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As a faculty, we are pleased to be involved in this rare opportunity to reimagine and potentially reformulate our university. The feedback submitted in this report represents the entire university faculty, as sampled through surveys sent to each college, as well as many in-depth discussions among Task Force members.

At our core, the faculty has a driving passion for our students to succeed, to progress smoothly and quickly through a degree that informs them and educates them holistically as people while teaching them a discipline, all of which open the doors of success to them. We work at the core of both the creation and transfer of knowledge, and it is critical that our university regain a place where these both exist and succeed at the highest possible level.

**Task Force Findings**

The following is a synthesis of faculty input from all the colleges. Points A, B and C were sent to faculty in a survey, had strong faculty endorsement, and are presented in order of support. (See Appendix A for details.)

**A. Increase Admission Standards.** Increase admission standards for in-state and out-of-state freshman and transfer students with the goal of increasing the percent of students who successfully graduate within four-to-five years. While we recognize and sustain ISU’s commitment to the land grant mission, we recognize that this mission has evolved with the advent of community colleges and pre-collegiate course equivalents. The task force specifically suggests that the GPA for community college transfer students without an Associates degree be increased to 2.5 and that the President open a conversation with the Regents to consider raising the RAI for guaranteed admission. Data show that students with an RAI of 265 have a substantially higher rate of success and retention at ISU than those with an RAI of 245.

- Data also show that high school GPA is the strongest indicator or success at ISU. Consider ways to emphasize GPA in admissions decisions to the greatest extent possible.
- Larger class sizes make it truly challenging to educate and properly serve the less well prepared students on campus. If faculty cannot assist weaker students, retention rates will likely also fall.

**B. Increase In-state and Out-of-state Tuition and Make a Stronger Case for Higher State Appropriations.** Tuition must be regularly increased to maintain teaching quality, improve the student experience, and to increase faculty numbers. This is needed in addition to an increase in legislative appropriations. We serve a higher percentage of Iowa students compared to the other two Regents Universities. We are the land grant institution in Iowa, and as such, if there is a preference given for state appropriations, it should be given to the land grant. As item a) below shows, state appropriations per student favor SUI, and our tuition is also not equal to SUI. In order to limit tuition increases each year, reducing the financial burden on students and their families, we need increased state appropriations.

- Since 2005, total enrollment at ISU has grown 40% from 25,741 to 36,001, with record annual enrollments since 2009. In this same general time frame, state appropriations per resident student (FTE) fell from a ten-year high of $12,705 in 2009 to a current $9,120 (from President’s report). In short, while in-state student populations have risen, state support per student for those students has fallen. Currently, the University of Iowa, due to its smaller student population, receives $15,474 per resident student. UNI received $10,255 per resident student in FY16. The data thus indicate that ISU receives less per resident student than SUI and UNI. And the number of resident students is much larger at ISU – approximately 64% of our student body comes from in-state compared to 43% at SUI. In the fall of 2015, resident student headcount was 21,064, while at the University of Iowa resident headcount was 17,531, and resident students at UNI totaled 10,549.
- The FY15 cost of instruction at ISU was $12,698 per student. This assumes that 74% of the General Fund Budget is allocated to instruction. Resident tuition for FY15 was $6,648 per resident undergraduate student, leaving over $6,000 as a deficit to be covered by other sources of funding. The problem is that we are managing to provide this education at a very inexpensive price only by increasing class sizes and teaching loads and skimping on support staff in the academic units and student services.
- One of the ways to contextualize our in-state tuition is this: faculty who have young children in Ames pay more for daycare in a year than they would pay for tuition if their child were enrolled at ISU – to have a child in daycare at Vet Med for 12 months costs approximately $15,000 per year.

**C. Examine the Impact of Differential Admissions and/or Tuition by College.** The goal of these recommendations is to allow Colleges to determine what they need to improve teaching quality and maintain the student experience. A solution to meet programmatic needs might include encouraging programs to develop a pre-major status (such as is already in place in Business and Design) or academic rules before progressing in the major (as in Engineering). Another alternative would be to allow specific courses with high instructional overhead to charge additional fees (such as lab fees) to address their unique needs for additional resource support.

