

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 29, 2019
3:30 – 5:15 pm
2520B University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

- Councilors Present: M. Foley Nicpon, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, E. Prussing, K. Tachau.
- Officers Present: S. Daack-Hirsch, R. Ganim, P. Snyder, J. Yockey.
- Councilors Excused: A. Deshpande, F. Durham, A. Durnev, A. Gerke, J. Szot, D. Wurster.
- Councilors Absent: K. Glenn, R. Oral, C. Sheerin, C. Thomas, E. Wasserman.
- Guests: R. Wilson (*Daily Iowan*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Ganim called the meeting to order at 3:38 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (November 13, 2018) – Professor Foley Nicpon moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (February 12, 2019) – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the draft agenda be approved. Professor Tachau suggested that a report be given at an upcoming Senate meeting regarding the work done by a task force examining employee benefits. She commented that the Senate may be able to weigh in on the task force’s recommendations. President Ganim responded that he would contact the relevant individuals. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - *None at this time.*

III. New Business

- *Office of Finance and Operations Review Update (Joe Yockey, Chair, Review Committee)*
Secretary Yockey explained that the review of the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations began in the fall semester. Also serving on the review committee are Ramji Balakrishnan (Business), Barbara Eckstein (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Megan Foley Nicpon (Education), Alicia Gerke (Medicine), and Lia Plakans (Education). The external reviewer is Brian Burnett, Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations, the Chief Financial Officer, and Treasurer for the University of Minnesota. Secretary Yockey indicated that in early December the review committee conducted a series of interviews of Finance and Operations

staff members, along with other relevant campus stakeholders. The review committee also reviewed the Office's self-study, numerous other informational documents, and the results of two surveys. The first survey targeted faculty and the second targeted constituents (such as collegiate budget officers) on campus with frequent interaction with the Office. The review committee will now produce two reports, one on the Office and the other on the Vice President. The former will become a public document after it is submitted to President Harreld, while the latter, as a confidential personnel document, will not be made public. The review committee is currently drafting the first report, which will be submitted to the Office for correction of any factual errors. Once any errors are corrected, the report will be given to President Harreld.

President Ganim, noting that Finance and Operations is a large and complicated organization, expressed appreciation to the review committee for taking on this challenging task. Secretary Yockey praised the diligent work of the review committee members. Professor Foley Nicpon, a review committee member, noted that the bulk of the work fell on Secretary Yockey and she thanked him for his extensive efforts.

Professor Tachau asked for clarification whether the office of the chief financial officer (CFO) and treasurer was reviewed. Secretary Yockey responded that it was because the CFO is a direct report to the Vice President for Finance and Operations. He added, however, that this review did not include Information Technology Services (ITS), which reports to both the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations. He suggested that in the future some avenue be found to review ITS. Past President Snyder noted that since ITS is not headed by a vice president, it falls outside of Faculty Senate's review responsibilities, as indicated in the Operations Manual. President Ganim commented that ITS has some structural ambiguities that perhaps should be addressed.

Professor Tachau commented that Faculty Senate most likely has responsibility for reviewing the vice presidential offices because of those entities' impact on the core faculty mission of teaching and research. This is also a rationale for faculty participation on search committees for the vice presidential positions. She added that the implementation of the new budget model may lead to a need for Faculty Senate to review additional campus entities. While charter committees could perhaps take on this duty, they likely do not have the resources to conduct reviews. Charter committees have also generally played advisory, rather than oversight, roles. Thorough reviews require greater independence. President Ganim noted that review committees benefit from the perspective and insight of an outside evaluator. Past President Snyder suggested that the finance, operations and ITS functions could all be reviewed separately in a future review of the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations. Professor Tachau advocated for a specific enumeration in the draft Senate constitution revision of the offices that Faculty Senate reviews.

- *Process for Review and Use of Consultants (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim explained that the topic of developing a process for review and use of consultants by the university had arisen at the November Faculty Council meeting. One avenue to explore is the human resources aspect of this issue, specifically, the rules regarding hiring consultants. President Ganim noted that there is also some confusion about who pays for

consultants. For dean search firms, for example, it is unclear to the Senate officers whether colleges or the Provost's Office pays for the firms. The university has used other types of consultants, as well, such as for the recent employment practices review. President Ganim added that we need to consider what our goal would be in conducting a study of consultant use on campus and what kind of recommendations we might propose. Professor Foley Nicpon asked what precipitated this discussion. President Ganim responded that one concern was cost. At a time when the university is closing centers and programs, perhaps we should reevaluate how the university spends money. Secondly, an argument could be made that we already have expertise on campus among faculty and staff to carry out the tasks for which consultants have been hired. On the other hand, President Ganim continued, in order to attract a wide and diverse candidate pool, we need to hire search firms with extensive networks. The university likely does not have the infrastructure to carry out this kind of work. Also, top tier candidates may *expect* to be contacted by search firms, rather than by individuals affiliated with specific institutions.

