

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, January 29, 2013**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Seminar Room (2520D), University Capitol Centre**

**MINUTES**

- Councilors Present: F. Abboud, D. Black, C. Bohannon, E. Ernst, N. Grosland, J. Murph, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, K. Sanders, S. Wilson.
- Officers Present: R. Fumerton, E. Lawrence, N. Nisly, L. Snetselaar.
- Councilors Excused: S. Gardner, B. McMurray, S. Schultz, J. Solow, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman.
- Councilors Absent: D. Bonthius, S. Clark.
- Guests: A. Beckett (University College), B. Bernard (University Housing & Dining/Residence Life), D. Drake (Office of the President), C. Gordon (History), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), D. Reed (Vice President for Research and Economic Development), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), T. Rocklin (Vice President for Student Life), L. Rubin (Office of the President), J. Walker (Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President Snetselaar called the meeting to order at 3:38 pm,  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultyCouncil.01.29.13.pdf>.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Black seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (November 13, 2012) – Professor Black moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (February 12, 2013) – Professor Black moved and Professor Wilson seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Replacements (Erika Lawrence, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - None at this time

III. New Business

- *Revised University Calendar (Beth Ingram, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education)*

Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Beth Ingram indicated that Provost Barry Butler had convened a committee to look at ways to add a week to the summer schedule, by making modifications to the spring semester calendar. She then explained how to interpret the distributed proposed schedule for winter break from the 2016-17 academic year through the 2021-22 academic year. Traditionally the spring semester has begun the day after Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, which fell on January 21 this year, leading to what was considered by many a late start to the semester. In five of the seven years in the proposed schedule, the first day of the spring semester is moved up to the Monday preceding Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. In all of the seven years, ten days are preserved for Winterim, with classes falling on one Saturday during that time; this would be a change from the current pattern. The adjustments to the spring semester calendar allow for the spring semester to end a week earlier in May, to be followed by a twelve-week summer session ending around August 1. Essentially, a week of winter break is being eliminated in order to add a week to the summer session.

Professor Ernst asked for clarification of the impact the calendar changes would have on May graduation dates. Associate Provost Ingram replied that those graduation dates would move up by one week. Professor Ernst noted that the professional colleges often follow calendars that differ slightly from the general university calendar. Associate Provost Ingram responded that she was presenting the general assignment and undergraduate calendar, but that graduation dates in the professional colleges would still be affected. Professor Pendergast asked where spring break would fall in the new schedule. Associate Provost Ingram replied that spring break would remain where it has traditionally been in the middle of March, in order to remain aligned with the calendar of the Iowa City Community School District. Associate Provost Ingram then commented that the changes may be implemented already with the 2013-14 academic year.

- *Carnegie Designation Initiative Overview (Colin Gordon, History)*

Professor Colin Gordon, chair of the Carnegie Designation Initiative at UI, explained that the Carnegie Foundation has maintained a typology of American institutions of higher education since the 1990's. Since 2006, it has also maintained an elective classification of these institutions based on community engagement. Two hundred institutions were certified in the first two application rounds (2006-08) and 115 more in 2010. The next round of applications will take place in 2015. Among the institutions that have already obtained certification are Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa, as well as many of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) institutions. The University of Iowa is in the process of preparing its own application.

Professor Gordon reminded the group that then-President Skorton had established 2005 as the year of public engagement and launched a number of engagement initiatives that were, however, slow to be realized. Later, then-Provost Loh established two task forces on engagement in 2009 and 2010. The recommendations from those task forces are only now being implemented. The Carnegie Designation application can be viewed as the culmination of all these efforts. Professor Gordon noted that the university already has a strong commitment to engagement. The UI has a number of service points, such as the hygienic lab, the College of Public Health, and the Public Policy Center. Lately, the Center for Teaching and the Career Center have been increasing opportunities for service learning. The Division of Continuing

Education has been forging ties with community colleges. Some individual units, such as Urban and Regional Planning, have created their own connections with local communities. These all contribute to a favorable application for the university. The university is lacking, however, in a few areas. For example, the institution-wide infrastructure to support engaged activity is weak. A central office to coordinate these efforts, recommended by the task forces, has yet to materialize. Also, the role that engaged work might play in tenure and promotion has not been addressed. Recognition efforts have also faltered; the President's Award for Public Engagement was last awarded in 2008, while an internal seed program has had a slow start.

