FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, March 3, 2020
3:30 – 5:15 pm
2390 University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present:	C. Bradley, J. Buckley, M. Cunningham-Ford, L. Erdahl, M. Foley Nicpon, L. Glass, M. Lehan Mackin, N. Nisly, M. Pizzimenti, C. Sheerin, S. Vigmostad, D. Wurster.
Officers Present:	S. Daack-Hirsch, T. Marshall, J. Yockey.
Councilors Excused:	A. Gerke.
Councilors Absent:	A. Deshpande, C. Lang, A. Merryman, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, G. Russell.
Guests:	A. Beck (University College), K. Brown (Tippie College of Business), S. Fleagle (ITS), Z. Furst (ITS), K. Harrell (*Daily Iowan*), D. Johnsen (College of Dentistry), S. Lewison (ITS), D. Tang (ITS), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Daack-Hirsch called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals
   A.   Meeting Agenda –Professor Pizzimenti moved and Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   B.   Faculty Council Minutes (January 28, 2020) – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   C.   Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 24, 2020) – Professor Glass moved and Professor Nisly seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   D.   Committee Appointments (Joe Yockey, Chair, Committee on Committees)
      • *None at this time*

III.   New Business
• *ITS Budget Review Board Success (Steve Fleagle, Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer; Zach Furst, Director of Security Operations, ITS; Shari Lewison, Director of Information Security, ITS; Danny Tang, Senior IT Director of Research Services, ITS)*
   President Daack-Hirsch explained that, as part of the university's new budget model, the colleges' budgets are set based on their previous year's revenue, which comes primarily from tuition and grant funding. Any new additional revenue is split between the colleges and the central service units (central administration, Facilities Management, ITS, Provost's Office,

Student Life, and the research office). These central service units, with the assistance and guidance of their central services advisory committees (CSAC's), then submit bids for funding to the university-wide Budget Review Board to conduct new projects within their units. In order to give the group an example of the central service projects funded through this new process, President Daack-Hirsch explained that Mr. Fleagle and his colleagues were speaking to the Council today about projects that ITS has implemented. Mr. Fleagle indicated that over the past several budget cycles, ITS has received funding to implement projects in IT security and research support. Ms. Lewison, who oversees information security for the entire university, commented on advances that ITS has made in IT security as a result of the new funding. She noted that since ITS supports the academic mission of the institution, any funds directed toward security instead must be used wisely. Ms. Lewison then indicated that the university receives over one million email messages every day. Many of those messages are filtered before reaching users. However, phishing emails were becoming increasingly common, leading to about 800 compromised accounts every month. ITS staff were able to do some "clean-up" work in the email system to drastically cut down on the number of fraudulent messages making it through the university's filtering system. Now, there are less than 10 compromised accounts every week.

Mr. Furst explained that through phishing attempts, credentials are stolen and used in financial fraud. He then described steps the university has taken to thwart specific email financial fraud attempts emanating from Nigeria. In this case, a financial institution contacted the university regarding fraudulent activity originating at UI. The university launched an investigation using tools purchased with funds obtained through the new bidding process. The investigation revealed that the credentials of UI students were stolen by criminals in Nigeria so that access could be gained to a university server. Using the UI server, the criminals could pivot from Nigeria to the University of Iowa and then to the financial institution. With the help of the new security tools, the university was able to collect three months of data on the culprits. As a result, 47 compromised student accounts were identified, as were 28 other universities impacted by similar phishing attempts. Twenty-three financial institutions that were targeted by the criminals were also identified. As part of the investigation, various personal online accounts belonging to the culprits were traced and the individuals could be identified. This information was provided to the FBI and then to the Nigerian authorities. Mr. Furst indicated that ITS will continue to improve the security systems that we have, as well as to work collaboratively with other institutions on security initiatives. ITS will also continue to strengthen our protective technology architecture. Nationally, there has been a renewed emphasis on risk management and compliance, and the UI will take steps to ensure that we are meeting all required standards.

