

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, October 4, 2016
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: S. Campo, S. Daack-Hirsch, F. Durham, A. Durnev, R. Ganim, T. Marshall, R. Oral, L. Plakans, G. Ryan, J. Szot, C. Thomas, E. Wasserman, J. Yockey.

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

Councilors Excused: M. Voigt, S. Vos.

Councilors Absent: K. Tachau, H. Udaykumar.

Guests: K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), M. Neal (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 Campo moved and Professor Ganim seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (August 30, 2016) – Professor Ryan moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (October 18, 2016) – Professor Durham moved and Professor Szot seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - *None at this time*

III. New Business

- *Barry Schreier, Director, University Counseling Service*

Professor Schreier began his presentation by pointing out that there has been an increase in the number of visitors to the University Counseling Service (UCS) over the past several years. Recently the UCS has made same-day walk-in appointments available to students. First-year students, international students, and male students tend to utilize the UCS at lower rates than do other student types. Group, rather than individual, counseling has proven to be very popular among students, especially since they spend so much time living, learning, and socializing in groups. Outreach efforts to various ethnic and racial communities on campus have led to an increase in students using the UCS in greater numbers than previously. Evaluations are indicating that students are generally satisfied with the services they receive at UCS. Efforts will be made to determine if students feel that they have made progress as a result of the services they receive.

Professor Campo asked if there was data available specifically on graduate and professional students' use of the UCS. Professor Schreier responded that this group was one of the highest users of services. There is also a fulltime counselor permanently housed in the College of Dentistry. Professor Durnev asked about the professional backgrounds of the UCS counselors and whether they receive training for dealing with international students. Professor Schreier explained that the counselors are doctoral-level psychologists. Recently, social workers with MSW degrees have also been added to the staff. They are trained in dealing with international students. Professor Durnev expressed appreciation for the informational folders, recently distributed to faculty members, that list offices to which students in distress can be referred. Professor Oral suggested that Professor Schreier present the UCS data in a public forum, in conjunction with the release of the Excelling@Iowa early intervention survey data, in order to increase awareness of the center.

Turning to the topic of financial support for the UCS, Professor Schreier noted that there are several funding models used nationwide. One of these is the student fee model, in which counseling services share the revenue from this mandatory fee with other student health providers on campus. Other counseling centers rely on a pay-for-service model. Increasingly, university counseling centers are accepting health insurance. The UI UCS, however, relies on the general education fund for financial support. Regarding staffing levels, Professor Schreier indicated that UI has the least-staffed counseling center in the Big Ten. The staff to student ratio is 1 to 2800, the second worst in the Big Ten. Accreditation standards call for a ratio of no higher than 1 to 1500 students. However, two staff members have recently been hired, and there are plans to hire six more. There is now a permanent UCS staff member located in Stanley Hall (one of the east side residence halls). This staff member will primarily serve first-year students, who tend to be the lowest users of the UCS. There is also a permanent staff member serving the unique needs of student athletes in the Athletics Department. As Professor Schreier noted earlier, there is a fulltime UCS staff member serving the needs of students at the College of Dentistry. Professor Menninger, the representative of the Emeritus Faculty Council, asked how the UCS position in Athletics was funded. Professor Schreier explained that this position follows the "embedded" counselor model and is funded by the hosting entity, i.e., the Athletics Department.

Professor Schreier indicated that a proposal has been forwarded to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa for a designated student fee for mental health. This proposed fee could also take the form of an increase in the existing health fee, which would then be shared with mental health services. And, he noted that UCS will soon open additional offices within the University Capitol Centre. This will give the UCS a presence on both sides of campus (the original offices are located on the west side, in the Westlawn building), as well as the embedded positions described earlier. Professor Oral requested that Professor Schreier speak about the general need for mental health services on campus. Professor Schreier explained that mental health continues to be a huge problem nationwide. Students are expressing distress in larger numbers than they have before. Depression and anxiety are major concerns and suicide has reached epidemic proportions. Professor Marshall praised the decision to embed a counselor in her college, the

College of Dentistry. Professor Schreier observed that when undergraduate students take leave from campus, mental health is indicated as the top reason.

