

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, October 18, 2016
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

Senators Present: F. Ahmad, L. Allen, C. Barnhardt, C. Benson, M. Blumberg, R. Boudreau, C. Brochu, G. Buettner, S. Campo, D. Caplan, J. Colgan, K. Culp, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, P. Dilley, S. Duck, A. Durnev, B. Eckstein, R. Ganim, D. Hall, S. Harwani, Z. Jin, A. Jung, J. Kolker, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, U. Mallik, K. Messingham, T. Midtrod, M. Nikolas, R. Oral, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, J. Scott, L. Segre, J. Streit, K. Tachau, J. Taylor, T. Treat, S. Vigmostad, M. Voigt, J. Wang, E. Wasserman, P. Wesely, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, D. Wurster.

Officers Present: C. Bohannon, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.

Senators Excused: M. Adamek, P. Brophy, F. Durham, T. Gallanis, I. Grumbach, A. Kwitek, T. Marshall, P. Romitti, G. Ryan, C. Thomas, S. Vos.

Senators Absent: R. Balakrishnan, J. Barker, B. Dixon, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, J. Klesney-Tait, K. Lamping, W. Maury, L. Ostedgaard, L. Plakans, R. Sah, D. Segaloff, J. Szot, H. Udaykumar, J. Welburn, J. Yockey.

Guests: G. Gussin (Emeritus Faculty Council), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), C. McKinney (Office of Strategic Communication), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Vaughn called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
 - A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Wilder moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (September 20, 2016) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Brochu seconded that the minutes be provisionally accepted, with the changes suggested by Professor Tachau to be presented at the next Senate meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
 - C. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Michael Moore (History) to the Student Publications Board, 2016-19
 - John Logsdon (Biology) to the Student Publications Board, 2016-19Professor Campo moved and Professor Treat seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Benefits Update (Joan Troester, Interim Assistant Vice President of Benefits)*

Ms. Troester noted that the benefits enrollment period would take place this year November 1-20. Faculty will receive an email message notifying them of the enrollment period. She then went on to describe several changes that will occur within our benefits plan. She indicated that there will be rate increases for the health insurance plan, along with a slight increase in the dental premium. The \$200 stay-away credit has been eliminated, per federal law. This was a credit given to those employees who elected not to enroll in the UI health care plan. Effective September 1 of this year, UI Choice now covers transgender care, including medically-necessary reassignment surgery services. Starting January 1, a \$5 co-pay will be instituted at the Quick Care clinics (previously there was no co-pay). Spouse and dependent life insurance levels have been increased. Several pilot programs are underway, including a program for diabetes management. Ms. Troester ended her remarks by commenting that the university has a very robust benefits plan for employees and that she feels confident about the value provided by the benefit plan design.

- *President's Report (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn began his report by requesting that all new senators and then all Faculty Council members stand and be recognized for their service.

Moving on to an update on summer events, President Vaughn noted that the Board of Regents, State of Iowa had revised their bylaws. In the section on academic freedom, the language was broadened to include teaching assistants, staff with teaching assignments, etc. (the word *faculty* in this section was changed to *teachers*). The Regents also inserted language about research and research publications that parallels language recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). President Vaughn also indicated that a Shared Governance Coordinating Committee on Inclusion and Campus Climate was formed by the administration and the shared governance bodies. This group meets weekly to allow members to provide updates to each other on climate, diversity, and inclusion efforts underway. Past President Bohannon is the Faculty Senate's primary delegate to this group.

This afternoon, shared governance leaders attended a budget meeting with representatives from the various organizational units on campus. There are a number of strategic initiatives that had been identified over the summer that have now been built into the budget; the group heard about progress being made on these projects. President Vaughn reminded senators that seven years ago a revised version of the Faculty Senate constitution was brought before the Board of Regents for approval. However, the Regents took issue with a number of passages and the revised constitution was withdrawn from consideration. He has now asked the Senate's Rules and Bylaws Committee to examine the revision with the intention of updating it and presenting it to the Senate and the Regents again sometime in the future. The Senate has fallen somewhat behind in its review schedule of central academic offices, so President Vaughn has reached out to the administration to determine how to get back on schedule.

President Vaughn commented that he has been approached by several senators who have requested that the Senate spend more time engaged in discussion on matters of great importance to faculty. He requested that senators send suggested discussion topics to him.

