</td>
<td>$203,039,000</td>
<td>$297,335,000</td>
<td>$500,374,000</td>
<td>$20,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University-Main Campus</td>
<td>46,064</td>
<td>$502,437,214</td>
<td>$419,081,848</td>
<td>$921,519,062</td>
<td>$20,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>32,863</td>
<td>$193,498,000</td>
<td>$378,622,000</td>
<td>$572,120,000</td>
<td>$17,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>37,858</td>
<td>$273,069,126</td>
<td>$359,015,771</td>
<td>$632,084,897</td>
<td>$16,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS) Finance and Enrollment Surveys
*FTE equals full-time plus 1/3 part-time student enrollment
**After discounts and allowances
The Budget Process and Strategic Priorities

The strategic plan of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, sets forth as one of the Board’s four priorities to “demonstrate public accountability and effective stewardship of resources.” A strategy associated with that priority is to “advocate for adequate support and optimize funding for Regent institutions from all sources for high-quality educational opportunities accessible to Iowans, research and scholarship, service activities, and economic development efforts.”

The University of Iowa manages its budget by pooling revenues and choosing how to direct resources toward strategic priorities. Each year, the University reviews institutional funding needs and submits a request for the following year to the Board of Regents. The University’s budget narrative to the Board ties the University’s budget priorities directly to goals and strategies in the strategic plan. The Board decides which requests, at what funding levels, will go forward to the state legislature.

Regent universities also submit proposals for tuition and fee increases each year. These proposals must include a “clear and concise explanation . . . for [the] proposed increase,” and must “describe how [the] proposed increase will assist the University in making progress on strategic goals and objectives.” The UI proposal for FY 2009, for example, indicates that incremental tuition revenue will be directed toward undergraduate student financial aid, faculty positions to maintain quality programs, and programs designed to improve first-year retention and four-year graduation rates—the latter including expansion of the University’s learning communities programs, expansion of peer-led supplemental instruction for some of UI’s most challenging courses, and development of an intervention program for at-risk students.

Allocation of General Education Funds

To follow the overarching principle in The Iowa Promise that limited resources must be directed strategically and differentially to support the most central and the most promising programs and initiatives, the University has implemented major changes to its management of GEF resources. Under the leadership of former Executive Vice President and Provost Michael J. Hogan, the University implemented a revised academic budgeting model that continues to support our highest academic priorities.

For example: the University’s “top budget priority,” according to The Iowa Promise, “is raising faculty salaries to be consistent with peers.” In FY 2006 the University reallocated $10.9 million, almost $9 million of which was directed toward improving salary competitiveness for faculty and staff. In FY 2007, about $5.5 million of the total $8.6 million reallocation went toward achieving competitive faculty salaries. With these reallocations, the University was able to provide two faculty salary increments (on July 1 and January 1), totaling more than 5% in each year. The University plans to do the same in FY 2008. Based on a preliminary look at salary data collected by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and estimated FY 2008 increments provided by the various institutions, these efforts will move the University from the bottom of the official UI peer group in a ranking of average faculty salaries in FY 2006 to eighth in FY 2008 (see Figure I-9).
In addition, over the last two years, the Office of the Provost has distributed a portion of the annual salary increment pool differentially among the colleges, based on the two key factors of competitiveness and contribution. In previous years, the salary increment pool was distributed equally to all colleges. The goal of this change is to help colleges that have fallen further behind in competitiveness of their faculty salaries, and to support units that work hard to contribute to the General Fund through tuition revenue and indirect cost returns.

The University is applying a similar model to the University’s “tuition set-aside,” a pool of funds created by setting aside a portion of all tuition revenue, which then goes back to students as financial aid. The University has increased the share of the set-aside directed to the group that generates most of it, and to the area where it has the greatest chance of further enhancing General Education Fund revenues: undergraduate students and undergraduate enrollment. Changes to the management of the Graduate College “block allocation” (a pool of funds to support graduate programs), to the distribution of student computer fee funds, and to the allotment of research space also demonstrate the University’s efforts to ensure that the allocation of resources reflects strategic priorities and rewards productivity and resourcefulness.