- Consider allowing colleges the latitude to impose their own ACT or GPA criteria for admission to the college on top of the guaranteed admission to the university with an RAI of 245.
Discussion Point 1: Emphasize the Importance of our Research Mission. We need to continue to communicate to the Iowa taxpayers that ISU is a top research university in disciplines that are vital to the state’s economy and population. Research is vital for its own sake, as well as in support of our land-grant mission. Research combined with land-grant mission are what sets us apart from many other institutions in Iowa.

Discussion Point 2: Actively Manage Enrollment Growth in the Near Term. We need time to enact measures to better manage our current population and required infrastructure. Looking to the future, we need to manage enrollment to be commensurate with resources available to the university and its programs. Despite ongoing construction projects that will add some classrooms over the next two years, it is not enough to accommodate our current student body.

a. The Office of Admissions suggests enrollment trends may be stabilizing based upon projected demographics and competition from other in- and out-of-state universities. The faculty respond that, even with the potential for such a trend, the student population is currently too large for our resources, and management of the problem should not wait for potential demographics to play out.

Faculty Priorities

Iowa State University faculty place a priority upon maintaining our AAU status, our Carnegie High Impact Research University status, and our land-grant mission. While our land-grant mission is often defined through admissions and teaching, equally important is the charge to conduct research that improves the lives of Iowa citizens and the world. While teaching is the immediate and most visible part of our jobs, we want to protect Iowa State University as an institution that fosters world-class research and scholarship. Supporting our research and scholarship contributes to the quality of the instruction we provide, our national standing, and our prestige as an institution. All of these things are negatively impacted by enrollment pressure.

We also place priority emphasis upon the quality of our students and the education they receive, as well as the quality of their holistic ISU experience. We want to build (as well as work in) an educational environment in which the students who attend are well-served by what the faculty and university offer, leading toward increased first-year retention and graduation rates. We want this to take place within a curriculum that challenges all students to think deeply and creatively about their fields of study, and to exceed the expectations they had when they arrived on campus. These goals are compromised with the continued rapid increase in student numbers without a concomitant increase in resources. Appendix B illustrates the negative impact enrollment growth is having currently upon our students’ education and experience at ISU.

Snapshots from Appendix B:

- Rapid enrollment growth has adversely affected the ability of programs to offer laboratory and hands-on learning experiences. This diminishes the ISU brand.
- Grading of homework for lower division Math classes was eliminated starting in Spring 2016 because of a shortage of staff and teaching resources.
- Our undergraduate writing classes average over 25 students per section, which is larger than all but one of our peer-institutions. Data show that both the quality of instruction and student performance decrease for classes with more than 20 students.

Core Concerns

The Iowa State University faculty understand fully that the current enrollment growth trajectory is unsustainable with current resources. We are deeply concerned that we can no longer offer the highest quality education to the students we teach, nor that we can advance research in the most highly impactful ways that will forward the university’s reputation as it moves our society and the world into the future.

Whether approached from the vantage point of infrastructure (too few classrooms and faculty offices, cramped library study space, and inadequate sidewalks) or from the vantage point of personnel (too few faculty to teach and too few staff to support the burgeoning student population), Iowa State University has passed our enrollment ideal and has begun an escalating process where both teaching and research are negatively impacted.

Increasing course sizes risks decreasing the student learning experience. Class sizes have grown by two-to-three hundred percent in some instances (see Appendix B). Growth of such magnitude requires a complete overhaul of pedagogy and assessment. This negatively impacts the level of critical thinking and reflection that can be expected, and requires inordinate time on the part of the faculty to maintain the quality education experience. It then becomes more difficult for faculty to ensure ISU produces the best thinkers and researchers.

