

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 24, 2017
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: F. Durham, A. Durnev, R. Ganim, T. Marshall, R. Oral, L. Plakans, P. Romitti, J. Szot, K. Tachau, H. Udaykumar, M. Voigt, S. Vos, E. Wasserman.

Officers Present: E. Dove, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.

Councilors Excused: S. Daack-Hirsch, G. Ryan, C. Thomas.

Councilors Absent: J. Yockey.

Guests: J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), M. Payne (Daily Iowan), 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 Ganim moved and Professor Durnev seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (November 15, 2016) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Romitti seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (February 14, 2017) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the agenda be revised to include the item *Legislative Initiatives Relevant to the Public Universities*. Secretary Gillan commented that these initiatives may well be covered in the agenda item, *President's Report*. Professor Tachau responded that some faculty members have asked that such an item be included, so we should listen to them. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Tachau moved and Professor Voigt seconded that the agenda item labels *Decision*, *Information*, and *Discussion* be removed hereafter from Council and Senate agendas. She added that these labels appear to reflect a tendency of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa to label many of the Board's agenda items *Decision* in order to limit discussion in public. Vice President Snyder noted that the label *Decision* indicates that Councilors or Senators should review meeting materials in preparation for taking a vote on an issue. Professor Tachau responded that Councilors and Senators should review the materials whether or not a vote is to be taken. Professor Marshall commented that, in her experience, a *Decision* item is one that will be acted on quickly, while *Information* items allow for greater discussion. Professor Wasserman found that labeling items in the *Approvals* section as *Decision* was

redundant. In the *New Business* section, there is so little distinction between the *Information* and *Discussion* labels as to make them unnecessary. Vice President Snyder and Secretary Gillan commented that there may be *Decision* items, such as a new policy, in the *New Business* section also. Past President Dove observed that labels on agenda items came into use while he was serving as Faculty Senate President. The labels were not intended to reduce discussion, but rather to indicate to Councilors and Senators what the Senate officers had in mind for each item. Professor Wasserman noted that all of the items under *New Business* on the draft Senate agenda are labeled as *Information*. He expressed strong dissatisfaction, stressing that the Faculty Senate is a deliberative body that should be discussing matters of importance. Information, on the other hand, could simply be sent to Senators to read, rather than taking up meeting time for presentations. If there is nothing for Senators to discuss, what is the point of meeting?

In a hand vote, the motion did not carry.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that all future *Information* agenda items be routinely changed to *Discussion* to encourage same. Professor Vos indicated agreement with the motion but commented that she viewed items labeled *Discussion* as requiring a greater degree of preparation than items labeled *Information*. If there is an intentional difference between the two labels, then they should be maintained; if not, then she supported the motion. Professor Oral commented that in her experience on the Council, every agenda item, even those labeled *Information*, allowed for discussion. Professor Tachau commented that preparation is necessary for all agenda items, although materials are not always provided in advance. Secretary Gillan questioned the need to wordsmith the agenda. He felt that the Senate officers need flexibility when crafting the agenda. Professor Romitti urged that the group move on to the meeting's business. Professor Plakans suggested labeling only items that require a decision.

The hand vote was tied. In the absence of a definitive vote, the Senate officers indicated that they understood the concerns expressed and would be more deliberate about future agenda labels.

- D. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
- None at this time.

III. New Business

- *Executive Session: Tenure Bill (Keith Saunders, Governmental Relations)*

Professor Ganim moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the Council move into closed session, inviting the members of the Governmental Relations Committee to remain in the room. The motion carried unanimously.

Via videoconference, Keith Saunders, of the UI Office of Governmental Relations, gave an update on the legislative session, including a bill pertaining to tenure. He then answered questions from Councilors.

Professor Yockey moved and Professor Durnev seconded that the Council move out of closed session. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn announced that Past President Bohannon has taken a faculty fellow position in the Provost's Office and therefore stepped down from her Faculty Senate officer role. Former Faculty Senate President Ed Dove will take on Past President duties for the spring 2017 semester.

President Vaughn reminded the group that the formation of the new Campus Inclusion Team (CIT) was announced at last week's annual Update on Diversity and Inclusion. The primary purpose of the CIT is to support students who feel they have experienced incidents of bias. At the same time, the CIT will be sensitive to issues of academic freedom and freedom of speech, and will not be investigative or punitive. The services of the CIT will only be available to students, but perhaps in the future services will be expanded to faculty and staff.