Professor Marshall suggested looking at perceptions, as well as the advantages and disadvantages, of using consultants, before exploring the impact of costs. Professor Tachau commented that a first step for a committee examining this issue could be to categorize the types of consultants used by the university. Consultants used for searches are very different from consultants used for employment practices, benefits, gender equity, etc. Following this step, Professor Tachau continued, the committee could look at who on campus has expertise in these areas, who pays for the consultants, whether the groups being helped have any say in the hiring, and whether there are non-profit entities instead of private firms that could assist us. Past President Snyder commented that sometimes outside expertise is needed to give the process greater credibility in the eyes of our external constituents. Professor Tachau commented that internal credibility may sometimes suffer in such circumstances. She added that it is important to consider all of our options and examine each situation on a case-by-case basis before making the decision to hire a consultant, particularly if payment is to be made from the general education fund.

Pointing out that having faculty take on consulting tasks for the university also has costs, Professor Marshall commented that faculty time spent consulting would be time taken away from other crucial activities, such as grant writing. The financial impact on the university from this lost grant revenue might be comparable to fees paid to outside consultants. There could also be lost faculty productivity costs that would be harder to quantify, but would nevertheless be significant. Professor Tachau commented that a committee could explore these, and many other, issues surrounding the use of consultants. Professor Foley Nicpon added that the processes of vetting and selecting consultants could also be examined, because these processes may not seem transparent to faculty members. Terms of previous consultant contracts should be reviewed, Professor Tachau suggested. President Ganim proposed having the Senate officers request answers from central administrators to the questions raised here. Once those answers have been reviewed by the Faculty Council, the group can determine how to proceed. He added that he considered the costs for consultants to be concerning and that greater transparency is needed overall.

- *Balance of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty vs. Other Faculty Tracks (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim commented that it appears that systematic discussions about the composition of our faculty are not occurring in departments and colleges. Optimal levels of each type of faculty track are not being identified and larger questions regarding the right balance of faculty types to accomplish the university's teaching and research missions are not being answered. Also, faculty do not have a clear process for voicing their opinions on these issues. President Ganim expressed concern that the research mission of the university might be slipping away in favor of teaching and service. He added that he is worried about the lagging rate of tenure-track hiring and its potential effect on our standing with the Association of American Universities (AAU). With our new budget model giving more authority to the colleges, this issue becomes especially important. The Faculty Senate must encourage more grassroots participation in shared governance; one way to do this is for the Senate collegiate delegations to meet with their deans and DEO's to raise this issue.

Professor Lehan Mackin commented that these issues are discussed among faculty in her college, in which there are almost equal numbers of tenure-, clinical-, and instructional-track faculty. Because her discipline is so clinically-focused, it appears that the Ph.D. could be devalued. She added that faculty in her college have not yet been able to arrive at a resolution for optimal faculty track distribution. While guidelines do exist for faculty hiring practices, the need to meet the college's teaching mission has taken precedence over these guidelines. Professor Foley Nicpon observed that the professional programs may have a tendency towards clinical-track, rather than tenure-track, hires. Professor Lehan Mackin added that the suggestion to offer tenure to all of the college's faculty has occasionally been made. Professor Tachau observed that the American Association of University Professors' position on tenure does not preclude different tracks within tenure. The purpose of tenure is to protect academic freedom, after all. Professor Prussing commented that even among tenured faculty there are workload and other issues that seem to fly under the radar of administrators. President Ganim stressed that Faculty Senators can promote better communication between faculty and administrators within colleges. Past President Snyder noted that Faculty Senators in his college had recently had a very productive meeting with collegiate administrators regarding potential changes to the clinical track. He added that now that more budget decisions will be made within the colleges, faculty input at the collegiate level will be increasingly important.

Noting that the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee mostly concerns itself with detailed review and revision of individual policies, Professor Tachau suggested that a separate standing committee be created to deal with this larger issue of the optimal balance of faculty tracks. Professor Lehan Mackin wondered if there is existing literature on this topic, especially on the historical balance of faculty tracks, that we could consult. Professor Tachau indicated that she would check the AAUP website. President Ganim noted that our Big Ten colleagues could be a source of information. Past President Snyder reminded the group that Assistant Provost for Faculty Diane Finnerty had recently presented data from our peer institutions on faculty track distributions. The Provost's Office likely has additional data to share. He added that a financial analysis that also took into consideration research output might help us find the optimal balance, particularly since this balance may differ between departments and colleges. Professor

Marshall noted that accreditation requirements also impact faculty track balance in some colleges.

- *President's Report (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim gave an update on the work of the Shared Governance Advisory Task Force on Academic and Research Centers, Institutes, and Activities, which was formed after the closing of several centers and institutes on campus. Noting that the task force is charged with providing an extra layer of analysis and assessment regarding closures and reductions of centers and institutes, President Ganim indicated that the task force has now veered somewhat from its charge because the university budget is currently experiencing a period of stability (although that could change in the next fiscal year as the impacts of federal tax cuts and trade issues are felt on the state budget). However, the task force does plan to develop processes and procedures for potential future cuts.