Faculty are increasingly challenged to insist upon advanced thinking when it: 1) creates significant in-course time challenges; 2) contributes to students not succeeding based upon their aptitudes and prior education; 3) increases time to graduation as students repeat courses; and 4) creates blockages for other students’ success when open seats vanish in classrooms. This environment is bad for student success, bad for research excellence, and bad for fostering the knowledge base and critical thinking skills expected of the graduates from a distinguished academic institution.
Conclusions

The EMTF states once again that ISU faculty are dedicated to student success, and we emphasize their success in a *quality* educational environment as a principal motivator for our involvement in enrollment management. We equally feel compelled to find ways to balance educational and research goals, working within the current resource constraints and funding challenges to find paradigms that restore balance to faculty workloads and missions. If the current educational model at ISU does not afford faculty the liberty to create new knowledge and transmit it efficiently to the student population and the world, the model needs to be adjusted until these two central missions realign and catalyze.

The Morrill Act was conceived as a partnership between the state government and its people, creating great opportunities for learning that the state supported as central to its governing mission. The definition of a land-grant university does not say that the university, in order to educate its state’s residents, must adhere to an unsustainable economic model. It is time that the university administration, in collaboration with its faculty and the Board of Regents, finds more effective ways to communicate how the state has allowed its support to erode to the point of adversely affecting the education of its citizens. With careful planning, we must manage the number of our students while also promoting improved *quality* in their learning experiences. This will ensure that they benefit from a stronger education, thus contributing more powerfully to the future economic welfare of the state, and the increased quality of life for Iowans and the world.
Appendix A
Survey Results

In March 2016, a task force member from each college sent a Qualtrix survey to all faculty in the college. The survey was open-ended, inviting faculty to write pros and cons and any other comment for each of five questions: Raise tuition? Create differential tuition standards? Create differential tuition standards? Index enrollment to state appropriations? Responses were received from 186 faculty (38 faculty in College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, 22 faculty in College of Business, 21 faculty in College of Design, 23 faculty in College of Engineering, 29 faculty in College of Human Sciences, and 53 faculty in College of Liberal Arts and Sciences). The task force member who sent out the survey categorized each response as indicating primarily a pro position, primarily a con position, or a neutral position. Averaged across faculty and across colleges, there was majority support for raising tuition across the board, for raising admissions standards to the university, and for allowing differential admissions standards by college.

In the sections below, the proportions of responses in each category are presented in tabular form with along with a description of major pro and con themes that were apparent across colleges.

I. Raising tuition (across the board? Only In-State tuition? Only out of state?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise tuition across the board?</th>
<th>proportion in college</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority response was yes in LAS, CALS, Business, Design, and CHS to raising tuition across the board. Only Engineering had a majority response of no.

Themes in the supporting comments:
• Necessary because of decreased state funding. In-state tuition does not cover cost of education even taking into account state appropriations. This should be made transparent to the people of Iowa.
• Tuition increases have not kept pace with the cost of course delivery and facilities.
• There is room to raise tuition and still be extremely competitive among peer institutions on both in-state and out-of-state.
• Tuition increases should be incremental, kept in line with inflation, and if possible tied to some parallel increase in financial assistance.

Themes in the comments against:
• Antithetical to our land-grant mission to be accessible.
• Will decrease student diversity and discourage low income students.
• Higher education is already expensive enough.
• Will increase student debt, which is already too high.
• The state will only further reduce its contribution.

II. Create differential tuition by degree/college/department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential tuition?</th>
<th>proportion in college</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design, Engineering, and CALS showed majority support for differential tuition. The majority response in LAS and CHS was against differential tuition. Business did not have a majority response.
Most of the comments in support referred to college-level tuition differences. There was less support for departmental or program level differences in tuition.

Themes in the supporting comments:
- ISU is already doing it in some colleges.
- If the university is to be run as a business, let the forces of supply and demand determine the price of the product and let that money be kept by the unit.
- If it costs more to run a program, then tuition should be higher. That is already done for Business and Engineering.