Initiatives in which the UCS is currently involved include training for faculty and staff on how to deal with students in distress, because students may well approach individuals they know on campus rather than go to the UCS, which only sees about 8-9% of students; ongoing de-stigmatization and awareness campaigns about mental health; working with student veterans, a growing population on campus; exploring the inculcation of technology in mental health; and developing a comprehensive wellness vision for the campus. Professor Schreier reminded the group that the UCS would soon be hiring new staff members. He asked Councilors if, in their views, there were particular campus populations that need to be served and also if there were certain skill sets that new UCS staff should have. Past President Bohannon praised the training opportunities for faculty and staff, who often recognize that a student may be in distress, but may be uncertain how to help that person. She also asked for more details about first-year student and underrepresented minority student use of the UCS. Professor Schreier explained that the relatively low usage of the UCS by underrepresented minority students reflects the numbers of those students on campus. First-year students, however, tend to be low users because they are busy settling into college life and are preoccupied with basic needs.

Professor Ganim suggested that counselors be hired who specialize in the specific needs of graduate students. Professor Schreier stressed that the UCS can also do presentations and other preventive outreach to the colleges. Professor Durham suggested that counselors with various cultural competencies be hired, in order to serve all members of our diverse student body. Professor Campo commented that one group to be targeted for preventive intervention could be graduate students moving out of coursework into preparation for comprehensive exams. This transition involves a decrease in structure that many students may find disconcerting. Professor Schreier thanked Councilors for their input and encouraged them to contact him in the future with additional ideas and suggestions.

- *Terry Johnson, University Chief Financial Officer & Treasurer*

Mr. Johnson began his presentation by commenting that when President Bruce Harreld arrived on campus about a year ago, he began meeting with faculty, staff, and administrators to learn about the university. During those meetings he realized that there is very little understanding across the university about the budgeting process. He decided to create a budgeting process that is open and transparent, allowing units to take ownership of their base budgets (those parts that come from the general education fund). For the 2017 fiscal year, which began on July 1, 2016, a retreat was held in April that brought together people from all over campus, including faculty, staff and student leadership; the deans; the vice presidents; cabinet members; and finance administrators. The retreat focused on how budget decisions could be made in the future. A set of principles was developed that day that would guide discussions moving forward. Those principles, or focus areas, included student success, benchmarking (in salaries and rankings), UI values (programs that the UI is known for, but that may not bring financial rewards), and the UI future.

Mr. Johnson explained that there are two components to current university budgeting, the base budget and a separate pool of funds for strategic initiatives. Everyone on campus can compete for these special funds. This year, the timeline for this process was very tight, with not as much time for consultation as some would have liked. Sixty-six proposals were submitted and twenty-three were recommended. Some examples of these proposals include completion of the cluster hire initiative, dual career hiring funding, strengthening of core research facilities, the research leadership program (focusing on large, interdisciplinary projects), additional hiring of academic advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences along with retention and graduation rate improvement, learning analytics, course re-design, and balancing of the base budget for FY2016 and into FY2017 (restoration of funding for some building maintenance and improvement and energy conservation that had previously been cut).

Participants in this new budgeting process appreciated the opportunity to be so deeply involved, but indicated that in the future they would prefer to move at a slower pace. Mr. Johnson was then asked by Provost Butler to chair a committee focused on improving the new budgeting process. One of the committee's proposals is the development of a more measured timeline. This new timeline calls for a message to go out to deans and others in July, requesting that they begin thinking of strategic initiatives for the next fiscal year. These proposals will be due to the vice presidents in October. Units that submit more than one proposal will be asked to prioritize them. The vice presidents will review the proposals from October to December and then provide their rankings (high, medium, low) of the proposals to the Budget Office. In January the Strategy Implementation Team (SIT) and Operations Team (OT) will be convened. The SIT will handle proposals for projects lasting 18 months or longer, while the OT will handle projects with shorter timeframes. Membership of the SIT and OT is comprised of shared governance leaders, faculty, deans and administrators. The overall purpose of the process is to gather as much input as possible from various parts of campus. In February, the UI Budget Retreat Team (the group mentioned earlier that had created the set of principles to guide budget discussions), will go through the proposals. Membership of this group may change over time. In April, the senior leadership team will receive all of this accumulated feedback and then make a decision, which will be reported back to the UI Budget Retreat Team.