Most of the task force's discussion thus far has been about the new budget model, President Ganim continued. At this point, it seems that greater clarification of the budget model is needed before progress can be made on the task force's charge. There was a sense among task force members that the university may need to go through several cycles with the new budget model before colleges have a good understanding of their financial situations. There is particular concern whether indirect cost revenues will be as high as colleges have anticipated. Other issues of concern related to colleges' abilities to give raises and to central administrative units' inabilities to raise revenue for themselves. It remains to be seen whether the new budget model can foster interdisciplinary work, because colleges will not have a financial incentive to share resources with other colleges. President Ganim viewed the Provost as obligated to encourage interdisciplinary work in spite of the potential financial repercussions to colleges. Task force members also expressed concern about the replacement of graduate students by postdocs, because the latter are less expensive than the former. Additionally, task force members encouraged a greater degree of communication among central administrators.

Turning to the review of the Office of the General Counsel, President Ganim noted that Past President Snyder is chairing that review committee. The internal committee has been formed, but an external reviewer has not yet been identified. The self-study has been completed. Regarding the Provost candidates who have been visiting campus, President Ganim indicated that the Senate officers have been meeting with them. Topics of discussion have included shared governance, hiring, strategic planning, and graduate education. Vice President Daack-Hirsch, a member of the search committee, commented that the goal is to have a new Provost in place by the start of the next academic year.

The last item in the President's Report concerned a meeting that the Senate officers held with the Graduate Council last week. President Ganim explained that the Graduate Council is made up of representatives of all eleven colleges and of the Graduate Student Senate. The Council deals with policy issues (approval of new programs and closure of old ones, funding and fellowship issues, etc.), along with advocacy of graduate education across campus. Conversation at the meeting turned to faculty and graduate student burnout. Service commitments appear to consume a considerable amount of faculty time, so it might be useful to survey faculty members

to determine exactly how much time they spend on service activities. President Ganim expressed the view that service expectations may need to be reconsidered during this time of fewer tenure-track faculty and resources, and less staff support. This is another topic that Faculty Senators could discuss with administrators within colleges. Past President Snyder wondered if the data from the Board of Regents Faculty Activity Survey could be mined for insight on faculty service. Vice President Daack-Hirsch commented that, although the survey data impresses the members of the Board of Regents with its evidence of the breadth and quality of faculty activity, faculty members themselves are unclear about the further impact of the data.

- *Governmental Relations Committee Update (Jerry Anthony, Chair)*

President Ganim explained that the Faculty Senate's Governmental Relations Committee had met with members of the Iowa City City Council, Mayor Jim Throgmorton and Councilor Bruce Teague, along with Johnson County Supervisor Mike Carberry, last month. The conversation had turned to student housing on and off campus, especially to a proposed private construction project at the intersection of Burlington and Madison Streets. This proposal calls for the construction of four fifteen-story structures. Professor Anthony explained that for some time, Iowa City has tried to encourage private development south of Burlington St. The developer behind this project has met all of the city's requirements for additional stories, hence the enormous scale of the construction. Professor Tachau commented that this project would likely impact natural lighting for both the Campus Recreation and Wellness Center and the Voxman Music Building. Professor Anthony commented that there are numerous campus planning implications for this project, so the university has been in dialog with the city about it.

Turning to the broader context of student housing, Professor Anthony explained that for a long time, the Iowa City community has been concerned about the influx of students into neighborhoods near campus, thereby altering neighborhood character through an increase in renter-occupied homes. When groups of students are able to pool their resources to rent houses, it drives up the cost of housing near downtown, especially for young families. For several years, following Ames' example, Iowa City was able to implement a policy limiting the number of unrelated people living in a rental house. However, subsequent state legislation overturned this policy. Two years ago, the university and the cities of Iowa City and Coralville commissioned a report from an educational facilities planning consultant. This report found that, although the proportion of students we house on campus is similar to other institutions, our students are displacing families from 56% of the off-campus rental housing market, compared to 33-34% for other institutions. Meanwhile, in response to UISG concerns about rising costs for student housing and dining, the university conducted a survey of on-campus and off-campus students. The survey results revealed that on-campus housing is more expensive than off-campus housing and offers fewer options for living arrangements. However, on-campus housing was perceived as safer than off-campus housing. Another key finding from the report was that the cost of a UI education had gone up by 7.8%, adjusted for inflation, over the past ten years. The big driver of the change has been the cost of housing and dining, not of tuition.

Professor Marshall asked if the report had examined the quality of the food offered in the residence halls. Professor Anthony responded that the report found residence hall food to be of very high quality. He added that the survey also revealed that many students are working 20+

hours weekly in order to pay for their educations. Professor Ganim noted that students' precarious financial situations can lead to food and housing insecurity. He indicated that he intends to bring up this topic the next time that the Faculty Senate officers meet with Vice President for Finance and Operations Rod Lehnertz. President Ganim added that, although there is much new off-campus construction targeted to students, these housing options tend to be expensive and financially out of the reach of many students. Professor Tachau commented that non-tenure-track faculty may face similar financial challenges. Professor Anthony noted that our on-campus room rate is comparable to the highest off-campus private room rate and he expressed the opinion that the university should use its influence to draw down this high rate. Professor Marshall stressed that a feeling of campus community is essential to student success; students who are struggling financially find it difficult to share in this culture of community.

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, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 12, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Ganim adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.