Themes in the comments against:
- ISU is a comprehensive university with diverse programs. Differential tuition creates division and reinforces an us against all mentality.
- Implies that more expensive programs are better.
- Will negatively affect certain disciplines that provide a critical role in the college and university.
- Will cause students to select a degree based upon the cost rather than interest.
- Specialized course fees more directly address differences in cost of instruction.

III. Raise admission standards (across the board? Only in-state? Only out of state?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise admissions across the board?</th>
<th>proportion in college</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority response was yes in all colleges for raising admissions across the board.

Themes in the supporting comments:
- Better prepared students will increase the probability of student success.
- Better prepared students allow more challenging classes and an improved learning experience for the majority of the students.
- The cost to faculty and staff of providing remedial help to so many under-prepared students is high.
- English-language comprehension standards for international students need to be higher.
- A GPA or 2.0 in high school or a community college is not enough for ISU.
- Would increase the prestige of ISU, making it a “destination” school rather than just a “good value”.

Themes in the comments against:
- Would have a negative impact on diversity and on the welcoming feel of ISU.
- Elitist; directly against ISU’s land-grant mission; Iowa students expect and deserve entry into ISU.
- Would reduce enrollment and we need tuition dollars.
- There are diverse kinds of intelligence, many of which are not reflected in our current admission standards.

IV. Create differential admissions standards by college/department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential standards by college/dept?</th>
<th>proportion in college</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modal and the majority response was yes in all colleges except LAS and CALS for differential admissions standards. No was the majority response in LAS and the modal response in CALS. Please note while the survey suggested differential admission by
program, the Task Force unanimously agreed that this would be very difficult to administer. Differential admission should only occur at the College level.

Themes in the supporting comments:
- There should be a university minimum, but colleges and departments need the flexibility to set higher standards.
- Differential standards are informative to students, indicating that they are suited to the program or not prepared for the program.
- With analysis of student performance, differential standards can be put in place that promote student success. Establish differential standards for majors based on performance of past students in the program.
- Already done in programs with a pre-major stage before being admitted into the major.

Themes in the comments against:
- Against the land-grant spirit.
- Would result in inequities in programs with elite versus catchall majors rather than holistic ISU programs.
- Would cause problems for open-option students and students who want to change their majors.
- Student gamesmanship would increase as students enter a program with lower standards and try to gain admission to a program with higher standards.
- Tuition revenue may drop as the “yield” of students to whom we offer admission could drop.

V. Index enrollment to state appropriations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>index enrollment to state appropriations?</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proportion in college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority response was yes to tying enrollment to state appropriations in Design, LAS, and Engineering. The majority response in Business and CHS was no. In CALS, responses were more evenly distributed.

Themes in the supporting comments:
- A logical way to communicate consequences of reduced state support; higher education cannot continue to do more with less.
- Will make the relationship between enrollment and state appropriations more transparent; the public does not realize how much state appropriations have dropped.

Themes in the comments against:
- Politically counter-productive; could backfire in angering the legislature.
- Could lead to large swings in enrollment depending on the actions of the legislature.
- Bad economics because state funding is only one part of the income stream and not the largest part.
- Gives too much control to the legislature.

VI. Other ideas and comments:

Comments across multiple colleges suggested combining raised standards with differential tuition. Students are admitted into ISU, but there should be major-based admission criteria that require demonstrated aptitude in foundation courses to gain access or proceed in specific majors. If a student cannot demonstrate aptitude in a major, the student is not admitted or allowed to proceed in the major. Once admitted into a major, tuition may be higher if the cost of the delivery of upper division courses is higher.

A consistent theme was that the lack of resources and the lack of space lead to pitting the two land grant missions against each other--accessibility to all students versus a focus on cutting edge research. The theme is captured in the question “Given current resources, do we want to be a large community college or an elite R1 university?”

