

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, April 9, 2019**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**2390 University Capitol Centre**

**MINUTES**

Councilors Present: F. Durham, M. Foley Nicpon, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, E. Prussing, C. Sheerin, J. Szot, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman, D. Wurster.

Officers Present: S. Daack-Hirsch, R. Ganim, P. Snyder, J. Yockey.

Councilors Excused: A. Deshpande, A. Durnev, C. Thomas.

Councilors Absent: A. Gerke, K. Glenn, R. Oral.

Guests: N. Grosland (Faculty Athletics Representative/Biomedical Engineering), T. Kulper (University HR), D. Matheson (Presidential Committee on Athletics/Leisure Studies), F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), J. Rantanen (Law), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda –Professor Marshall moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 12, 2019) – Professor Szot moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 23, 2019) – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Sheerin seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *UI Values Refresh (Teresa Kulper, Director, Organizational Effectiveness/Learning and Organizational Development, Human Resources and Jason Rantanen, Law)*

Professor Rantanen indicated that he and Ms. Kulper co-chair the UI Values Refresh Project, a multi-disciplinary working group that was created to focus on the university's core values. He added that, ideally, the university's values are fundamental principles that help internally define the organization, guide decisions, grant credibility and legitimacy to the institution, and provide us with a sense of shared purpose. Currently, the UI values are not well known and are hard to find in written form. They are also just single words without any elaboration. A multi-stakeholder advisory group (comprised of representatives from the Provost's Office, the Office of Strategic Communication, the Office of External Relations, and Human Resources) charged Professor Rantanen and Ms. Kulper with creating a working group to refresh the values, add descriptions for the single-word values, and produce recommendations for raising the profile of

the values on campus. Ms. Kulper and Professor Rantanen formed a working group that included representatives from shared governance, the Provost's Office, Human Resources, UI Healthcare, Athletics, and the DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) community. The formal, three-part charge to the working group was to understand the context and landscape of the current UI Core Values; to create meaningful, useful and relevant definitions for the current UI Core Values; and to recommend ways to communicate and utilize the UI Core Values.

Professor Wasserman recalled that former UI President Mary Sue Coleman had an interest in the development of a set of core values for the institution, but that those values seemed to have disappeared from the collective landscape. He asked where the renewed push to establish UI Core Values was coming from. Professor Rantanen explained that the values had been created in the mid 1990's at the request of the Board of Regents, as part of the university's strategic planning process. The original five values were eventually expanded to seven. The values were tweaked and modified in the 2006-10 strategic plan and the descriptions were dropped. The values were entirely absent from the most recent strategic plan (2016-21). Professor Rantanen reiterated that individuals from the Provost's Office, Strategic Communication, etc. had begun to wonder what had happened to the values and they requested that a working group be formed to take up this issue. They approached Faculty Senate to name a faculty representative to the working group, which is how Professor Rantanen became involved. The working group is purely an advisory group with no authority to implement its recommendations. The working group began its work in February and will produce a report by the end of the academic year. The group's process involved reviewing the values, gathering input from the campus community about the values, creating descriptions of the values, and gathering feedback about the descriptions from various campus stakeholders to take back to the working group.

Professor Rantanen indicated that today he and Ms. Kulper were particularly interested in hearing feedback about the newly-created definitions for the value terms and also suggestions for keeping the values current and relevant for the UI community. Ms. Kulper then read the definitions for the seven values: *responsibility*, *excellence*, *community*, *learning*, *integrity*, *respect*, and *diversity*. Professor Wurster suggested that the definition of *responsibility* include some mention of "stepping up to the plate," of actively taking on difficult tasks for the good of the community. Also in the definition of *responsibility*, Professor Tachau suggested replacing *accountable* (a current buzzword) with the more nuanced *committed*. She also advocated for the inclusion of the word *fair*. Professor Sheerin suggested that, since we are an educational institution, the value *learning* should be listed first. The passive *permeate* in this definition should be replaced with a more active verb, such as *motivate*, *drive* or *inform*. Professor Foley Nicpon questioned the placement of the value of *diversity* as last. Ms. Kulper commented that the working group had extensively discussed this term, especially in light of the university's recent shift to a diversity-equity-inclusion paradigm. The group had even considered making each of these three components a separate value. However, since their charge was simply to refresh the values, not revise them, they opted to keep *diversity* as a stand-alone value and not add *equity* and *inclusion* at this time. Also, because the university is just on the cusp of this paradigm change, we should wait to see how the next strategic planning committee deals with this new concept before making recommendations for changing the values.