Last week a memo from Provost Butler regarding an academic organizational structure study was forwarded by many deans to their faculty members. Past President Dove expressed the opinion that this study is one of the most important issues facing the university right now. It was unclear to him what the rationale for the study might be. Professor Durham speculated that the study might lead to attempts to shrink the university to a more elite, efficient institution. Professor Tachau agreed that the rationale was not clear, but commented that it could be related to impending budget cuts for the university. She added that other institutions' experiences have shown that little savings are attained from such restructuring efforts. Moreover, there are few departments that could comfortably fit into a college different from the one in which they already reside.

President Vaughn commented that the Senate officers have spoken only briefly so far to Provost Butler about the study. In these conversations, Provost Butler had indicated that possibly nothing would change, but that it would be a good idea to review the university's current structure, since we have not done so in a long time. President Vaughn expressed the opinion that this effort might lead to the university becoming more productive. Professor Voigt commented that educational needs are changing rapidly; lifelong learning, rather than simply a four-year degree, now seems necessary in order to maintain employment. Perhaps an examination of the university's relevance to society is a goal of the study. Professor Wasserman suggested that the university president or the provost address the Senate and explain what they have in mind for the study. Vice President Snyder commented that the four deans leading this effort have been given wide latitude to develop the study. There does not seem to be a specific goal in mind at this time. He added that it is encouraging that shared governance will be involved in every step of the process.

Professor Tachau commented that one of the elements the study should look at is whether relevance is a useful measure for us. Unlike the professional school degrees, liberal arts degrees are less closely aligned with specific jobs. Many liberal arts faculty work in fields that are

important in relation to other things – calculus, for example, has relevance to a wide range of fields. Past President Dove commented that we must remain vigilant regarding this process. Professor Ganim concurred, noting the relatively quick timeline for the process. President Vaughn indicated that he has contacted the four deans, stressing the Senate officers' desire to be involved in the process. He was also told by Provost Butler that, while these four deans are leading the effort, they are not expected to have any more influence on the process than the other deans. Professor Tachau observed that the act of sending the memo to the deans to disseminate within their colleges implies that the colleges are separate entities, but what makes us a university is our interconnectedness. The Senate is a place where that interconnectedness is discussed. Professor Wasserman still felt that it would be useful to hear from the president or provost regarding the study, to obtain a better sense of the goals toward which the study will move us. Secretary Gillan commented that the Council might be a more appropriate venue for this conversation, given the early stages of the study.

Professor Oral wondered about possible connections between this memo and the university budget. She expressed concern that private funding, from questionable sources, may move in to fill the budget gaps that the university experiences. These funding entities may seek to train students for their own purposes. Professor Tachau stressed that the most important time in a process to have input is at the beginning. The notion that the university is made up of separate units that can make their own decisions is a philosophical viewpoint that not all faculty share. Therefore, this is an issue that we should eventually discuss as a Senate. Also, she added, what about entities that are not part of a college? The art museum, for example, may be looked upon by some as a source of entertainment, but for the School of Art and Art History it is as crucial as laboratories to chemistry or the hospital to medicine.

- *Working at Iowa Survey Results (Teresa Kulper, Director, Human Resource Services, UI Organizational Effectiveness/Organizational Development)*

Ms. Kulper's presentation focused on the results of the 2016 Working at Iowa survey. She noted that results likely have already been distributed within university units, because reports were generated more quickly this year. Action-planning may even be taking place within some units. Turning to the university-wide results, Ms. Kulper noted that participation dropped slightly this year, from about 67% last time the survey was administered to 60% this time. Other institutions struggle to obtain a 40% participation rate, so the university is still doing well. A reason for the drop has not been identified. The lowest participation rate (46%) occurred in the merit employee category. Not all merit employees use computers on a regular basis, so this poses a barrier to participation. Professor Wasserman observed from Ms. Kulper's slides that professional & scientific employees had the highest participation rate, both in terms of percentage (66%) and of actual numbers. He asked why this was so. Ms. Kulper speculated that accessibility plays a role; many professional & scientific employees use computers throughout the day, so this facilitates access to the online survey. Significant messaging takes place throughout the survey period and survey ambassadors promote the survey in their units. These efforts may most easily reach professional & scientific employees. Professor Wasserman suggested that the reason for this high participation rate be determined, so that similar rates can be generated for the other employee groups.