- *Ad Hoc AAUP Sanction Removal Committee (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn indicated that the charge of this committee, created by the Senate at the last meeting, is *to explore mechanisms and recommend appropriate actions aimed at the removal of the AAUP sanctions*. The chair of the committee will be Sandra Daack-Hirsch (Nursing). Members of the committee include Frank Durham (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Russell Ganim (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Edward Gillan (Liberal Arts & Sciences), Justine Kolker (Dentistry), and Christie Thomas (Medicine).

Professor Scott thanked the officers for launching the committee. He added that, for this hiring cycle, the university is hobbled by this stigma and we need to have the sanction removed as soon as possible, so that it does not impact next year's hiring cycle. He stated that his professional organization urges job-seekers to ascertain whether an institution appears on the AAUP sanction list before applying to a position. Professor Scott stressed that the sanction is one of the most urgent issues that the Senate has to deal with. He commented that Regents and administrators may not feel the urgency to the degree that faculty do. Professor Scott doubted, however, that this committee would have success unless it is directed to work closely with the local chapter of the AAUP. He added that the committee should move as quickly as possible. President Vaughn noted that the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Values had recently met with the executive committee of the local chapter of the AAUP. Professor Tachau commented that one of the first concrete steps for the Regents to take to show a willingness to cooperate with shared governance would be to consider approving the revised Senate constitution this year. The concerns raised by the Regents years ago about the revision that led to it being tabled were largely based on misunderstandings. She stressed that it is important for the Senate to adhere to its own rules, i.e., the Senate constitution, if we would want the Regents to follow their rules.

- *Update on Strategic Plan, Strategy Implementation Team (SIT), and Operations Team (OT) (Pete Snyder)*

Vice President Snyder indicated that he would explain changes to the university's budgeting processes that have occurred over the last year. He noted that previously, budgeting was primarily done centrally by the administration. He emphasized that under the new process, there is a much greater role for faculty, as well as for other members of shared governance, and expressed the view that this is a positive development. Vice President Snyder explained that there are two basic parts to the budget. One part, base budgeting, encompasses things that we are already doing. These are units' annual budgets, which previously were created centrally. Now, however, base budgeting has been de-centralized out to the colleges. This new collegiate responsibility for annual budgets could impact faculty significantly. Major collegiate budgeting decisions, such as strategic priorities, could now be influenced by faculty.

The other component of the new budgeting process is strategic planning. This involves new initiatives that could move the university forward. This type of planning also used to occur at the

central level. Under the new budgeting model, however, there is a greatly increased role for shared governance. Two committees have been formed to deal with these projects, the Strategy Implementation Team (SIT) and the Operations Team (OT). SIT will deal with projects that have a longer time frame (1-5 years), while OT will handle projects that have a shorter time frame (0-18 months). Vice President Snyder displayed a diagram illustrating the new budgeting process. The UI Strategic Plan identifies the overall goals of the university, as well as some specific initiatives. Other ideas for initiatives come from faculty, staff, and students. For example, last spring the Senate solicited suggestions from the entire faculty. Those suggestions have been incorporated into this process already. Recently, the Senate again solicited ideas. The SIT and OT review, prioritize and streamline these solicited proposals. Those proposals that are most highly prioritized are passed on to subject expert task forces, which strategize how to develop the proposals. The Senate officers have recommended faculty members to sit on these task forces. The task forces also interface with the charter committees and others on campus with relevant expertise. The final phase would be implementation, which might involve the acquiring of funding, the writing of policies, etc. Appropriate individuals would become involved at this stage of the process.

Vice President Snyder stressed that faculty have been involved in all aspects of this new budgeting process. Faculty helped develop the strategic plan, they serve on the SIT and OT, they have been asked to sit on the subject expert task forces, and many already serve on charter and other university committees that will be asked for input. Vice President Snyder displayed a list of the members of both the SIT and the OT. He indicated that more information about the teams' projects could be found at <https://pathforward.uiowa.edu/issues>. The OT is working on, for example, academic innovation, a central student garden, competency-based education, and cultural centers. The SIT is currently working on eight initiatives, including national research standing, underrepresented minority participation in graduate/professional programs, the undergraduate academic experience, campus inclusion/climate, and the strategic budgeting process.

