

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, March 3, 2015
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: F. Abboud, S. Ali, S. Campo, J. Kolker, U. Mallik, P. Muhly, S. Seibert, P. Snyder, M. Voigt, J. Wilcox.

Officers Present: C. Bohannan, R. Fumerton, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.

Councilors Excused: P. Brophy, S. Daack-Hirsch, E. Gillan, K. Kieran, S. Vos.

Councilors Absent: H. Udaykumar.

Guests: M. Braun (Office of the President), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), L. Glass (Governmental Relations Committee), G. Martin (Office of the General Counsel), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), D. Reed (Vice President for Research and Economic Development), J. Walker (Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development), K. Ward (Human Resources), L. Zaper (Office of the Provost).

I. Call to Order – President Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda –Professor Wilcox moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (January 27, 2015) – Professor Mallik moved and Professor Seibert seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 24, 2015) –Professor Campo moved and Professor Ali seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Christina Bohannan, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - None at this time.

III. New Business

- *Update on TIER Efficiency Review (Mark Braun, TIER Transformation Project Manager; Richard Fumerton; Scott Seibert)*
Mark Braun, the Transparent, Inclusive Efficiency Review Transformation Project Manager, indicated that a consultant, Pappas Consulting, has now been chosen to assist with the second phase of the academic business cases, distance education and time to graduation. Other consultants already engaged by the university are Chazey Partners, which is lending expertise as the institutional plans for shared services are developed; Huron Consulting, which has made significant progress on implementation work on sourcing and procurement; and Ad Astra,

which is looking at space utilization and schedule optimization. All three of these consultants should complete their work by the end of the spring semester. Past President Fumerton, one of two faculty members serving on the Sounding Board that provides feedback to the consultants, reminded the group that there is a university website with all the latest updates on TIER, <http://efficiency.uiowa.edu/>. It is possible to submit questions and feedback through the site.

Vice President Bohannon asked what problems the consultants might be looking at regarding time to graduation. Mr. Braun responded that the consultants would be exploring, for example, whether there were any bottlenecks in course offerings that would prevent students from progressing through their degrees in a timely manner, and other similar issues. Professor Campo asked if data for full time and part time students would be analyzed separately. Mr. Braun answered that it would be. In response to a question, he indicated that Pappas Consulting would have access to Ad Astra's findings over the summer while Pappas is preparing its recommendations. Ad Astra will make recommendations independently of Pappas' work, however, and those recommendations will be thoroughly discussed by the Sounding Board and other relevant entities when they are released. Mr. Braun added that both Pappas and Ad Astra will be producing detailed *recommendations*; any policy changes that would drive implementation would need to be approved by the Regents.

Secretary Vaughn asked who would implement the recommendations made by the consultants. Mr. Braun responded that if the solutions proposed are relatively simple, it probably would not be necessary to bring in an outside consultant for the implementation phase. Professor Seibert, one of two UI faculty members who participated in the selection of Pappas, commented that the consultant is unlikely to suggest a major overhaul of curriculum, but could propose options such as using online or off-campus course offerings to alleviate bottlenecks in time to degree. Secretary Vaughn asked if the articulation agreements with community colleges would impact time to degree recommendations. Mr. Braun indicated that Pappas would look at data on transfer students as part of its work. Professor Seibert commented that Pappas understands the complexity of the issue of time to graduation. He added that Pappas was the unanimous choice of the selection committee because of its flexible approach and range of experience.

- *Executive Session: Update on 2015-16 State Appropriations (Keith Saunders, Office of Governmental Relations)*
- *Executive Session: Faculty Tracks (Kevin Kregel, Associate Provost for Faculty)*

Professor Snyder moved and Professor Ali seconded that the Council move into closed session, inviting Professor Loren Glass, chair of the Faculty Senate 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 and the 2015-16 Board of Regents state appropriations request and answered questions from Councilors. Then, Associate Provost for Faculty Kevin Kregel gave a presentation on faculty tracks and discussed this issue with Councilors.