There are three primary goals as the university lays the groundwork for the application process. The first is to build recognition and support on campus regarding the Carnegie Designation. The second is to build a centralized database of all engaged activity, for the benefit of internal and external audiences. The third is to move as quickly as possible on the key elements of institutional commitment. With each round of applications, the bar for certification has been raised. In the 2015 round of applications, centralized institutional commitment will be essential for a successful outcome. Professor Gordon stressed that even without the application, engagement is something that the university should be involved in. He added that he will be presenting the case for the Carnegie Designation to a variety of groups across campus.

Noting that Professor Gordon had indicated that standards rose with each round of applications, Past President Fumerton asked what institutions needed to do to be re-certified. Professor Gordon responded that the initial cycle in 2006-08 had been designed to encourage many institutions to apply. The plan is to settle into a five-year cycle. He commented that earlier, most institutions were certified based on either engaged teaching or engaged research, but now both would be expected, with differing weights assigned based on the type of institution. Institutional commitment, however, is the major difference between the 2010 and 2015 application cycles. He added that he did not believe there was an effort to push more faculty into doing engaged work, but rather to support and publicize the engaged work already being done.

Professor Pendergast asked whether the electronic CV system being implemented across campus was expected to be useful in the gathering of data about engaged work. Professor Gordon responded that it was expected to facilitate this effort. Professor Pendergast questioned whether the present format of the electronic CV would capture all of the information needed for the application. She observed that, in her college at least, the electronic CV solicits a narrow range of information on engaged activities. Associate Provost for Faculty Tom Rice commented that the engagement portion of the CV will be expanded to capture more detailed information. Professor Pendergast suggested that faculty be advised of this impending update so that they can retain information about current activities for future reporting so that valuable data is not lost. President Snetselaar asked whether most institutions have a central engagement office, housed in either the president's or provost's office. Professor Gordon replied that most other institutions did not have such an office, but rather cobble together a data collection. Secretary Nisly asked if efforts were being made to organize a central coordinating agency for engagement activity. Professor Gordon indicated that this issue was in the process of being worked out.

- *Living-Learning Communities (Tom Rocklin, Vice President for Student Life)*

Vice President for Student Life Tom Rocklin explained that Living-Learning Communities (LLC's) are one of the purest examples of collaboration between academics and student life. LLC's bring together the residential and academic aspects of students' experiences by housing students of similar academic interests together and then providing programming related to those interests. LLC's are based on a broad conceptualization of learning that recognizes that students learn not only from faculty members but from staff members and from each other, both inside and outside the classroom.

Precursors to LLC's include the foreign language houses that existed in one form or another on campus beginning in 1977. In 2006, while serving as Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Vice President Rocklin had commissioned a study from the Center for Research on Undergraduate Education in the College of Education. This study came to be known as *Research on the Iowa Student Experience* (RISE). One of the questions the researchers addressed was what experiences most contributed to student retention. It turned out that students who resided in LLC's during their first year were very likely to return for their second year. Vice President Rocklin indicated that this was not surprising, since one of the key elements of retention is engagement; LLC's promote engagement with all facets of the university.

The current strategic plan, *Great Opportunities, Bold Expectations*, seeks to provide each first-year student with the opportunity to live in an LLC, thereby enhancing undergraduate student success. This would entail a major expansion of the program, however. Two decisions were made early on to set this process in motion. First, individuals were hired to focus their efforts specifically on LLC's. And, although LLC's were initially thought of as an "add-on" to residence hall life, they would now be conceptualized as an intrinsic feature of residence hall life. Starting in Fall of 2013, all first-year students will be living in an LLC, making the University of Iowa unique in this respect. About 90%-95% of first-year students who are arriving directly from high school live in the residence halls, so the LLC requirement will have a significant impact on Iowa students from now on. Vice President Rocklin distributed a handout describing the LLC's available to first-year students. Themes range from health and green adventures to the arts and careers. Each LLC will have an academic connection to a department or college, and will also be accompanied by an optional academic course, usually a first-year seminar. LLC's will have student programmers, and training for Residence Assistants will now include a focus on working together with the LLC student programmers. Each LLC will have an east-side and a west-side location. Students will choose their preferred five LLC's and then move on to choose a building and a room. Surveys will be administered to students before they move in and throughout their first year to measure the effectiveness of the program. Longitudinal data on retention and GPA will also be available to assess effectiveness.