After noting that employee engagement positively impacts productivity, turnover, and absenteeism, Ms. Kulper turned to a list of the UI work environment's strengths, as indicated by the survey results. Survey statements that generated over a 90% agreement response included *know my work expectations*, *know my contribution to mission*, *unit focus on customer service*, *recommend UI for employment*, and *supervisor treats me with respect*. Ms. Kulper commented that Professor Eean Crawford of the Tippie College of Business advises the Working at Iowa survey group. Professor Crawford has indicated that his research has shown that engagement comes about through alignment (understanding how one's work makes a difference), support (having a supervisor who cares about employees), and the opportunity to develop.

Seven questions have been asked consistently since the survey was first administered in 2006. Agreement with a statement regarding *managing conflicts constructively* has risen 13% (64% to 77%) from 2006 to 2016. Ms. Kulper credited the outreach efforts of the Office of the Ombudsperson, among other offices, for this improvement. Opportunities for additional improvement among faculty occur in the areas of *workload distribution*, *support for work and personal life*, *UI treats faculty and staff with respect*, and *UI recognizes accomplishments of faculty and staff*. Ms. Kulper observed that the issue of workload distribution is a concern across all three employee groups. Professor Tachau commented that faculty in her college are provided with both their departmental and their collegiate survey results. There can be wide variations between the two. She asked if faculty responses to the statements *UI treats faculty and staff with respect* and *recommend UI for employment* differ by college. Ms. Kulper responded that there is currently no focus on comparing results in this way. The survey group is most concerned with identifying factors that drive engagement and then developing action plans to increase engagement. The type of result analysis described by Professor Tachau may be something the group takes up in the future, if it seems warranted. A pilot study currently underway will help identify what factors drive engagement specifically for UI employees.

Following up on Professor Tachau's comments, Secretary Gillan observed that certain portions of the campus may have particular needs which could be identified through greater analysis of the survey results. Some colleges may be better at fostering engagement than others. Ms. Kulper responded that the impetus for change within a college or division typically comes from the dean or vice president. She agreed that comparing results between units would be helpful in identifying opportunities for improvement. Professor Ganim commented that some faculty find the survey questions vague and not always applicable to their circumstances. For example, faculty are often not sure if the term *supervisor* refers to the DEO, the dean, or someone else. Ms. Kulper acknowledged this issue. She recalled that there had been an effort some years back to develop a survey targeted specifically at faculty, but she was unsure of the fate of that initiative.

Professor Tachau expressed concern that a significant percentage of faculty in her college has indicated that they would not recommend the UI to others as an employer. She wondered if this was true for other colleges, especially for colleges that teach undergraduates. This information could be very useful to faculty, even though such analysis is not the main purpose of the survey. Ms. Kulper indicated her willingness to work with faculty members, perhaps through a committee or focus group, to compare and analyze the survey results in this way. Professor

Wasserman encouraged a sharing of collegiate reports by Council members. Data from all of the collegiate reports could be compiled into a single report, allowing for cross-collegiate comparisons. Administrative approval may be required for this effort, which would clearly show which units should be targeted for improvement. Ms. Kulper responded that she would look into following up with administrators regarding these suggestions.

Turning briefly to the topic of ongoing changes within University Human Resources, Ms. Kulper reminded the group that the Talent @Iowa Task Force had produced various recommendations related to recruitment and retention. Efforts are underway to ensure that human resource functions are supportive of the university's strategic priorities. Following up on the Working at Iowa survey, Human Resources is considering the implementation of various campus-wide recognition strategies (new awards, publication of faculty and staff success stories, etc.). Professor Wasserman praised these potential recognition efforts.

- *AAUP Sanction Update (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Ad Hoc AAUP Sanction Removal Committee)*

Professor Daack-Hirsch was unable to attend today's meeting, but she passed on her presentation notes to Professor Ganim, who is a member of the committee. The other members are Faculty Councilors Professor Thomas and Professor Durham; Faculty Senate Secretary Gillan; and former Faculty Councilor Kolker.