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

- *Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy (Usha Mallik; Grainne Martin, Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel; Jim Walker, Associate Vice President for Research, Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development)*

Jim Walker, Associate Vice President for Research in the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, explained that this *institutional* conflict of interest policy is supplemental to the university's *individual* conflict of interest policy. This policy relates to financial interests that the institution holds or that university officials (vice presidents, deans, DEO's, etc.) hold. Often these financial interests are distant from the research project itself. However, although the financial interests may be tangential, they are real, because decisions could be made by the institution or its officials that might affect the outcome of the proposed research.

There is currently no federal regulation of this particular area of conflict of interest. However, the university is accredited by the Association for the Accreditation of Human Subjects Protection Programs, which mandates that member institutions have an institutional conflict of interest (ICOI) policy in place. This draft ICOI policy mirrors a model ICOI policy developed by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and the Association of American Universities (AAU). The draft policy has a narrow focus, on higher-risk human medical clinical trial research that evaluates a drug, device or treatment. The policy is only triggered when the financial interest of the institution or a university official exceeds the threshold, is related to the research, and the outcome of the research can directly and significantly impact the value of the financial interest.

Situations which the policy would address might include a scenario in which the institution holds an equity ownership in a start-up company, or when the university licenses a device, and that device becomes the subject of a research project. Regarding university officials, the policy would address situations in which the official has equity interest or fiduciary responsibilities in a start-up company. The policy causes the institution to be aware of these possible conflicts of interest, which are then evaluated by the Conflict of Interest Office in conjunction with other offices on campus. In the case of a university official COI, that individual can divest or have some of his/her duties re-assigned. If that is not possible, then the case would go to the ICOI review committee. Conflicts of interest involving the institution would go directly to the review committee. This committee, which would operate under the authority of the Office of the President, would be chaired by the President's designee and be comprised of faculty representatives of the ten colleges, along with one member from the community. This review committee would examine whether the research project could still be done at UI, and if so, under what conditions. In cases of negative outcomes, appeals could be made to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

In response to a question, Dr. Walker clarified that the accrediting body would not be involved with the review committee, but would determine whether the university had an appropriate policy in place. Vice President Bohannon asked if our draft policy deviates in any

way from the model policy. Dr. Walker responded that the model policy does not specify a dollar threshold for university official conflicts of interest, as our draft policy does. Dr. Walker based the threshold on an average dollar figure derived from examining other institutions' policies. He added that the core principle of ICOI policies is that if compelling justification cannot be made for a research project to go forward in the presence of an unavoidable ICOI, then that research project must be halted. This high bar is necessary to protect the reputation of the university.

Professor Campo noted that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) do not allow reviewers to sit on panels when they have the same institutional affiliation as the individuals whose projects they are reviewing. She therefore asked why a committee formed to evaluate whether there is an ICOI would be comprised of individuals from that same institution. It would seem better to put together a review committee made up of individuals from outside the institution. Dr. Walker commented that, at most institutions, the research simply will not go forward if an ICOI is discovered. There must be unique and compelling reasons to overcome this presumption. In those rare cases when the research does move forward, the management plan will generally call for external monitoring and review. Dr. Walker expressed confidence that the draft ICOI policy establishes the appropriate procedures to protect the university's integrity.

Professor Snyder moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the draft Institutional Conflict of Interest policy be approved. The motion carried with one abstention.