Professor Pizzimenti praised the forward-looking nature of these IT security efforts. He asked what would happen if we don't carry out such activity. Ms. Lewison commented that following up after an account is compromised is very disruptive and time-consuming for the victim. Professor Nisly observed that faculty members on the health care campus use the same password for logging into their health care and university accounts. She asked if this was problematic. Ms. Lewison responded that so many people on the health care campus were getting confused about their two passwords that it was becoming very time-consuming to assist them. There was also a potential for compromised accounts because so many different people were calling in to change passwords. The decision was then made that it was far more efficient

and safer to use one password only for both accounts. Dean Johnsen, one of the co-chairs of the ITS Central Services Advisory Committee, commented that the internet is inherently "insecure and unsecurable." Also, good people make mistakes using their computers, while bad people with very sophisticated tools are out there to take advantage of them. Internet security is a moving target, he added.

Mr. Tang indicated that in spring 2018, ITS submitted a proposal, the One IT Data Intensive Computing Initiative, that was approved by the Budget Review Board. He proceeded to give an update on the status of that initiative, which has three key components. One of those components is development of a data analytics platform for research and instructional use. The second component is increased support for artificial intelligence and the third involves data-sharing tools for research. The data analytics platform launched in August 2019 as the Interactive Data Analytics Service (IDAS). IDAS combines some common data science analytic tools with powerful computational machines. The advantage of this combination is that users do not need to train on new tool sets, but still have access to vast computational power to analyze much larger data sets. IDAS is useful for coursework, in addition to research. There are now over 100 active users of this service on campus. Some of the research projects using IDAS involve RNA sequencing, injury prediction, behavioral analysis, and text mining of legal documents. Twelve courses across five colleges are using the service, as well, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, for in-class instruction and homework assignments. Because of the greater computational power, instructors are able to present their classes with complex, real-world scenarios. The integrated system also allows for a consistent and easily-accessible format for the scenarios. Annual costs are expected to be around $260,000.

Regarding increased support for artificial intelligence, Mr. Tang noted that original plans had called for hiring one AI deep-learning specialist, but that has proven difficult, as it has for many institutions. Instead, ITS has split the functions of this position across several employees. For example, there is a senior high-performance computing administrator who has been transitioned to a software support role to implement common AI software, thus making it more available to the campus community. A data science consultant has been hired to advise researchers on tools and resources, while also conducting workshops. Other staff provide additional support for this initiative. One element of this proposal is still to be implemented; ITS was originally considering the purchase of a high-end machine learning platform. The current system used by the university has a limit on the amount of data that can be analyzed. However, because the available tools are evolving so quickly, it is difficult to determine which platform to purchase. Also, we must determine which tools would be most useful for our researchers. Regarding the third component, data-sharing tools for researchers, Mr. Tang noted that data varies widely across campus in how it is generated, shared, and stored. ITS has received $25,000 annually to build a research data collaboration service, for data sharing, collaboration, and movement, using a product from a non-profit company based at the University of Chicago.

Professor Erdahl asked how these new initiatives would be advertised and how researchers would integrate their work into the new systems. Mr. Tang indicated that ITS has a plan for stakeholder engagement, including consultations with associate deans for research and collegiate IT directors. In response to a question, Mr. Tang provided the group with contact

information, including the website for the High Performance Computing unit, https://hpc.uiowa.edu/, and a group email address, research-computing@uiowa.edu. President Daack-Hirsch thanked the ITS presenters. She commented that there had been a lot of nervousness when the new budget model was first adopted regarding how both the academic units and the central service units would receive needed funding. She indicated that she has observed that the central service units have remained focused on the teaching and research missions as they develop proposals for funding. We have seen an example of that here today. President Daack-Hirsch reminded the group that faculty members (including the three Faculty Senate officers) now sit on all six of the central service advisory committees, so that there is a faculty voice in the development of proposals.