- *Top Ten Initiative Process (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn explained that the administration has asked each of the shared governance groups to put forward about ten high-priority issues for their constituent groups. He noted that in the future the process of identifying these issues will begin at the start of the semester. This time, however, a message went out to all faculty last week requesting proposals by October 21. About a dozen proposals have come in so far. These proposals will be reviewed at the November 15 Faculty Council meeting and Councilors will decide which proposals to put forward at this time for consideration during this budget year. President Vaughn reminded the group that a similar message had gone out to faculty last spring, and some of those proposals have been taken up by the SIT and OT. Proposals not taken up at this time could be brought forward again.

Professor Tachau commented that, while there is faculty involvement in other parts of the new budgeting process, it appears that the first step, the allocation of base budgets to the units, is still controlled by central administration, with the result that these amounts are simply increased incrementally each year, without regard to whether any changes should be made. She

also asked if faculty senates at other CIC institutions are involved in this type of prioritizing. Vice President Snyder responded that these are questions being actively talked about on campus. He added that last year there was discussion among administrators and shared governance whether we should start from scratch regarding how much funding goes to each unit, or if we should accept the historical reasons why base budgets are the amounts that they currently are and go from there. A decision was made to adopt the latter model, because it is very difficult to start from zero. Faculty primarily have input into these issues through budget retreat meetings, which include senators and the co-chairs of the Faculty Staff Budget Committee. It is possible that this decision could be revisited, with some sort of middle alternative eventually being developed.

Vice President Snyder observed that we are in a complicated situation. Previously most of the university's money came from the state and was allocated where it was needed. The overarching principle of this new budget model is that all units must act in the best interests of the university as a whole. Professor Tachau commented that she was interested in the Senate's role in establishing what proportion of the entire budget goes to the academic side of the university. Vice President Snyder responded that this is not a decision that faculty have traditionally been involved in, either here or at our peer institutions. With this new budgeting process, however, faculty here now have an unprecedented opportunity to be involved in the financial decisions of the university. While faculty must still remain vigilant to be sure their voices are heard, administration has thus far been very receptive to faculty input.

Professor Tachau commented that she had once served on a General Education Task Force, charged with finding \$12 million to cut from the general fund so that this money could be used for other purposes. Members of the task force were faculty, staff, and administrators. The task force was provided with vast amounts of data, far more than she had ever seen as a member of the Faculty Staff Budget Committee. She stressed that there was, therefore, precedent for the Senate to advocate for as much funding as possible to come to the academic side of the university. She added that her colleagues in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences do not feel that all the College's needs have been met and it is possible that faculty in other colleges feel the same. President Vaughn noted that at today's budget retreat meeting, both deans and shared governance leaders advocated for greater access to data.

Professor Mallik commented that building maintenance is a significant component of ongoing expenses, mostly coming from the general fund. Some colleges have more new buildings than others and this should be kept in mind when considering the overall university budget. Vice President Snyder commented that previously, operating expenses such as this were taken off the top of the budget. Now, units must justify each year how much money they need, including money needed to operate buildings. Professor Wilder asked where workers' compensation costs come from. Vice President Snyder did not know, but he commented that faculty and staff salaries are now the responsibilities of the units. Professor Wilder observed that we can keep costs down in this area through ergonomics and sustainability.

Commenting that it seemed to her that the campus' needs were barely met under the old budgeting model, Professor Oral wondered where the extra money beyond base budgeting

would come from for new strategic initiatives proposed under the new budgeting model. Vice President Snyder indicated that we must look at where our funding comes from generally. Sources of funding that could potentially see increases include the state appropriation, tuition, TIER savings, and philanthropy. Also, university budgeting used to take place on a yearly basis. President Harreld has observed that, in order to do strategic planning, we must think about our budget over a longer-term basis, two to five years. For example, the university could have a five-year tuition strategy.

Past President Bohannon commented that the Faculty Staff Budget Committee has been trying to determine its role in this new budgeting process. Prior to the new process, the Committee largely weighed in only on salary policy. Salary policy, however, has now been allocated out to the colleges. The Faculty Staff Budget Committee will take on different tasks under the new budgeting model, such as weighing in at certain points of the process, as proposals move through the SIT and OT committees. The Committee could also have input on “bigger picture” issues, such as determining the appropriate level of enrollment for the university. Now that budgeting has been decentralized to the colleges, it is more challenging for the Committee to find a consistent role for itself, since it does not interact with collegiate administration. Past President Bohannon invited suggestions for guidance on this issue. Vice President Snyder commented that deans will likely want input from their faculty, since they will now need to answer to their faculty if there are budget difficulties in the colleges. He added that this is a prime time for faculty to get involved in collegiate budgeting.