In FY 2006 the Office of the Provost created the Strategic Investment Fund, a central pool of resources reallocated from collegiate GEF budgets, which is entirely dedicated to advancing University-wide strategic initiatives. Colleges were required to reallocate 0.5% of their recurring GEF budgets to this new central pool—a total of $1.2 million, which was used to advance key strategies identified in The Iowa Promise, such as expanding the University of Iowa Honors Program, funding a first-year seminar program, increasing funding for FDOP, and supporting the January 1, 2006 faculty salary increase. In FY 2007, the Office of the Provost required colleges to reallocate 0.4% of their recurring GEF budgets to the Strategic Investment Fund, for a total of $1 million, which again contributed to the faculty salary increment and other strategic planning priorities including graduate student scholarships, faculty diversity, the Honors Program, and realigning the student computer fee distribution.

For the past several years, the vice president for research has reallocated to the colleges about 4.0% (approximately $1.58 M in FY 2008) of their GEF indirect cost recoveries, based on their sponsored research productivity. These funds are used for a variety of expenditures related to fostering research in the colleges, including the purchase of equipment, seed funding, and other research-related expenses. This has been a creative

---

**Figure I-9:**
Estimated 2007-08 Average Full-Time Instructional Faculty Salary at UI Peer Group Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>$118,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$107,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$106,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$104,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$101,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$99,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$96,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$93,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$93,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$91,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FY 2007 salary data from American Association of University Professors Faculty Compensation Survey; estimated FY 2008 increments provided by each institution*
way for the University to support the work of scholars in the arts and humanities and in some social sciences for whom large external grants are not available.

In FY 2004, Athletics received approximately $2.2 million in GEF support. The University leadership decided, as a major component of its GEF reallocation strategy, to substantially reduce or eliminate GEF support for Athletics. In FY 2005, GEF support for Athletics was reduced to $1.9 million. In FY 2006 it was reduced to about $900,000, and $800,000—the student aid set-aside derived from the Department of Athletics’ tuition scholarship payments—was designated as support for athletic scholarships. In FY 2007, the University reduced GEF support for Athletics by an additional $100,000, and in FY 2008 the remaining $800,000 of GEF support for Athletics will be eliminated. Athletics will continue to receive non-GEF support for central services costs such as utilities and maintenance. The reallocated GEF dollars will be used to support functions that enhance the teaching, research, and service missions of the University.

As called for by The Iowa Promise, University leaders have made thoughtful decisions about the effective allocation of limited resources in order to support the goals and strategies most central to the University’s mission.

Human Resources

The University’s employees are our most important resource. Our ability to serve our students and other constituents with excellence depends on recruiting and retaining a talented, diverse, and dedicated faculty and staff.

Table I-6 shows that as of November 2007 The University of Iowa employed 26,059 individuals, or 21,441 full-time equivalents (FTEs).

The University of Iowa faculty includes three Pulitzer Prize winners, four former clerks to U.S. Supreme Court justices, two National Medal of Science winners, and four Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigators. Numerous Iowa faculty have been elected to the nation’s most prestigious scholarly academies, including ten members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, one member of the National Academy of Engineering, four members of the National Academy of Sciences, and sixteen members of the Institute of Medicine. According to the Office of the Provost, 96.7% of UI tenured and tenure track faculty have a terminal degree. As mentioned above, faculty are highly research-productive, as evidenced in part by their having generated (along with staff and student researchers) $382 million in sponsored funding in FY 2007.

As described above, increasing the competitiveness of our faculty salaries has been our top budget priority, and we have made significant progress toward that goal—bringing average (nonclinical) faculty salaries up from the bottom of our peer group to about the median. We have also set a goal to increase clinical medicine faculty salaries to the 50th percentile in the American
Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC; currently they are in the 40th percentile),
and to annually monitor the competitiveness of professional and scientific (P&S) staff
salaries in relation to our peers (in 2006-07, average UI nonorganized P&S staff salaries
surpassed the Big Ten mean by 3.16%).

_The Iowa Promise_ includes a goal to increase graduate teaching assistant (TA) and
research assistant (RA) salaries to the top third of our peer group. In 2005-06, UI TA
salaries ranked 6th out of 11—up from 7th the year before. RA salaries remained at 7th.

Also among the indicators we use to track progress toward our strategic planning goals
are several related to the diversity of faculty and staff, as shown in Table I-7.