We need more emphasis on quality and not just quantity. More intensive, hands-on pedagogy requires smaller class sizes and more instructor time. If high quality education is important, this must be recognized and high performing educators must be rewarded just as high performing researchers are rewarded.

Provide time and resources to implement more creative pedagogy, like hybrid classrooms. Students benefit and space is freed up. The problem is that reformattting of delivery requires time, but we are teaching so much that we don't have the time to become more efficient.
The administration should stop presenting increased enrollment as a good thing.

The following themes/questions occurred in multiple comments across colleges:

- There is a concern that lowering the quality of the education as a result of larger classes with less faculty interaction will negatively affect alumni loyalty and the ISU brand.
- Should we consider a two-tier faculty system with teaching-focused and researched-focused tracks?
- ISU needs to increase its endowment so that we become more self-sufficient.
- The increase in administrative positions far outpaces the increase in faculty positions.
- Is the growing enrollment a product of the contingencies in the RMM?

Complete table of responses to survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raise tuition across the board?</th>
<th>Differential tuition?</th>
<th>Raise admissions across the board?</th>
<th>Differential standards by college/dept?</th>
<th>Index enrollment to state appropriations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proportion in college</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Science</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average over colleges</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of total</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Examples of impact of enrollment on specific programs

Enrollment in certain degree programs and core general education courses has exploded with the overall increase in students. Some of the most affected programs include Animal Science, Business, Computer Science, English, Kinesiology, Math, and Mechanical Engineering. These examples show in vivid detail what results when we try to teach more students than our human and physical infrastructure can handle.

- Animal Science (ANS): ANS is the largest major in Agriculture and Life Sciences and the fourth largest major on campus. Enrollment in Animal Science majors (ANS) has almost doubled in the past decade, from 622 in 2005 to 1,057 in 2015.

  Classroom availability is a major impediment to offering class sizes at the level appropriate to ensure a high level of student learning and provide the necessary experiential learning (labs) that are part of the ISU brand. Several required courses in ANS have been at maximum enrollment for the classroom assigned for multiple semesters. After repeated requests, room scheduling remains unable to assign larger classrooms that are needed to teach integral and important courses. This situation not only creates a backlog in ANS, but potentially prevents students from graduating on time, since many of these courses are prerequisites for other courses. This problem continues to affect student success despite the increased number of section offerings, additional personnel (lecturers and teaching assistants) and summer offerings.

- College of Business (BUS): The Gerdin Business Building was opened 12 years ago and the college has already outgrown it. Office spaces are now completely filled and new faculty hires will likely not be able to move into their offices until right before the school year starts. The building’s classrooms are also in constant use from 8:00am to 10:00pm, Monday through Thursday, and 8:00am to 5:00pm on Friday. This requires faculty to teach into the evenings affecting work-life balance. Students also miss opportunities for extracurricular activities when they must take evening classes.

- Computer Science (COM S): Teaching Computer Science courses places very intense time demands on faculty and teaching assistants, especially in more programming-oriented courses, as grading software programs submitted by students requires careful reading, testing, and essentially correcting any error in the program. Due to inadequate faculty and TA numbers, most 200- and 300-level COM S courses have rapidly increased in size, as much as 500% in some cases, thus adversely affecting student learning and faculty workload. The Software Engineering program, taught primarily by Computer Science faculty is also placing stress on limited resources. The program was created less than a decade ago and enrollment is now over 500 students, much larger than the initial projection of fewer than 200 students.

- English (ENGL): The Department of English offered 808 courses in the past year, teaching 17,713 students, including 295 sections of writing for 6,838 students. Due to low faculty numbers and pressure to meet the needs of all students in the writing courses, faculty in the department are working at an unsustainable pace affecting learning outcomes, research production, and faculty retention.