Secretary Nisly asked if there were faculty mentors for each LLC. She also asked if veterans had an opportunity to live in an LLC specifically designed for them. Vice President Rocklin indicated that very few veterans choose to live in the residence halls. Andrew Beckett, Assistant Dean of University College, responded that many of the existing LLC's currently have faculty or

staff involved in the programming. He also indicated that there are other, less time-consuming ways for faculty to be involved with an LLC. For example, students in two of last year's LLC's took several classes in common, allowing them ample opportunity to discuss the coursework with each other outside of class. Vice President Rocklin added that the LLC system is flexible; there is no standard requirement, such as a faculty mentor, for all of them. Professor Bohannon asked if students can change their LLC preferences each year. Vice President Rocklin responded that most returning students do not choose to live in the residence halls, but that those who do will have the opportunity to make a new choice. Professor Bohannon asked if there are first-year students who do not want to live in an LLC. Vice President Rocklin commented that, since LLC's have proven to be so successful, why not require them? Undoubtedly there are students who may not want to live in an LLC, but students face many requirements at the university that they cannot avoid. Also, the incoming first-year students will not know anything different from required LLC's. Dr. Becket added that the LLC themes are very broad and not all are major-based. Therefore, if someone's preferred roommate has a different major, an LLC can usually be found to accommodate both of them. Brooke Bernard, Assistant Director for Academic Initiatives in University Housing & Dining, then provided a description of the very broadly-themed First Year Hawks LLC, which is geared toward providing students with the optimum first-year experience by connecting them with a wide variety of academic and extracurricular activities. Professor Bohannon's final question was whether there were some LLC's that were more popular than others, and if so, how easy it is for a student to get his/her first choice. Vice President Rocklin indicated that students haven't selected their LLC's yet, but that there is flexibility in determining the size of LLC's. He did not anticipate significant problems, however, with providing students with their first or second choices.

Professor Murph asked if efforts would be made to maintain engagement and the relationships forged during the first year during subsequent years, especially for those students who do not live in the dorms. Ms. Bernard responded that students would be connected with student organizations linked to the themes of their LLC's in an effort to maintain continuity and encourage sustained engagement. Returning students will also have the opportunity to remain in contact with their LLC's through mentorship roles with incoming first-year students. Vice President Rocklin observed that the LLC experience may lead more returning students to live in the residence halls in subsequent years, adding that students who live in residence halls for more than one year tend to be more successful at the university. Finding housing for additional students will be a challenge for the university, however. Past President Fumerton asked if advice was available for the choice of an LLC. Ms. Bernard responded that some advice can be given to students when they visit campus prior to attending the university. Generally, though, selection of an LLC will largely depend on the student's interests at the time of the choice. Certainly those interests may change over time.

Professor Pendergast praised the wide range of LLC themes available. She asked if there would be opportunities for students who belong to one LLC to participate occasionally in the activities of other LLC's. She suggested that students be given a limited number of passes in order to invite friends to LLC events. Professor Penny followed up on Professor Bohannon's question about opting out of LLC's. He commented that there would most likely be students who are perfectly comfortable living outside of an LLC and who would not be in danger of dropping

out of the university. Vice President Rocklin responded that attending LLC events would not be mandatory; students could still choose not to be involved in any of their LLC's activities. Students would also be able to change their LLC if they do not like the one in which they have been placed.

- *Institutional Review Board Update (Jim Walker, Associate Vice President for Research)*

Jim Walker, Associate Vice President for Research, indicated that he would speak to the Council about improvements in human subjects research administration overall, although lately he had been engaged in discussions with the Faculty Senate officers primarily about the Institutional Review Boards. Given the difficulty of pinpointing specific issues when not hearing faculty complaints firsthand, he had decided to take a broader approach. Also, the concerns raised had seemed somewhat dated, so he wished to describe to the Council the wide range of improvements that have been made regarding human subjects research. Dr. Walker reminded the group that the UI Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) operates under a Federalwide Assurance (FWA), a document which defines the university's roles, responsibilities and obligations for conducting human subjects research. The UI HRPP had been the first such program to be accredited in the U.S. Last summer a team from the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Human Research Protections reviewed over 1100 studies and gave the university an excellent evaluation.