**Table I-7: Progress on Selected Faculty/Staff Diversity Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall of FY</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>Target*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minority tenured/tenure track faculty as a percentage of total tenured/tenure track faculty</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women tenured/tenure track faculty as a percentage of total tenured/tenure track faculty</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minority professional &amp; scientific (P&amp;S) staff as a percentage of total P&amp;S staff</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minorities in executive positions</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in executive positions</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Targets set during most recent strategic planning process, based on fall 2003 data

We have made significant gains with regard to increasing the diversity of the faculty,
even surpassing the target (set in 2005) of 16.0% racial/ethnic minority tenured/tenure
track faculty as a percentage of total tenured/tenure track faculty. We have also seen a
steady increase in the percentage of women tenure track faculty, and in the percentage
of women and racial/ethnic minorities holding executive positions. As mentioned above,
in 2007-08 the University is implementing a new Staff Diversity Opportunity Program
(SDOP) that applies best practices from the Faculty Diversity Opportunity Program
(FDOP) to the hiring of women and minorities into classifications in which they are
underrepresented.

In the University’s most recent annual governance report to the Board of Regents on
faculty resignations, we identified the following key strategies for retaining faculty:

- Improve faculty salaries.

- Increase attention to family and career issues—for example by reviewing the
  recommendations of the Gender Equity Task Force (mentioned above), which found
  that “family reasons” was the second most commonly cited reason why faculty
  members resigned (the most commonly cited reason was to take an employment
  opportunity at another educational institution).

- Improve retention of underrepresented and minority faculty, with initiatives such as
  continuing to bolster FDOP.
Further improve mentoring of junior faculty. A mentoring task force, appointed by the Office of the Provost in January 2006, submitted its final report in November 2007. Recommendations in the report include training for DEOs and other mentors; creation of a Mentoring Advisory Board in the Office of the Provost; establishing a requirement that each college prepare a mentoring plan that meets its individual needs; the development of methods for monitoring the outcomes of mentoring programs; and development of a centralized web site/clearinghouse to provide information and web links to a variety of University resources for both mentors and mentees.

The University offers a variety of professional development programs for faculty and staff, as described under Criterion 4, below. Human Resources’ career development web page provides access to resources including advising, reclassification assistance, and job seeking tools. In addition, the HR services and resources for faculty, staff, and departments page offers links to employee assistance (e.g., counseling, disability services, flexible work arrangements), family services (e.g., child care and elder care), the UI Wellness program (e.g., weight management, smoking cessation, wellness seminars), and a variety of other tools and resources to help the UI workforce fulfill personal and career development goals.

In 2006 Organizational Effectiveness offered a confidential survey, Working at IOWA, asking faculty and staff to report on their work environment at the University. Working at IOWA explores the concept of engagement and views the survey as an ongoing opportunity for improvement and action.

**Physical Resources**

The University of Iowa campus sits on 1,900 acres and comprises 131 major (10,000 gross square feet or more) buildings (268 buildings total). The University has 10 residence halls, with a capacity of 5,600.

From 1998 to 2007, about 2.9 million gross square feet (GSF) of new building space were added to the campus, including the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics. This reflects a growth rate averaging about 250,000 GSF per year—a rate that has remained steady since World War II, and that is similar to the average at the University’s peer institutions. Facilities growth at UI and at peer institutions is expected to slow over the next ten years.

As of the 2005 Campus Master Plan, about 535,000 GSF of new projects were in the planning phase, including the State Hygienic Laboratory ($37.7 million); the Campus Recreation and Wellness Center ($69.0 million), a new recreational facility to be located on the east side of campus; a new academic facility for the College of Public Health ($47.7 million); and a high density archival facility for the Libraries ($7.5 million).

Additional major capital projects now under way or about to begin include the Iowa Institute for Biomedical Discovery ($90 million), which will house laboratories conducting “high-risk, high-reward” research in areas such as cardiovascular disease, children’s health, and cancer, as well as the new Center for Regenerative Medicine; renovation of the Chemistry Building ($41.4 million); fire and safety improvements in Slater Hall ($3.2 million); renovation and landscaping of the Art Building ($14.7 million); and an addition to the Burge residence hall ($9 million).

A map of significant construction projects is available on the UI Facilities Management web site.
The Campus Master Plan asserts that

Perhaps the most beneficial concept to grow out of the . . . process of campus master planning is the idea of facilities stewardship—taking care of the buildings we already have. For the first time ever we have a clear picture of the current condition of every General Education building on campus.

Appendix 2 of the Campus Master Plan summarizes the current conditions of General Education Fund buildings and categorizes them according to immediacy of need for renovations.

The University’s strategic objective continues to be attaining annual financial support for facilities renewal equal to 1% of the replacement cost of all General Education Fund-supported buildings. Contributing to this goal are the General Education Fund Building renewal budget, operations and maintenance budget directed to renewal, capital appropriations from the state for facilities, state Academic Building Revenue Bonding authorizations, and other central sources of support such as designated gifts and grants.