Turning to the role of faculty in this new budgeting process, Mr. Johnson encouraged faculty to engage with their deans and with the vice presidents in developing strategic initiatives, as well as on the development of the base budget. He indicated that the Faculty Senate officers are consulted on faculty appointments to the SIT, OT and Budget Retreat Team. Mr. Johnson urged faculty to contact faculty serving on these teams to learn about proposals under discussion and to provide input.

President Vaughn asked where in the timeline it was most effective for faculty to have input. Mr. Johnson responded that the beginning of the annual process (July to October) would be the best time, as this is when new proposals will be sought. Mr. Johnson also commented that interdisciplinary work would be particularly favorably viewed during the decision-making stages. Professor Ganim asked for what number of years funding would be available. Mr. Johnson responded that the intention was to have funding available every year, although this could depend on state appropriations, tuition rates, resource reallocation, fringe benefit rates, and other factors that could impact the university's financial situation. Professor Ganim

commented that ideally project funding would last for five years, the length of the strategic plan. Mr. Johnson added that recurring projects could be added to a college's base budget. Professor Menninger asked if the individual faculty member would learn about the process and have the opportunity to give input solely through the collegiate structure. Mr. Johnson answered that for most faculty, this would be the case, although they could also reach out to the faculty members serving on the SIT, OT and Budget Retreat Team. Professor Oral asked about the state of the budget this year. Mr. Johnson responded that we are looking at enrollment and tuition revenue to determine how much money would be available for strategic initiatives.

Past President Bohannon commented on the interface of these new budget-related committees with existing shared governance groups. She noted that administrators have been very responsive to the Senate officers' requests for greater faculty involvement in the new committees. She and Vice President Snyder serve on the SIT, and the officers were asked to nominate two faculty members for the OT. Several officers usually attend the Budget Retreat Team meetings, as do the co-chairs of the Faculty Staff Budget Committee. Members of the central administration, including Mr. Johnson, regularly attend the Faculty Staff Budget Committee meetings. And, central administrators intend to involve existing charter committees in budget discussions when relevant topics arise.

Professor Menninger observed that departments collaborate with one another on issues of instruction and of research emphasis. Departments see needs to be addressed, due to resignations, retirements, or increased enrollment; however, recently, the most effective way to acquire new faculty appears to have been through the cluster hire initiative, which may not lead to filling a department's particular needs. If proposals are being created at the collegiate level, deans may not be aware of departmental needs unless they specifically seek departments' input. The cluster hire initiative originated above even the level of deans, so Professor Menninger wondered how this new budget process would work in practice. Mr. Johnson responded that the cluster hire initiative was created before this new budget model was implemented. At that time, central administrators spoke one-on-one with deans about needs for their colleges. Decisions were then made within central administration and funding was carved out of the overall university budget for the cluster hire initiative. The new budgeting process will be more transparent, with deans first looking inward to their colleges for proposals before passing recommendations on to the budgeting committees and central administration. Extensive feedback will be sought throughout the process.

- *Top Ten Initiative Process (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn explained that, as part of the new budgeting process just described, the Faculty Senate has been asked to submit a ranked list of approximately ten proposed initiatives to be undertaken in the near future. A message will soon go out to all faculty from President Vaughn soliciting suggestions for these initiatives. A message to the campus from Provost Butler and Vice President Lehnertz is also planned in order to provide an update on the budgeting process and to direct the campus community to this website, <https://pathforward.uiowa.edu/>, to learn more about the activities of the Strategy Implementation Team and the Operations Team.

President Vaughn reminded the group that last spring the Faculty Senate sent out a similar solicitation for proposals. The Senate officers then sifted through the proposals and brought them to the Faculty Council for review. A similar approach could be taken for this round. Or, a subcommittee of the Council could be formed to do this initial work. Having the entire Council go through the suggestions might be unwieldy, but is also a possibility. In response to a question from Professor Plakans, President Vaughn indicated that some of the suggestions from last spring are already being handled by the SIT or the OT. Vice President Snyder added that last time, the Council had forwarded all of the suggestions received to the teams, but this time the Council has been asked to do some prioritization and send on only about 10-15 ideas. Secretary Gillan noted that this will become an annual process.