- *Senate Endorsement of New Approach to Evaluating Faculty Teaching (Annette Beck, Director of Operational Services for University College and Ken Brown, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Program in Business, Tippie College of Business)*
Associate Dean Brown explained that a task force to revise the ACE evaluations has been at work for the past 1½ years. This task force includes numerous associate deans, along with various faculty members, staff and students. Associate Dean Brown and Ms. Beck chair the task force, charged with improving response rates (which dropped when evaluations were moved online) but also taking the opportunity to suggest improvements to the entire teaching assessment process. The task force adopted the following driving principles: *1) advance assessment of teaching to facilitate improvement over time, 2) increase student voice in the process by maintaining their input and increasing response rates,* and *3) reduce known bias in ratings and comments against women and under-represented instructors*. Turning to the timeline for the task force's work, Associate Dean Brown indicated that the task force was charged in spring 2018. Several committees were formed to focus on end-of-course questions, the peer observation process, and utilization and policy. Task force members then gave presentations and gathered feedback from faculty (including faculty governance organizations), students (including UISG and GPSG), and university and collegiate administrators. Pilot programs were launched in the College of Nursing and College of Education during fall 2019; these pilots yielded a great deal of useful information. In order to proceed to the next steps in the process, which will include a commitment of funding by the university, the Provost has indicated that she would like the endorsement of the Faculty Council and Faculty Senate.

Turning to some of the recommendations put forward by the task force, Associate Dean Brown explained that the task force is advocating for the introduction of new core questions on the end-of-course student ratings. These new low-bias questions would be fewer in number and simpler than previously. The Likert-scale questions would include three instructor-focused and three course-focused questions, while structured, open-ended questions would also be included. Other recommendations fell into the categories of encouraging ongoing student feedback, promoting systematic peer and expert observation, and offering comprehensive educational resources, including the creation of videos for students, instructors, and administrators. The task force also recommends building a supportive culture and infrastructure to facilitate more fair, systematic, and pervasive assessment of teaching, leading to continuous improvement. An essential tool for the improvement of teaching would be a new software product for online evaluations. The software currently used by the university, CollegeNET, has proven

unsatisfactory because of the high number of staff hours that it consumes. Software alternatives, such as Explorance Blue, investigated by the task force would potentially increase the university's recurring annual costs from the current $24,000 up to $100,000, if the price were not negotiated. One-time start-up costs would include $55,000 for installation and $10,000 for video/marketing production. While new software is not required to carry out all the task force's recommendations, the task force believes that the university should launch all of these initiatives simultaneously. Associate Dean Brown concluded by indicating that the endorsement of the Council and Senate was sought not just for this project as a whole, but also specifically for the purchase of new online course evaluation software. He expressed his enthusiasm at this opportunity to fundamentally change the culture around teaching improvement and evaluation at the UI.

Noting students' low level of response to the existing online teaching evaluation system, Professor Lehan Mackin questioned whether simply a new software tool would make a difference in participation levels. Associate Dean Brown noted that the new evaluations would be more standardized across colleges and departments and would include fewer questions. Currently, colleges and departments are permitted to add multiple questions specific to their units; the length of these questionnaires discourages students from completing them. Additionally, departments that employ best practices around evaluations (reserving class time for them and distributing them during the last few weeks of the course, among others), have seen their participation rates rise. The pilot results from the College of Education and the College of Nursing have suggested that more specific open-ended questions have led to better suggestions for improvement of classes.

Professor Sheerin asked for clarification why new software was needed when simple modifications such as reserving class time for evaluations and asking fewer questions seemed to raise response rates considerably. Associate Dean Brown responded that, from a technical perspective, the current software is "clunky" and requires a significant amount of manual labor to produce results. Other software alternatives are not only more automated, but also flexible in terms of data generation and report production. Ms. Beck added that the new software would allow, for example, for the results of all of an instructor's course sections to be combined and for modifications of the questions depending on the course. Professor Wurster urged that the recovery of personnel time that the new software provides be added to the slide presentation, because this is a key argument for its purchase. Professor Lehan Mackin asked if the new software is capable of performing narrative analyses on the open-ended questions. Ms. Beck responded that none of the new software options has this function, beyond the ability to create word clouds.