The replacement cost of UI General Education Fund-supported buildings is now $2.8 billion. Because facilities replacement costs will continue to rise due to inflation and new buildings and major additions, the University’s financial model will include a future capital renewal set aside equal to 1.5% for each new major addition or building project approved.

Significant progress toward the goal of annual facilities renewal support equal to 1% of the replacement cost of all GEF-supported buildings was possible in FY 2007, in part due to a new energy/environment tuition surcharge. The University increased its building renewal support by $1,430,000 to a total of $8,509,000 budgeted. In FY 2008, the University added another $1,350,000 to this budget category.

The University’s annual Facilities Governance Report to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, contains additional information about UI facilities, including types of space, utilization, procedures for making decisions about allocation of space, conservation and sustainability, deferred maintenance, and fire safety.

Core Component 2c: The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Evaluation of Faculty

Assessment—both self-assessment and external review—takes place across the University and at all levels. The heart of assessment at The University of Iowa is the system of tenure and promotion and faculty review, alongside regular reviews of academic programs. Ultimately, the quality of educational programs depends on the quality and commitment of the faculty delivering them, and these faculty undergo regular review, including post-tenure assessment.

As required by section III-10.1a(4) of the Operations Manual, every probationary (tenure track but not yet tenured) UI faculty member receives a performance review each year. Probationary faculty members also undergo full-scale departmental or collegiate review in the third or fourth year of service, depending on the norm within the unit. The Operations Manual states:
Reappointment reviews should take into account the faculty member’s proven teaching effectiveness and research productivity and potential . . . [and] also should include an evaluation of departmental, collegiate, and University educational goals and include a determination of the likely role of the faculty member in achieving such goals. Only if an institutional need is found likely to exist for a person with the faculty member’s substantive background, and only if the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness and research productivity and potential are deemed of such a quality that an affirmative tenure decision is likely to be made, should something other than a terminal appointment be tendered.

The Faculty Handbook, a web resource maintained by the Office of the Provost, defines the process for completing the annual and third-/fourth-year reviews.

The Faculty Handbook also points to the procedures for tenure and promotion decision making for tenure track faculty and to the procedures for promotion for clinical track faculty. Both policies have been revised over the past few years in order to standardize processes across campus.

The promotion and tenure process begins with and relies on peer review in each faculty member’s home department, followed by evaluation by peers outside the University and detailed evaluation at the collegiate and University levels. Ultimately, the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, approves all faculty promotion and tenure decisions. Section III-10.2 of the Operations Manual describes the basic criteria for promotion—which include criteria related to:

- Teaching (e.g., “recommendations for promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student counselors and of colleagues who have visited the individual classes or who have been closely associated with the person’s teaching . . . or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses”)

- Research (e.g., “quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity . . . . The candidate should pursue a definite, continuing program of studies, investigations or creative works”)

- Other professional contributions (e.g., “such contributions should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University and its effect on the development of the individual”)

Section III-10.4 specifies the basic qualifications required for promotion to the academic ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

Section III-10.9 contains clinical track policies, including the basic qualifications required for promotion to the clinical faculty ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.

In accordance with section III-10.7, all academic units have policies for peer review of tenured professors, to be carried out at least every five years. These reviews are to “address the quality of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and should result in recommendations that help to enhance that performance.”

According to the Post-tenure Effort Allocation Policy (section III-10.6), or PTEAP, each academic unit defines an expected distribution of effort for tenured faculty within that
unit ("unit norms," defined by each unit and approved by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, in May 1998). The policy allows differential allocation of effort for an individual faculty member on a yearly, negotiated basis, to capitalize on particular faculty strengths, provided the allocation is consistent with the unit’s overall mission and strategic plan. Every spring, departments and colleges report to the Office of the Provost (via a web application) the expected effort allocation portfolio for each of their tenured faculty members.

**Evaluation of Staff**

Under section III-3 of the *Operations Manual*, professional and scientific (P&S) staff members are appointed to one of five status categories: career, probationary, at-will, term, or temporary. Most new P&S staff are appointed to probationary status for a period of 24 months, during which time an employee may be terminated for any legitimate reason at any time. The staff member must be informed of the reason for termination, and has recourse through P&S grievance procedures (section III-28.4) if he or she feels the termination decision was made on improper grounds. Upon successful completion of the probationary period, a P&S staff member may earn career status. Should the University take action to dismiss a P&S staff member who has career status, the burden of proof is on the University to prove lack of satisfactory performance.