Regarding improvements to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) application review, Dr. Walker indicated that the number of steps involved in the review decreased from three to two. An additional staff member was hired for the IRB-02, and ongoing education was increased for all staff in the Human Subjects Office. In order to increase the consistency in IRB determinations, additional training was provided for board members and chairs, and checklists were created to facilitate the reviews. Numerous improvements have also been made to the electronic IRB application (HawkIRB). Help icons have been embedded throughout the application to provide sample language. Other required committee forms have been integrated into the HawkIRB and will now auto fill. A Human Subjects Research Determination form will assist applicants in determining if the full application needs to be completed. There is now a linkage between the electronic Conflict of Interest system and the HawkIRB, and full integration of compliance monitoring. For those who need to access the hospital's Epic medical record system, there is now linkage between HawkIRB and the UIHC Health Care Information Systems. Full electronic application review has been implemented, eliminating the need for paper documents.

Dr. Walker went on to say that a collegiate IRB advisory committee was formed over a year ago and brings together faculty members representing all of the colleges to offer recommendations for improvement and address the concerns and issues of faculty in a systematic and efficient way. The advisory committee has dealt with a variety of issues in collaboration with staff from the Human Subjects Office. One outcome of this collaboration has been flexibility in selecting the appropriate board for review (01 vs. 02) for researchers in the College of Nursing and the College of Public Health. Also, faculty in the social sciences had long complained about the amount of time needed for 02 applications. Upon investigation it turned out that these faculty are submitting applications infrequently, so the applicants are not familiar

with the system; this is the source of the delays. One-on-one mentoring will now be available to help move these applications along faster. Another innovation has been the development of “umbrella” IRB applications for students working on similar projects. For example, medical students often do many retrospective chart reviews. One principal investigator can now list all medical students doing similar work on one IRB application, vastly decreasing the number of applications.

Improvements to processes for dealing with community-based research have also been made. This type of research differs from more traditional forms in that community members participate as full partners in the design, execution and reporting of the research. Previously, only minimum risk studies were allowable in Iowa, but this restriction has been eliminated. There is now a Human Subjects Office staff member dedicated to community-based research, and the office partners with the principal investigator for the development of the community partner. Guidance on student projects and IRB review is now available to faculty members, including a *New Investigator Guide* to help faculty members determine if an IRB review is even necessary. Additional policy revisions and guidance materials will be developed in collaboration with the IRB advisory committee. Dr. Walker urged that questions or concerns about human subjects research be brought to his attention, or to the Human Subjects Office, or to the IRB advisory committee.

Professor Abboud asked what percentage of IRB approvals are outsourced. Dr. Walker responded that about 85 (approximately 3%) of the roughly 3200 open studies go through the Western Institutional Review Board (WIRB). Some industry-sponsored reviews go through the university IRB, however. Investigators have only recently been provided a choice between a university or an outside review for industry-sponsored studies. Secretary Nisly asked if specific training on community-based research is provided to reviewers, so that they understand the particular challenges that community-based researchers face. Dr. Walker indicated that frequent interaction between the review board chair and the faculty researcher is now the norm; this has contributed greatly to a more timely and efficient review process. Professor Pendergast expressed appreciation for the many improvements just described. She asked if the increasing involvement of the chairs would be a deterrent to faculty members to serve in this capacity. Dr. Walker responded that the chairs receive support for their work. He added that he monitors the work of the chairs to be sure that they are receiving an appropriate level of support. Vice President Lawrence praised the streamlining of the process as well as the responsiveness of the chairs and staff involved in her recent research projects. Dr. Walker stressed that faculty input is invaluable in making improvements to the IRB process.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 12, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 5, 3:30-5:15 pm in room C217 of the College of Public Health Building.

- The call has gone out for nominations for the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa. Please encourage your colleagues to nominate someone. The deadline to submit nominations is Thursday, March 14.
- The online committee recruitment drive is scheduled to begin tomorrow, Wednesday, January 30. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- Online nominations for Faculty Senate elections began on Friday, January 25. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- President Mason's reception for Faculty Senate will take place on Monday, April 29, 4:30-6:00 pm at her residence, 102 Church St.
- Past President Fumerton announced that a search committee for the new Vice President for Strategic Communications was now being formed. He requested that Councilors contact him with names of potential committee members.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Bohannon seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snetselaar adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.