Past President Snyder observed that the values (without definitions) are listed in the Operations Manual in an order different from the one here. He suggested maintaining that order for now: *excellence, learning, community, diversity, integrity, respect, and responsibility*. Professor Marshall commented that some of these values need to be in place before others can occur, for example, *integrity* and *respect* must exist before *learning* can take place. Past President Snyder expressed surprise that *discovery* was not listed as one of the values, since research is one of the university's core activities. Ms. Kulper indicated that the reasons for selecting these particular values and not others were no longer clear. Professor Tachau suggested amending the *excellence* definition to state that, *We constantly reach for the highest quality of education, research and discovery, and outreach and service*. Past President Snyder commented that *creative endeavors* could also be included in this definition.

Professor Tachau noted that the working group's report stated that the values *are not well known or utilized by faculty, staff or students*. She suggested altering this sentence to indicate that we should be *living by* or *guided by* these values. Professor Durham suggested looking at the four pillars of the strategic plan in relation to the values. Ms. Kulper commented that the most recent strategic plan had been completed on an accelerated timeline, leaving no opportunity to reconsider the values. Vice President Daack-Hirsch suggested simply listing the values in alphabetical order, because otherwise there could be many points of view regarding how the values should be ordered. Ms. Kulper indicated that this suggestion and the earlier suggestion to retain the order found in the Operations Manual would be taken back to the working group. Professor Rantanen commented that visuals could be developed to show that the values are all of equal worth. President Ganim noted that it is almost time to begin creating the university's next strategic plan. Ms. Kulper added that we must ensure that consideration of the values is part of that planning process. In conclusion, she explained that the working group has recommended that the values be widely communicated to the university community. Past President Snyder suggested that, once definitions are finalized for the values, these definitions should be inserted into the Operations Manual.

- *Faculty Athletics Representative Nicole Grosland and Presidential Committee on Athletics Chair Dan Matheson*

Professor Matheson explained that the Presidential Committee on Athletics (PCA) is an advisory group to senior administrators. As such, it does not have authority over decisions made by the UI President or by the Athletics Department. PCA advises on three primary areas relating to athletics: equity, student-athlete well-being, and academic achievement. PCA carries out its duties through monthly meetings of the full committee, which includes 11 faculty members, as well as staff, students, and alumni. Representatives from Athletics and from central administration also attend these meetings. Subcommittees dedicated to each of the three focus areas meet monthly.

Turning to specific issues that the PCA has recently addressed, Professor Matheson indicated that the committee has been working on the policy regarding missed class days for student-athletes. He explained that currently student-athletes are allowed to miss up to eight class days per semester for their team's travels. Permission must be requested from the Faculty

Athletics Representatives to go over that limit. However, the measurement of missed class days has been inexact. For example, if a student-athlete's team leaves for an event at 11 am on a Friday, that student-athlete is considered to have missed a day of class, even if s/he actually had no scheduled classes on that day. New technology is now being piloted to measure student-athletes' actual missed class days. The Faculty Athletics Representatives have provided input during the pilot project and the academic achievement subcommittee has reviewed the project. Professor Grosland, who serves as one of the Faculty Athletics Representatives (Professor Liz Hollingworth is the other), added that she gives consideration to the academic standing of the student-athlete when making these difficult decisions whether to approve additional missed class days. Professor Sheerin commented that in the College of Law, accreditor standards require attendance at all classes. She wondered how this was compatible with the university's eight-day missed class policy. Professor Wurster speculated that deans might have some discretion in this matter. Professor Tachau asked if efforts were made to protect the crucial last week of classes from student-athlete absences. Professor Matheson responded that efforts are certainly made to minimize travel during finals week, but, to his knowledge, there is no specific guidance on missing days during the last week of classes.