Performance reviews of University staff members are governed by the policies outlined in section III-3.2 of the *Operations Manual*, which were substantially revised and clarified in 2007. The policy requires every administrative unit to demonstrate utilization of an appropriate performance management system. The associate vice president for human resources runs a compliance report annually for each college or division. Performance management consultation is available for all organizational leaders through Organizational Effectiveness.

The percentage of UI employees receiving annual performance reviews is one of the indicators of progress associated with the University’s strategic plan. That percentage has increased from 85% in FY 2004 to 95% in FY 2007.

**Academic Program Review**

All academic programs are regularly reviewed on a five- or seven-year cycle, in accordance with section II-28 of the *Operations Manual*. Departmental and program reviews always include a self-study, a detailed analysis by reviewers from outside the unit (and members from outside the University), a written critique with the opportunity for comment from the unit, and a final response by the dean of the college or director of the larger administrative unit. The final report and supporting documents are forwarded to the executive vice president and provost for consideration within the context of institutional goals and long-term strategic planning.

In 2005-06, the Office of the Provost worked with the Faculty Senate Committee on Policies and Compensation to revise the University’s academic program review policies—sections II-28.2 and II-28.3 of the *Operations Manual*—to follow up on the recommendations that came out of a 2004 Board Office audit of academic program review and student outcomes assessment procedures at the Regent institutions, streamline the language of the policy, and create parallel policies for reviews of colleges and departments. The changes were approved by the Faculty Senate in February 2007.

Areas to be considered in a departmental or program review are determined by the
college in which the department or program is housed, but generally include, among other considerations:

- The department’s mission and goals, and their contribution to the mission and goals of the College and the University
- Projected enrollments over a seven-year period
- Admissions policies and procedures
- Student perceptions of the department or program, the faculty, and the administration
- Learning objectives for the program and student achievement of those objectives
- Interaction of faculty and students and interaction of the program with other parts of the University
- The nature of scholarly, creative, and service activities within the department
- A profile of faculty
- An assessment of facilities and support services

Criteria for program evaluation are determined by the executive vice president and provost, but should include assessments based on the program’s quality and centrality, as well as student demand, potential for excellence, external impact, and cost. These are the primary and secondary criteria defined in the document Criteria for Institutional Enhancements and Reductions, generated in 1991 by the University of Iowa Strategic Planning Steering Group and last revised in 1997. “Particular attention should be focused,” the policy states, “on ways in which improvements in programs and functions can be achieved within currently available departmental resources, or if indicated by enrollment trends and other factors, with appropriately reduced resources.”

Collegiate reviews are expected to consider these issues as well, and also to address the college’s organizational and financial structure, the role of faculty and students in the college’s operations, the college’s relationship to the University and to its alumni, and the effectiveness of the college’s strategic planning and plan implementation.

**Evaluation of Individual Courses and Instructors**

Student evaluation of individual courses, supported by Evaluation and Examination Services, occurs in most undergraduate classes. Processes for these evaluations are described in the special emphasis section of this self-study.

**Non-Academic Program Review**

Nonacademic programs also are regularly reviewed to assess their quality and centrality to the University’s mission.

At its December 2003 meeting, the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, adopted an “Administrative Services Transformation” resolution that, in part, directed the University presidents to propose methods to achieve administrative efficiencies and other cost-containment measures through enterprisewide collaboration. The University of Iowa set a goal (a strategic planning progress indicator and target) to conduct six of these administrative reviews per year during the first three years of the planning period.
In 2004-05, the University conducted 12 reviews; in 2005-06, 13; and in 2006-07, 10.

Organizational Effectiveness (OE) is a unit of the Office of Human Resources within Finance and Operations, with the mission to assist in “strengthening individual and organizational learning and performance,” in support of the Iowa Promise goal to “strengthen the University’s intellectual and community vitality.” Home to the HR Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) unit, OE provides assistance with nonacademic unit reviews. CQI has compiled helpful documents on its web site, including a description of the unit review process and information for units about how to prepare for a review.