  Enrollment per section in our writing courses is higher than at any of our peer institutions with the exception of Michigan State. For example, UIUC teaches 16 students per section, North Carolina State 18 students, and Purdue University and University of Wisconsin teach 19. The Conference on College Composition and Communication recommends no more than 20 students per section in writing courses; 15 is ideal. Beyond 20, data show that quality of instruction and student performance decrease. English at ISU was temporarily able to lower our enrollment in writing classes from 26 to 24 last year, but due to a lack of additional teaching resources to hire instructors as the student population continues to increase, we are forced to raise it back again to 26 this year.

  In every way, we have also struggled to meet the demands of our undergraduate majors, particularly in the 300-level courses. These courses fill immediately, often before juniors are done registering, because as we have lost faculty, no tenure-track lines or additional NTE hires have replaced them. This is true in Creative Writing, Communications, Literature, English Education, and Rhetoric.
• Kinesiology (KIN): From 2004 to 2015, the Department of Kinesiology experienced a 95.8% increase in number of undergraduate students (from 782 to 1365), accompanied with a net increase of only 2.5 tenure-track faculty members. Kinesiology has increasingly relied on non-tenure eligible faculty to meet teaching demands.

The Junior level core-course, KIN 372, increased from 156 students per year in FY08 in which there were also lab sections of 20-23 students, to 326 students in FY15, with no laboratory sections. In fact, all lab sections for all three core courses that traditionally had lab sections have been dropped due to lack of lab space and resources for TA support. The term paper and lab reports previously required in KIN 372 were reduced to one more extensive lab report.

Other core courses (HS 350 and KIN 358) increased from 178 students in FY08 to 365 in FY15, and 177 to 443, respectively. In KIN 366 (growing from 141 to 317), all in-class points were removed because the management of all the student exceptions had become overwhelming. KIN 472, a senior-level elective, the number of students has doubled; verbal presentations were dropped because they required too much class time given the number of students. And, while a term paper is still required, this single assignment requires approximately a 40-hour work week to manage and grade.

• Mathematics (MATH): Math has been increasing class section sizes and using more lecturers across all their service courses because of increased student enrollment and insufficient funds to hire replacement instructors or new tenure-track faculty.

Service courses accounted for approximately 8000 seats in Fall 2015. Even rooms to teach additional sections are becoming very scarce. Advisers have been restricting Engineering students to one instead of two downstream courses, Math 265 or Math 267 (both have the same prerequisite course, Math 166), due to fewer seats available in both courses relative to the number of students needing both. This has reduced and will continue to reduce scheduling flexibility for students, thus increasing graduate times.

Grading of homework for undergraduate Math classes, for which half of the enrolled students are not Math majors, was eliminated starting in Spring 2016 because of a shortage of staff. This has negatively affected students' ability to succeed in these classes due to lack of adequate feedback on homework assignments.

• Mechanical Engineering (ME): Mechanical Engineering is the most popular major on campus. Enrollment in the ME has more than doubled from 1014 in 2008 to 2047 in 2015. Since 2010, almost 10% of total enrollment growth across the entire University has been new ME majors (from about 150 majors on campus).

The ME enrollment growth has overtaken the available numbers of instructors and seats in high-level ME technical level courses resulting in ME students being forced to take non-ME (and non-engineering) courses as technical electives. This has led the offering departments enacting restrictions to avoid ME 'crowding out' students from other majors wishing to take these courses. Examples of such courses with substantial ME enrollment growth and/or recent enrollment restrictions are: Environmental Science 324: Energy and the Environment, Marketing 340: Principles of Marketing, Management 370: Management of Organizations, SCM 301: Supply Chain Management, and Ag Education and Studies 388: Agricultural Mechanics Applications.

Providing laboratory (hands-on) experiences to these large numbers of students, which is a crucial component of ISU’s brand and appeal, poses a serious challenge. The only remaining options currently for additional laboratory times are late in the evenings and weekends. Offering labs at these times would pose significant safety concerns due to inability to staff the labs at appropriate levels (i.e. machine shop safety) and security worries on campus late at night (i.e. laboratories finishing later than available Cy Ride routes). These times would also limit the ability of students to participating in popular extra-curricular activities (e.g. student clubs).
Appendix C

Summary of P&S Council and Staff Responses to Survey Discussion Points

Adjustments to the Regent’s Admission Index (RAI)
Comments included do not admit students that are below 245, and to consider increasing the RAI.