- *Faculty Response to the Working at Iowa Survey (Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration)*

Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration, visited the Council as a follow-up to his presentation at the Faculty Senate meeting, during which he described the results from the *Working at Iowa* survey overall. For the Council, he presented survey results for faculty only. Mr. Ward noted that a striking finding from the survey was that associate professors had lower levels of agreement than either assistant or full professors with the statements *My unit distributes workloads fairly*, *My unit supports work and personal life*, and *UI recognizes accomplishments of faculty/staff*. Council members speculated on why this might be so. Professor Snyder commented that much faculty developmental effort goes toward assistant professors, and perhaps associate professors simply "fall off the radar." Past President Fumerton suggested that there might be a correlation between how long a faculty member stays at the associate rank and his/her level of dissatisfaction, especially if that person believes that s/he should have been promoted already. Professor Muhly urged that the survey be adapted in future to allow for comments, so that we may have a fuller picture of faculty attitudes. Professor Campo suggested that the survey be controlled for years at the university, since those recruited are usually at the assistant or full rank and may overall have fewer years of service here.

Vice President Bohannon commented that research has shown that the greater dissatisfaction of associate professors is not a phenomenon confined to UI. Part of the problem may be that expectations for moving to full professor are less clear than those for moving to associate professor. Fewer resources are also available to associate professors as they try to make the transition to full. This leads to a situation in which some associate professors may "fall into the abyss" after they receive tenure. Mr. Ward noted that it may be helpful to identify those

departments or colleges that consistently and successfully guide their associate professors to the next rank, so that those best practices can be shared across the university. Professor Voigt wondered if it might be the greater dissatisfaction in general of the age group that associate professors usually fall into that is reflected in the survey results.

Professor Mallik asked for clarification of the goal of the *Working at Iowa* survey. Mr. Ward responded that the survey measures levels of engagement with work at the university, in order to help employees be as productive as possible, as well as to facilitate recruitment and retention of employees. While survey results for the university have remained relatively static, there is often opportunity for growth at the unit level. Professor Mallik acknowledged the appropriateness of the survey questions for staff, but questioned their relevance for faculty. Mr. Ward commented that the deans have found the survey results useful and have been supportive of the survey. He added that the survey presents one opportunity to spark conversation and thought about the collegiate and departmental working environments, and he believed that the survey has generally achieved that purpose. Professor Seibert suggested releasing collegiate information to the elected faculty councils in each college for discussion. Mr. Ward said that could be considered. President Thomas urged that faculty results be available for posting on the Faculty Senate website. In response to a question, Mr. Ward commented that the information gathered at exit interviews is only partially helpful, for various reasons. There may be benefit, however, in conducting “stay” interviews, during which current faculty members are questioned why they have remained at the institution.

- *Presidential Search (Alexandra Thomas)*

President Thomas noted that the members of the search and screen committee have been announced, <http://president.uiowa.edu/ui-president-search/search-committee-ui-president>. The largest representation on the committee is from faculty, with nine members (among whom are two administrators, Vice President for Medical Affairs Jean Robillard and Tippie College of Business Dean Sarah Gardial). The faculty members include President Thomas and Vice President Bohannon, as well as three faculty members from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences – Meenakshi Gigi Durham, Lena Hill, and Dorothy Johnson, along with Aliasger Salem from the College of Pharmacy and Larry Weber from the College of Engineering. President Thomas voiced her appreciation to the Board of Regents for their willingness to give faculty a strong presence on the committee. She also expressed confidence that the search committee has broad representation from all university stakeholders. There will be many opportunities for faculty input during the search process. A forum for faculty was held recently, and comments and suggestions can be made on the President’s website, <http://president.uiowa.edu/forms/comments-and-suggestions>. Finalists will visit campus and meet with faculty, as well as lead town hall meetings. The timeline for the search is not yet clear, although it seems likely that campus visits will take place in the fall.

President Thomas emphasized that she expects an abundance of excellent candidates to come forward. Traditionally, presidential search committees have submitted to the Board of Regents an unranked list of several names, from which the Board selects the new president. However, the exact procedure for that stage of the current search process has not yet been revealed. Search committee members may also visit the colleges to gather feedback.

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

V. Announcements

- 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 12.
- The online committee recruitment drive is underway and ends Friday, March 6. Please encourage your colleagues to volunteer for committee service.
- Faculty Senate elections are underway. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 24, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 14, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Campo moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 5:30 pm.