Observing that various college athletics scandals have erupted across the country in recent years, President Ganim asked how similar scandals could be prevented here. Professor Matheson explained that we have a system of checks and balances in place at UI related to eligibility and academic misconduct. For example, Professor Grosland commented, if a faculty member were to change a student-athlete's grade so that the student-athlete moved from ineligible to eligible, she would meet with that faculty member to learn the reasons for changing the grade. Personal integrity is key, Professor Matheson noted; all students must be held to the same standards. He added that he had previously served as an NCAA investigator. Based upon that experience, he has found that UI Athletics holds itself to very high standards. Professor Durham observed that student-athletes are under tremendous stress in balancing their studies with their sport. He asked if they are provided with resources to help them manage this stress. Professor Grosland responded that Athletics has dedicated mental health counselors. Student-athletes also have mandated time off from their sport.

- *Committee on Academic Values Free Speech Document (Pete Snyder)*

President Ganim indicated that this agenda item was a follow-up to a Senate meeting agenda item two weeks ago. During that meeting, the Senate had a robust discussion of the draft free speech document and suggested a number of revisions. The Committee on Academic Values met last week and made some additional changes indicated in today's version of the document. If this document is approved today by the Council, it will then come before the Senate in two weeks for final approval. President Ganim stressed that the Committee on Academic Values has been working on this document for eighteen months. The document is not a reaction to a bill recently passed by the state legislature and signed by the governor, nor is it a response to President Trump's executive order regarding free speech.

Past President Snyder indicated that the revisions found in the latest version of the document reflected input from the Senate, as well as last week's discussion among the members of the Committee on Academic Values, along with feedback from the Provost's Office and other

individuals on campus. He then drew the group's attention to three particularly substantive edits. On line 29, *shall* was substituted for *must*, *With regard to academic freedom, all those who teach ~~must~~ shall avoid importing into the classroom controversial material that has no relation to course content.* This wording is consistent with the wording found in Board of Regents policy. On line 32, *shall* was substituted for *will*, *The university ~~will~~ shall enforce these rules and policies with a view towards ensuring a secure environment...* Senate discussion had focused on this sentence and consideration of where the statement would eventually be situated. If it is to remain a Senate document, the Senate does not have authority to direct the university's actions. If it becomes a university document, inserted into the Operations Manual, however, then stronger language is appropriate. On line 35, *negative reaction* was substituted for *over-reaction*, *It is important that all rules and policies be applied in a content-neutral manner, and that the mere possibility of ~~over-~~ negative reaction not be used as an excuse to suppress expressive activities...* This word change was not suggested in the Senate meeting, but in the subsequent discussion of the Committee on Academic Values, some committee members felt that *over-reaction* had a pejorative connotation.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the Committee on Academic Values Free Speech Document be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Update on Health Benefits Discussion (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim reminded the group that at the last Senate meeting Jon Garfinkel, Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (FRIC) faculty co-chair, and Joni Troester, University Human Resources, presented information regarding a proposed new health benefit plan. A spirited discussion then ensued at the Senate meeting. Some senators expressed concern about the process that led to the proposal of a second, low-premium but high-deductible plan option, especially about the compressed timeframe of and the minimal faculty involvement in the process. The Board of Regents is currently scheduled to vote on the plan at their June meeting. Senators also raised questions about the details, such as co-pays and out-of-pocket expenses, of the proposed plan. Migration between the existing and new plan, and how this migration would affect cost and benefits of both plans, was also the subject of conversation. Following the Senate meeting, the Senate officers conveyed these concerns to senior administrators, underscoring that more time and information are needed before a decision can be made to establish the proposed new plan. At this time, faculty are not satisfied with either the process or the proposed plan details. Senate officers also spoke with their counterparts in Staff Council. Although the Staff Council officers do not have the same level of concern about the proposed plan as the Senate officers do, they will participate, along with the Senate officers, in a meeting next month with Human Resources senior administration to discuss the proposed new health plan.