Raise GPA Requirement for Community College Transfer Students
Comments included raising the GPA from 2.0 to 2.25-2.30, and possibly higher depending on the major (e.g., engineering).

Raise Out-of-State Admission Standards
If the out-of-state admission standard is raised, it must be balance against lost revenue and maintaining diversity.

Raise Out-of-State Tuition
If the out-of-state tuition is raised, as we our considerably below our peers, retaining competitiveness with other Midwest universities must be observed.

Raise In-State Tuition
It is recognized that costs are quite low compared to our peers, but the sentiment was as much in favor as against raising in-state tuition (in contrast to out-of-state).

Differential Tuition by College, Degree, or Major
Generally in favor of differential costs, provided they are justified.

Differential Admission Standards by College, Degree, or Major
Logistically challenging and does not reflect our “brand” of exploring as an undergraduate; institution standards further in the degree program may be better than at time of admission. Does this really help enrollment issues?

Create New Degrees for Students
Generally, not a lot of support and only a few comments.

Adjustments to the RMM
Generally, not a lot of support and only a few comments.

Adjust Teaching Hours
Comments reflect that expanding teaching hours outside the prime times is more of a “no choice” option with current student numbers, coupled with space availability. Large classes in the evenings affects other student activities; can do this if some sections still offered during normal hours.

Tie Enrollment to State Funding
Issues here were the year-to-year variability and how to accept students (or not) well in advance of knowing the state budget.

Change Current Deadlines/ Policies/ Systems
Comments include moving up the registration deadline; additional tuition charge for taking more than 20 credits; and decreasing scholarships as a means to increase revenue.

Additional Comments
Differential fees by discipline; uniformity with state support and in-state numbers across state universities (i.e., ISU and SUI); no degree overlap between 2 schools; less recruitment so more students go to community colleges.
Appendix D

Additional Faculty Suggestions

• Revisit the number of times a student may retake a course without penalty. Currently, students have 15 credits of designated repeats. Specifically, under this proposal, students would be allowed to repeat the course more than once, but could not use designated repeat credits to replace the grade in their cumulative GPA calculation beyond the first repeat of the course. This would incentivize students to prioritize their time to graduation and incur smaller debt loads by using course fees more sensibly.

• Allow departments that need to put an enrollment cap on student admissions to their degrees/majors to do so.

• Any enrollment management strategies should be accompanied by proactive efforts to increase the diversity of the campus.

• Consider a new presidential hiring initiative with a teaching emphasis, perhaps backed by a research area that emphasizes teaching.

• Convince the Regents to consider raising the RAI and setting a higher graduation goal than 60% at the current RAI (at its adoption in 2009).

• A gateway standard would help to ensure that a student is prepared to be successful in a degree program. If a student is not prepared to be successful in a degree program right from the start, it is extremely difficult ever to get them caught up. This situation is not fair to the student as it strongly impacts their futures when they marginally scrape through a program. Additionally, underprepared students create a significant time sink on faculty, the curriculum, and other students as they struggle through a program.

• We need to consider assigning less credit for AP classes, especially if enrollment has grown through our relaxed approach to this entrance metric. We have freshman arriving with dozens of high school AP credits who are not proportionally better prepared for college than others.

• Create a centralized General Education course list for all majors. A university-wide list of Gen-Ed courses will centralize advising and availability in Gen-Ed courses in all colleges that meet the Gen-Ed criteria. LAS already uses this model and has a shared list for all majors in the college. This will help spread students across more large-class options, reducing traffic jams in currently overpopulated Gen-Ed courses, and make changing majors more seamless.

• Emphasize that student debt is not a 1-1 result of tuition costs. It comes from all costs associated with attending college, including fees, rent, food, entertainment, and other expenses.