Professor Ganim asked if there were any criteria to assist the Council in prioritizing the proposals. President Vaughn responded that the officers had not been provided with any criteria; the Council could develop criteria during the prioritization process. Secretary Gillan commented that each group submitting proposals could have a different set of criteria, depending on the priorities of the constituent group. President Vaughn offered three possible criteria: urgency, degree of impact on the entire university, and length of time until completion. Professor Daack-Hirsch requested that the list of proposals from last spring be forwarded to the Council for review, along with an indication of which ones were taken up by the SIT and OT. (That list can be found here, <https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/article/strategic-priority-recommendations>.) If good ideas have already been submitted, but not accepted yet by the two teams, there is no need to recreate them. Also, since there is already a process in place for proposals to come up through the colleges, the proposals that the Council considers should focus on university-wide projects. Past President Bohannon commented that it is high-impact, university-wide proposals that seem to have the most chance of success. Vice President Snyder listed some of the initiatives taken up by the SIT: improvement of national research standing, improvement of underrepresented minority participation in graduate and professional programs, and improvement of the undergraduate academic experience. These are clearly very broad categories, and ideas could still be submitted that would fall under one of these categories.

President Vaughn indicated that if anyone had ideas for how the Council should approach prioritization of the new submissions, to please contact him. Past President Bohannon added that this new step of prioritization would seem to require wide input from the Council. Professor Ryan advocated for broad representation from Councilors from across campus during the prioritization step; perhaps initial feedback could be gathered from the entire Council. Professor Oral urged that prioritization criteria be developed. Professor Campo commented that proposals should map to the strategic plan. Referring to Mr. Johnson's description of the timeline for submitting proposals to the colleges, Professor Oral noted that she was not aware of any such solicitation within her college. She wondered if there was a mechanism to ensure that all collegiate faculty are notified of this opportunity, rather than just a select group of faculty. Vice President Snyder responded that faculty can still have input into the SIT and OT process through the Senate's solicitation. As for the collegiate base budgeting, processes are still being worked out for faculty input. Past President Bohannon noted that with the decentralization of budgeting out to the colleges, it is difficult to establish a uniform process for faculty involvement. Professor Wasserman expressed concern about collegiate budgeting process

information not reaching all faculty. The Senate officers commented that they will continue to advocate for faculty input into collegiate base budgeting. Some colleges have a shared governance structure that can facilitate this. They also stressed that the Senate's solicitation for proposals will go out to all faculty.

- *UISG Open ACE Evaluation Call Discussion (Ed Gillan)*

Secretary Gillan explained to the group that UISG had recently passed a resolution to make the results of ACE evaluations from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences public to students, so that they can read what has been written about specific classes and individual instructors. The proposal suggests that these evaluations could be accessible to students through MyUI. Secretary Gillan questioned whether looking at these aggregate numbers would help students decide if a particular instructor's teaching methods were appropriate for their learning styles, as the proposal suggests. The proposal also calls for requiring instructors to make mid-semester evaluations public, so that students currently attending the class can assess the instructor's teaching abilities and the instructor can then improve his/her teaching during the rest of the semester. Professor Durnev commented that this already happens in some of his college's courses (although the evaluations are not publicly released and only the instructor sees them).

Professor Campo, chair of the Council on Teaching and former co-chair of a task force that examined the implications of moving to online evaluations, noted that on the former, written evaluations, there was a block of questions that instructors could opt into. Those responses were then made available to students via UISG. There were two main problems with this system, however. Not many instructors opted into the block and it was difficult for the Evaluation and Examination Service to provide the data from those who did opt in. Providing a wider context, Professor Campo noted that when the University of Missouri implemented a uniform electronic evaluation system across all of its campuses, the system's governing board used data from these evaluations to compare units across campuses. She noted that once this type of data becomes available to students, it likely also becomes available to the media, governing boards, etc. Professor Campo added that too much emphasis on ACE evaluations can discourage innovation, because there is usually a period of time for students to adapt to a new type of learning experience. Low response rates or small-enrollment classes also present concerns. Long-term outcomes of student learning are not necessarily apparent to students while they are still in the class. Midterm evaluations, however, have been shown to be helpful to instructors.