Professor Macfarland asked if there was a mechanism to allocate funding from under-performing units in one college to high-performing units in another college; if such a mechanism does not exist at this time, perhaps we should consider it. Vice President Snyder responded that under the new budgeting model, there is no provision for shifting money between colleges. He added that if a unit has a new initiative, it could be funded by a college’s base budget or it could be funded through the new strategic initiative process. Professor Caplan asked for clarification about the role of the deans in the new budgeting process. It appeared that they might be in competition with each other. He also asked how the new budgeting process would support the university president as he seeks greater funding for the university from the state. Vice President Snyder explained that once new initiatives are developed through the SIT and OT, it then becomes the responsibility of the deans to keep them moving forward. The most successful initiative proposals will likely be those that involve several colleges, in which case more resources would become available to sustain these projects. He added that one of the most important tasks of the university president is to let the Board of Regents and the legislature know about the great work being done at UI. Faculty also need to get this message out.

Professor Barnhardt commented that we should ascertain the robustness of shared governance within colleges. She noted that, while decentralizing the budgeting to the colleges might give faculty an unprecedented opportunity for input on colleges’ financial matters, that input might depend on the quality of the shared governance structure within the colleges. She speculated that the quality of shared governance might vary across the university. Vice President Snyder concurred and added that this was an opportunity for local shared governance to be improved. Dean Johnsen, from the College of Dentistry, observed that deans do have a great

deal of discretion regarding how funds are distributed within their colleges. What deans look for, however, from the university's strategic planning are whether it provides a sense of direction and whether it is explicit enough to serve as a guide for making decisions regarding resources.

- *Campus Inclusion Team (Christina Bohannon)*

Past President Bohannon, who serves as chair of the Senate's recently-formed Committee on Academic Values, explained that her committee is focused on fundamental values such as free speech, academic freedom, tenure, and shared governance. The Committee's first task had been to review a proposal for a bias assessment response team, similar to those in existence on some other campuses. The team would hear complaints from students about incidents of bias, e.g., a racial slur in a residence hall or a potentially controversial statement by a faculty member that caused offence to a student. The team could then take some type of action. At some universities, this action could take the form of an investigation leading to punishment. Some universities also allow for anonymous reports, some of which have later turned out to be hoaxes. The Committee raised concerns with the administration regarding academic freedom and free speech, so the administration asked the Committee to produce an alternative proposal. The result will be the creation of a Campus Inclusion Team. Publicity in the coming weeks will introduce the campus to this new service.

Staff members on the Campus Inclusion Team who will hear student concerns will be located in the Center for Diversity and Enrichment and in the Office of Student Life. They will be trained on issues related to academic freedom and free speech. Staff may also try to educate students who seek assistance about these issues. If the complaint concerns a faculty member, the student will be encouraged to speak directly to the faculty member about their concerns. The Team will be modeled somewhat on the Office of the Ombudsperson. The Team will not be investigative or punitive and it will not issue formal reports. There will not be a mechanism through which to submit anonymous complaints. The Team will help students think through and deal with the issue. If a policy violation appears to have occurred, however, students will be directed elsewhere to make a report regarding harassment or discrimination.

Professor Macfarland asked if a Faculty Senate statement supporting free speech and academic freedom exists. If not, should one be created? Past President Bohannon responded that there was some language in the Operations Manual regarding free speech and academic freedom, particularly in regards to tenure. Professor Macfarland noted that this language seems to apply only to faculty and wondered if a general UI statement was needed to affirm that a university should be a place where a wide variety of ideas can be explored. Past President Bohannon commented that there has been some discussion about creating such a statement for UI. Other universities, such as the University of Chicago, have already done this. She added that, in her view, this might be a good thing for UI to do and that it would also be helpful for the administration, giving them something to draw upon when they need to respond to incidents that occur here. She cautioned, however, that we need to be careful about how we draft such a statement. Some university statements could be interpreted as showing a lack of concern about diversity, inclusion, and campus climate. She did not think that diversity and inclusion, and free speech and academic freedom were mutually exclusive. Professor Tachau concurred, and observed that the AAUP has published a number of statements on these issues.