Professor Foley Nicpon noted that when the pilot was carried out in her college, faculty members were able to include numerous additional questions. She asked if this would generally be allowed. Associate Dean Brown responded that the task force has recommended, based upon feedback from students, that a maximum of three questions be added to the core six questions. Professor Nisly asked if the new evaluations would also be used to solicit feedback from fellows, residents, and other high-level trainees. Associate Dean Brown said that the task force was open to this possibility, but it is unclear whether the core questions are applicable in all clinical settings. Professor Nisly then asked if the new software could separate data according to

instructors' gender. Associate Dean Brown commented that the task force would like to completely eliminate the use of norms, because normative comparisons carry forward systematic bias. Since the purpose of the evaluations is to determine if a faculty member is improving his/her teaching, a self-referencing comparison, not a normative comparison, is needed. Professor Pizzimenti asked whether the new software options under consideration would allow for the evaluation of courses that are team-taught. Associate Dean Brown expressed confidence that the new software would allow for this.

Professor Buckley observed that a massive culture change around teaching is being proposed by the task force. She added that, having recently gone through the tenure process, she was left with the impression that one's teaching evaluations must be uniformly perfect from the beginning in order to meet tenure expectations. This also appears to be the expectation for instructional-track faculty seeking promotion. Any weakness in the teaching record could serve as a justification for blocking the progress of the faculty member. She stressed that an extensive education effort must be undertaken to inform units at every level of these new directions recommended by the task force. Professor Buckley commented that, although faculty understand what constitutes good teaching, what has in fact been valued during the tenure and promotion process is students' highly subjective feelings of happiness with their courses. This is very frustrating for instructors. Associate Dean Brown commented that the task force is proposing shifting responsibility for teaching evaluations away from ITS and to the Provost's Office. The task force recommends the establishment of an institutionalized committee that includes the associate provosts and faculty representatives. This committee will study the ways in which the teaching culture change proposed here can be advanced. He stressed that we must shift the way we think institutionally about assessment of teaching, and both the Provost's Office and faculty governance should be in the forefront of this multi-year endeavor. Early pockets of success can be held up as models for the rest of the university.

Professor Glass wondered whether the elimination of norms in the teaching assessment process could be mandated. Associate Dean Brown commented that the Provost's Office is unlikely to mandate this unless faculty governance supports it. He added that in his conversations with deans, he has pointed out that comparisons to norms are meaningless if we are truly striving to improve an individual faculty member's teaching. Professor Erdahl expressed support for the task force's approach. She asked if irrelevant comments (about the instructor's appearance, for example) could be removed from evaluation reports by the software program before those reports are given to department heads and faculty members. Associate Dean Brown commented that the three proposed open-ended questions focus on what the instructor does to help the student learn, what the instructor could do better next time the course is taught, and any additional comments from the student. Irrelevant comments usually appear in response to the last item. So, one solution could be to use the software to screen out these types of responses. Another solution could be to propose that, for the purposes of tenure and promotion, the responses to the third question are unnecessary.

Professor Wurster moved and Professor Sheerin seconded that the Faculty Council support the teaching assessment initiatives, including the financial components, proposed by the Task Force to Revise ACE. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Glass urged that additional conversations occur regarding the issues discussed here today. Professor Buckley thanked the task force for their important work. President Daack-Hirsch emphasized that the proposed culture change must also be embraced by faculty peer groups during the tenure and promotion processes.

- *Continuation of Agenda Planning Discussion (Sandy Daack-Hirsch)*
President Daack-Hirsch reminded the group of the discussion held at the last Council meeting regarding issues for the Senate to address in the coming year. She added that the Senate has tended to be a reactive body, merely responding to speakers who ask to appear on the meeting agendas. However, the Senate should be proactive, deciding what topics it would like to consider and then developing action steps for standing or ad hoc committees and work groups to carry out. Planning for the priorities of the next year should begin in the spring semester of the previous year. President Daack-Hirsch noted that among the topics Councilors discussed at the last meeting were the decline in tenure-track faculty hiring and the resulting feeling of isolation among the existing tenure-track faculty members; recruitment and retention, prioritizing under-represented minority faculty; systematic improvement across all faculty demographics to enhance retention; a system to evaluate up (DEO's, deans, etc.) on an annual basis; and continued improvement of parental leave policy.