Professor Oral asked what the intent was for making the evaluations public to students. President Vaughn responded that one intent was to help students decide whether or not to take a course. Another intent was to increase instructors' accountability. Professor Ganim asked about proprietary rights. To whom do the evaluations belong? He noted that at his former institution, the evaluations belonged to the instructor. He also asked how promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions would be affected. And, who is going to be responsible for compiling and maintaining this database; some free responses, after all, might contain personal attacks on an instructor, for example. The Senate officers clarified that the proposal does not call for the collection of text responses, just numerical responses.

Professor Yockey commented that some studies have shown that student evaluations can sometimes be biased against women, minorities, and international instructors. Professor Menninger asked if the students would remain anonymous. The Senate officers responded that they would. Professor Campo noted that student anonymity may be harder to preserve in a smaller class. Professor Wasserman asked if anyone was looking into the issue of student evaluation results being automatically loaded into instructors' electronic Academic & Professional Records (APR). Faculty were told that this would be done, but it does not seem to have happened yet. That data could potentially be available to DEO's, deans, the Regents, etc., already, although it does not appear to be available to faculty yet through this portal. He expressed dismay at this confusing situation. Professor Marshall noted that there had been some problems in her college last year with electronic evaluations.

Professor Oral observed that often it is those students who have had a negative experience who are more likely to fill out evaluations. President Vaughn speculated whether the evaluations are part of the instructor's personnel record, which should remain confidential. Professor Durham asked if all CLAS departments use the same reporting system. Secretary Gillan commented that there are some core questions that are similar across general education requirement courses; students seem particularly interested in the responses to these core questions. Professor Campo noted that some CLAS courses opt for different evaluation metrics. She added that the Operations Manual mandates that courses be evaluated, but it does not mandate how. Past President Bohannon observed that this seems to be primarily a CLAS issue, for now. She suggested that the CLAS Faculty Assembly take this up, as well. Professor Wasserman speculated that every college that teaches undergraduates may eventually be faced with this issue.

- *Free Speech/Academic Freedom Discussion (Christina Bohannon, Chair, Committee on Academic Values)*

Past President Bohannon reminded the group that the proposed initiative for a bias assessment response team has been significantly modified after input from the Committee on Academic Values and other faculty members. Instead, a campus inclusion team will be formed to hear complaints, but the team will not be an investigative or punitive entity. Those staffing the team will be trained on academic freedom and free speech issues. Later this week Past President Bohannon will meet with members of the Graduate and Professional Student Government to discuss co-hosting a panel event on free speech and inclusion on college campuses. Faculty Senate will co-sponsor the event. There has also been discussion of including a module on free speech and academic freedom in the Success at Iowa online course that all new students are required to take. Past President Bohannon commented that many students do not seem to know what does and does not constitute free speech. The committee also plans to look for ways to educate students about free speech issues.

- *Ad Hoc Committee for Lifting AAUP Sanction (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn noted that at the last Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate was charged with creating a committee to work toward a way to lift the AAUP sanction. He has asked Professor Daack-Hirsch to chair this ad hoc committee and has asked Professor Durham to serve on the committee. The committee will likely be comprised of 5-7 individuals. President Vaughn has

asked several other people to serve and is waiting to hear back from them, but he encouraged Councilors to send him suggestions for potential committee members, as well.

IV. From the Floor

Professor Wasserman requested that Vice President Snyder speak briefly about the Big Ten Academic Alliance Governance Leadership Conference that he attended last week. This is an annual gathering of the faculty senate leaders from the Big Ten universities. Vice President Snyder commented that the other senate leaders are dealing with the same types of issues that we are here at UI: inclusion and diversity vs. free speech, relationships with governing boards and trustees and how those boards are configured, the role of non-tenure-track faculty and how to integrate them into shared governance structures, and athletics concerns such as the role of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (of which a number of Big Ten schools are members).

V. Announcements

- There will be a free screening of the film, *Starving the Beast*, about the costs of higher education, on Monday, October 17, at 7 pm at the Englert Theatre. Faculty Senate is one of the co-sponsors of this event.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 18, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 15, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

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