Professor Ganim described the activities of the committee, which has met five times, thus far. The first (November 1) meeting was largely organizational; the committee members discussed their goals and how they would proceed. At the November 16 meeting, the group reviewed the AAUP Redbook policy on faculty participation in the selection of administrators, along with the UI sanction report. Committee members looked carefully at the reasons for and the parameters of the sanction. They also determined the role of the Faculty Senate officers in relation to the committee. The committee spoke with Professor Dan Power, faculty co-chair of the UNI Presidential Search Committee, via Skype on November 30. Professor Power gave his perspective on the search process at UNI. He was generally positive about faculty representation and leadership on the search committee and mentioned Regent Mulholland's collaborative attitude (she served as the other co-chair of the committee). Professor Power also indicated that the search committee would remain active through the naming of the new president, unlike the UI search committee, which was disbanded prior to on-campus interviews. Professor Daack-Hirsch has had some follow-up conversation with Professor Power after the naming of the UNI president. It appears that the UNI AAUP chapter was encouraged by the faculty involvement in the search process. The ad hoc committee is now looking toward the UNI search as a model as it develops its recommendations for best practices.

Professor Ganim indicated that the Senate officers have contacted Executive Director Bob Donley of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, along with the UI president and provost to inform them of the formation of the ad hoc committee and of the committee's goal to have the sanction removed. The committee's next meeting took place on December 16. The members were joined by the Executive Committee of the UI AAUP chapter. Professor Tachau attended as a member of the latter group. They reviewed the process and procedures leading to the sanction. Following

that meeting, Professor Tachau contacted the national AAUP - Hans-Joerg Tiede (who staffs the governance committee) and Michael DeCesare (who was a lead author of the report and who chairs the governance committee, which will be involved in lifting the sanction) - to inform them that the Faculty Senate and the UI AAUP are collaborating and taking steps to have the sanction removed.

Professor Ganim explained that the ad hoc committee envisions that the sanction removal process will be iterative and collaborative with the AAUP, the Faculty Senate, the Board of Regents, and senior UI administration, particularly President Harreld. The committee's plan calls for writing a best practices document based on several key pieces of information. As for the timeline, the committee intends to draft its document by the end of the spring semester with input along the way from the Faculty Senate, the Board of Regents, and the President's Office. Review and editing of the document will take place in the fall of 2017. The AAUP investigative team will return to campus sometime during the 2017-18 academic year. The final version of the document will be ready by the summer of 2018, to submit at the national AAUP meeting.

At its January 10 meeting, the ad hoc committee reviewed and discussed the AAUP sanction report, the AAUP Redbook, and Board of Regents policy. The committee is also looking at procedures from past UI presidential searches, including search committee composition, chairs of the search committees and their roles, committee charges, usage of search firms, overall process, diversity of final candidates, affirmative action issues, and orientation of committee members particularly relating to diversity training. Professor Wasserman asked if the committee would look at previous job descriptions for UI presidents, since this had been a point of some contention in the last search, especially regarding degree requirements (terminal degree or not), relevant experience, and preferred vs. required qualifications. Professor Ganim said that the committee would look at job descriptions and had already discussed this issue with Professor Power regarding the UNI search. He added that the ad hoc committee is also reviewing statements regarding searches from the AAUP and the Association of Governing Boards, along with other best practices publications. Elements from these documents will make their way into the committee's final best practices document. The committee has been meeting every two weeks but will now meet monthly until its work is done. Professor Daack-Hirsch will give a formal presentation at the February 14 Faculty Senate meeting. Professor Ganim commented that the committee has focus and direction and has made a lot of progress in a short time. Efforts to remove the sanction will be a process that will engage all of the relevant parties, and there is a workable blueprint moving forward.

Professor Wasserman commended the committee for its assiduous work and stated that it is essential that the matter be handled in the most authoritative way without any particular prejudice. We should look at best practices and reestablish those here. Additionally, the three Regents universities should establish uniform presidential search procedures. Professor Durham suggested that a proposal be made to the Regents that they follow their own most recent best practices. Professor Tachau observed that UI search procedures have evolved over time.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Wasserman mentioned that he had recently read of a course on financial management being required of all undergraduates at the Regents institutions. This course had reportedly gained the approval of all three Faculty Senates. President Vaughn responded that this course is something about which some of the Regents feel strongly. It may eventually take the form of a training course to be taken before students arrive on campus. The UI Faculty Senate was not involved in approving the course.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 14, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The Provost's Office will sponsor presentations on Challenging Classroom Conversations on February 28 and March 3. More details will be forthcoming. Professor Wasserman suggested that a recent AAUP document on this topic be forwarded to senators.
- The Graduate and Professional Student Government will be sponsoring a Free Speech Event on March 28. More details will be forthcoming.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Romitti moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.