Vice President Yockey added that the Senate officers are beginning to build the program for the annual Faculty Council/Administrative retreat, to take place in August. He explained that his original plan for the retreat focus was the collegiate entrepreneurship that the university's new budget model seeks to foster, in order to find new sources of collegiate revenue. However, following the January Council meeting, he is now considering building the retreat focus around some of the topics discussed then. He asked for ongoing feedback about the retreat focus. Turning to the issue of how the Senate would accomplish its goals, President Daack-Hirsch noted that the Senate's committee structure is not very deep, unlike the committee structures for the staff and student governance groups. Work groups or task forces will likely need to be formed. She added that a task force on catastrophic leave and parental leave is already being put together and will include faculty representatives along with HR staff. Possibilities for this task force to consider include the institution of a new short-term disability benefit or the establishment of vacation leave for nine-month faculty.

In addition to the topics President Daack-Hirsch listed for the Senate to focus on, Professor Glass suggested the issue of the high turnover among senior administrators and the resulting expenses for external searches. Professor Wurster added that, for external hires, we should weigh the benefits in innovation that person brings against the momentum the person loses while learning about the institution. Professor Erdahl commented that a task force on recruitment and retention could begin its work by trying to identify the most pressing issues in this area. Professor Foley Nicpon noted that the Provost's Office has developed a pilot project on recruitment and retention that we should look at if we take up this topic. Councilors observed that there may be numerous such initiatives across campus, but that they are not widely known. They concurred that the Senate could be the medium for the amplification of the faculty voice on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. President Daack-Hirsch noted that the Senate officers are called upon to serve on a wide variety of university committees. While the officers appreciate

being included, this extensive committee service leaves them with little time to carry out the Senate's own initiatives. Therefore, the formation of work groups and task forces will be essential to the achievement of the Senate's goals. Vice President Yockey commented that it might be helpful not just to focus on "the big picture," which can be daunting, but also to work on incremental change, for example, taking a close look at and recommending changes to the exit interview for faculty who choose to leave UI for another institution. President Daack-Hirsch concluded the discussion by indicating that the Council would further refine its topic list and next steps at the April meeting.

- *Policy Revisions (Sandy Daack-Hirsch)*
  President Daack-Hirsch gave a brief update on some recent minor university policy changes. She indicated that the university is moving towards uniformity in the use of UI logos. The UI Brand policy has been revised regarding the stated uses and requirements for UI logos. Exceptions can be made for centers that may be required to display other logos in addition to the UI logo. The Conflict of Interest in the Workplace policy and the Conflict of Commitment policy have been modified to indicate where in the Operations Manual that dispute procedures for the various faculty tracks can be found. Also, University Human Resources, which already manages the conflict of interest and conflict of commitment processes for staff, will now manage the COI and COC processes for faculty, too, in close collaboration with the Associate Provost for Faculty. Minor wording changes were made to the Anti-Harassment policy following recommendations from the recent employment practices review. These changes do not impact how the policy is implemented. The Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee has reviewed and approved these policy changes.

- *President's Report (Sandy Daack-Hirsch)*
  Regarding the coronavirus outbreak, President Daack-Hirsch indicated that the university is taking steps to deal with this unfolding international public health crisis, including developing contingency plans for faculty, staff, and students. The university has also established a website for all coronavirus-related information, https://coronavirus.uiowa.edu/.

IV.   From the Floor – There were no items from the floor.

V.   Announcements
   - The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 24, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
   - The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 14, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2520D UCC.

VI.   Adjournment – President Daack-Hirsch thanked councilors for their feedback. Professor Glass moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the meeting be adjourned.   The motion carried unanimously.   President Daack-Hirsch adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.