In FY 2005 UI formalized a function of business office improvement emphasizing LEAN methodology (the business improvement methodology that calls for the reduction or elimination of waste and work that does not add value). Organizational Effectiveness leads the program, which involves collaborations with the LEAN program in the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics (UIHC) and with private sector partners such as Rockwell Collins; HNI, Inc.; St. Luke’s Hospital; Principal Financial Group; and Deere Credit Corp (together, the Business Process Improvements Partners group). The program has led to many opportunities for reallocation among business services and support functions in the University and UIHC. During calendar year 2006, business process improvement initiatives were applied to a variety of University functions, including parking, registration, the Cashiers Office, biohazards disposal, sponsored programs contracting (primarily research contracts), printing, and bundling of on-campus financial services. For the spring 2007 semester, projects included University Hygienic Laboratory contracting, construction bidding and award processes, fringe benefit systems/costs, and student services functions within the Office of the Provost.

Reviews of Administrative Offices

As noted earlier, section II-28 of the Operations Manual provides for reviews of the offices of the president, executive vice president and provost, and all vice presidents at least once every seven years (the most recent administrative reviews can be accessed from the Faculty Senate web site). Central academic officers, including the president, vice presidents, and deans, are to be reviewed at least every five years, in addition to annual performance appraisals.

Strategic Planning Indicators of Progress

The University reports each year to the Board of Regents about progress related to the strategic plan. As part of this annual review, the University tracks 44 indicators of progress tied to the plan’s five top-level goals. Among these are indicators of student success, such as graduation and retention rates; faculty success in winning grants and contracts; indicators of progress in increasing diversity among faculty, staff, and students; competitiveness of faculty salaries; gift productivity; and various measures related to the University’s engagement with the larger community.

Governance Reports

Each year, the University submits to the Board a series of governance reports on topics such as faculty activities and workload, economic development and technology transfer, graduation and retention rates, distance education, facilities governance, and many others. These reports allow the Board to verify that the University is using its resources effectively and making appropriate progress toward established goals.
Institutional Data

In keeping with our decentralized nature and tendency toward lean central administration, to date The University of Iowa has not established an Office of Institutional Research. This presents a variety of challenges that come to the forefront during an intensive data-collection process such as the preparation of an institutional self-study. There are individuals in various central offices, however, who have responsibilities related to data collection and analysis. The Office of the Provost administers the University’s participation in peer data exchanges, and communicates regularly with deans and collegiate budget officers about its analyses of data from central sources.

More and more institutional data have become available for central, departmental, and collegiate use over the past several years with the advent of the new HR system, the growth of the University of Iowa Research Information System (UIRIS), major enhancements to the Registrar’s data warehouse, and improvements in other systems as described above under significant developments since the last NCA accreditation evaluation. The new student information system now under development—described in the special emphasis section of this self-study—will be another significant improvement in data delivery.

Core Component 2d: All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

As described above, all of the colleges and major non-academic organizational units have strategic plans, most closely aligned with the University-wide plan.

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences strategic plan for 2006 to 2011, for example, establishes the College’s five key goals, which echo the University’s goals:

- Provide students a rich and challenging experience in General Education and in the undergraduate major.
- Promote excellence in education by increasing the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students.
- Advance the research and scholarly enterprise and cultivate excellent graduate and professional programs.
- Strengthen the College’s intellectual and community vitality.
- Reaffirm the College’s service mission and partnerships with the public.

The College’s mission statement also echoes the University’s mission statement—and emphasizes student learning in an increasingly complex environment:

The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences provides academic programs that prepare our students to be knowledgeable citizens of the 21st century and empower them to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world. The College also advances scholarly and creative endeavor through leading-edge research and artistic production. Faculty and staff use this research and creativity to enhance undergraduate, graduate, and professional education, and to provide a wide range of services to the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world. The College conducts its activities in, and serves as a model for, a culturally diverse, humane, technologically advanced, and globally conscious environment.
As described, academic program review policies expect those reviews to consider how the program contributes to the mission and strategic goals of the department and college in which it resides, as well as the mission and goals of the University as a whole.

Organizational Effectiveness, which assists with non-academic unit reviews and administers business process improvement initiatives, explicitly states (in its most recent annual report, for 2006-07) that its aim is to meet the challenge of the Iowa Promise goal “to strengthen the University’s intellectual and community vitality.”

The University’s annual budget narrative aligns budget initiatives with specific goals and strategies in The Iowa Promise, and the University’s new academic resource management model (described above) has transparently supported the University’s top budget priority (faculty salary competitiveness, as defined in The Iowa Promise) and other strategic priorities such as faculty diversity and undergraduate education initiatives.