Past President Bohannon went on to say that she thought that the university's commitment to research, even on controversial topics, was clear. In her view, the problem lately has been a perceived tension between free speech and academic freedom on the one hand, and sensitivity, diversity, and inclusion on the other. As an example, she mentioned a classroom exercise at another university in which the professor asked the students to debate issues around transgender rights. One student felt this was inappropriate because it appeared to be a challenge to that student's identity. Professor Macfarland suggested that the Senate produce a thoughtful document on these important issues.

Professor Nikolas asked if there was any plan to do a formal orientation to these issues for students when they first come to the university. Students might feel more comfortable later on approaching faculty if they have had some training in academic freedom issues at the start of their university experiences. Past President Bohannon agreed and noted that this is now being done here to a limited extent. She added that inserting additional information into an already packed orientation may not be helpful, since students may be overwhelmed at that time and not retain anything. Other suggestions might be to offer an individual course on these topics, or insert an academic freedom module into the Success at Iowa online required course. Faculty Senate also plans to host a forum on academic freedom along with student government. Past President Bohannon commented that it seems unclear to many students just what academic freedom is, and therefore some students view it unfavorably.

Noting that, in her college, course syllabi are required to include a variety of information, Professor Nikolas suggested that perhaps a statement about academic freedom could also be added to syllabi university-wide. Professor Ganim urged that the Graduate Student Senate also participate in the proposed forum, especially since training for teaching assistants may not include much information on academic freedom. Perhaps in the future, such training could be included in orientation for teaching assistants. The Graduate College should also be part of this conversation. Professor Jung suggested that students be educated on academic freedom and free speech issues going into their second semester or second year at the university. Professor Brochu agreed that new students are overwhelmed with information at orientation and may not be receptive yet to the notion of academic freedom.

Professor Barnhardt commented that instead of a Senate statement on academic freedom we could make a public affirmation that the faculty are open to discussions with students about topics of inclusion, academic freedom, etc. She noted that students around the country appear to be frustrated with their administrations regarding campus climate. Past President Bohannon cited information from a survey indicating that some of the highest priority demands of students who had been protesting on campuses around the country recently included calls for more meaningful strides toward diversity and inclusion, such as hiring more faculty from underrepresented groups. We need to work in good faith toward realizing those goals, because when we don't do that, trust breaks down between students and faculty and administrators. Professor Macfarland commented that the best time to educate students about academic freedom is even before they come here, when they are still looking for a college. We should broadcast a message that UI is a school that takes a research-based approach to issues, but that

students will be accommodated and their hopes and fears will be dealt with sympathetically rather than rejected. He thought that we could come up with a two-part statement indicating that this is a friendly place for students of all backgrounds, while at the same time we have a hard-nosed approach to determining the truth.

IV. From the Floor – President Vaughn asked senators how they communicate with their collegiate constituents about Senate matters. Professor Daack-Hirsch, from the College of Nursing, indicated that she is part of the executive team of her college, along with the deans and chairs. She informs this group about issues that arise in the Council and the Senate. The college also has a highly-developed faculty governance structure through which faculty are kept regularly apprised of Senate issues. Professor Buettner, from the Carver College of Medicine, notifies his colleagues of Senate business at faculty meetings. Professor Caplan, from the College of Dentistry, notifies his colleagues via email when requested by the Senate. There are also three collegiate meetings per year, and if the Senate needs input on a particular issue, then the senators will be given a spot on the agenda. Professor Jung noted that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly leadership meets occasionally with the Senate officers. Professor Mallik suggested that the officers regularly pass on to senators items for dissemination and discussion.

Past President Bohannon observed that as part of determining the climate for shared governance at each college, the Senate officers could suggest to the deans that time be set aside on collegiate shared governance body agendas for Senate updates and requests. Professor Nikolas urged that time be set aside occasionally at Senate meetings for senators to bring forward issues from their colleges. She added that she would like to see more time in general at Senate meetings set aside for discussion of current concerns. Professor Kolker commented that she feels that she is sometimes expected to cast votes in Senate meetings before she has a clear understanding of the issues involved and before she has had a chance to discuss the issues with her collegiate colleagues. Professor Tachau suggested that the draft Senate agenda be sent out to senators immediately after it is approved by the Council, along with any accompanying documents. This would give senators more time to review the information and formulate questions and comments after communicating with constituents.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 15, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 6, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The Center for Teaching will be hosting an interactive workshop on *Difficult Dialogues and Stereotype Threat: Facilitating Effective Classroom Discussions*, Monday, October 24, 2:00-5:00 pm, Pappajohn Business Building S401

VI. Adjournment – Professor Brochu moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.