President Ganim then summarized his recent conversation with FRIC faculty co-chair Professor Garfinkel. During that conversation, Professor Garfinkel emphasized that state-level changes regarding collective bargaining had brought the university's merit staff into the health plan that had previously covered only faculty and non-unionized staff. The university must now take on the responsibility of providing health insurance to thousands of additional employees. Merit employees, however, raised concerns about the cost of UI Choice, the university's only

health plan. In proposing a new health plan in addition to UI Choice, the goal was to come up with adequate coverage that merit staff would find more affordable. Additionally, Professor Garfinkel explained, no substantive discussions about costs and cost sharing regarding our health plan had taken place for about a decade. When President Ganim raised concerns about high deductibles and co-payments associated with a lower-premium plan, Professor Garfinkel acknowledged that the plan was not cheaper overall because of these higher subsequent costs. Senior administrators have echoed this view. Professor Garfinkel indicated that there are ways to manage the risks that migration between plans could present. Premiums for both plans could be set in such a way that reduces this migration. The consulting firm that the university has engaged, Aon, is modeling expected costs, premiums, and migration rates. The anticipated migration rates are currently 30-35%. This level of risk appears sustainable for the university. Aon will present this modeled data to the campus and to the Board of Regents. The proposed new health plan would need to be approved by the Board. At this time it is unclear whether the Board simply needs to approve a proposal for a new plan in the abstract or if it needs to approve the specifics of the new plan. If the former, then there would still be time to work out the details of a new plan. Professor Garfinkel further noted that results of a recent survey regarding health benefits indicated support for a second health plan option.

Professor Tachau, a member of both FRIC and of the Health Benefits Advisory Group charged with developing the second plan, wondered why a separate plan could not be created just for the merit employees, who number several thousand. She also expressed concern about high costs for deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses in the proposed new plan. She added that while our health benefits may seem generous to some, we must look at our health benefits in relation to faculty salaries, which tend to be lower here than at many of our peer institutions. Professor Tachau also questioned the need for the separate advisory group, when FRIC itself could take on this work, adding merit staff to its membership to give representation to that segment of the UI population. President Ganim concurred that offering the merit staff its own plan was a reasonable suggestion. There is precedent for this solution, because the graduate students and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) employees have their own health plans. Past President Snyder wondered why the pools for UI Choice and the proposed new plan could not be combined. Professor Tachau distributed a resolution that she and Professor Jon Carlson, a senator, had drafted stating the Senate's concerns with the process leading to the proposed new plan and urging the postponement of further action regarding the new health plan until additional information regarding costs, migration, etc. is available.

Secretary Yockey thanked Professor Tachau for maintaining the group's focus on this important issue. He expressed surprise that a new health plan was under consideration by the advisory group; when the Senate was informed of the benefits review last fall, there was no indication that such profound change was anticipated for our health insurance. He expressed support for the resolution, but commented that it might be better to wait and see how discussions with senior administrators proceed before voting on the resolution. Professor Sheerin asked for clarification why FRIC did not handle the task of creating the second plan. President Ganim noted that a subset of FRIC members serve on the advisory group. Also, FRIC membership does not currently include merit employees. Professor Sheerin expressed support for the resolution, along with concerns about the accelerated process that led to the

development of the proposed second plan. Professor Tachau commented that although the advisory group has been at work since December 2017, most faculty were made aware of the process only a short time ago. She suggested that perhaps premiums for merit staff could be subsidized while a permanent solution is worked out. Secretary Yockey emphasized that this is not a situation in which faculty and staff are in opposition.

Vice President Daack-Hirsch commented that our health benefits are key to recruiting and retaining faculty. She noted that professional and scientific staff do not share concerns about the proposed new plan to the same degree as faculty do; however, faculty are not convinced that this second plan option is in the best interests of either faculty or staff. Professor Marshall speculated that staff may currently have fewer concerns because insufficient information is available thus far regarding the costs of the new plan. President Ganim stressed that additional information is necessary before faculty can form a clear opinion about the proposed new plan. Professor Tachau suggested that the resolution be approved subject to revision, adding that one potential revision could be the appointment of merit staff to FRIC prior to final approval of the proposed new plan by FRIC. Professor Wurster expressed concern about approving a document subject to future revision. He suggested instead editing the document and approving a final version via email. Past President Snyder wondered if our goal could be accomplished without resorting to the resolution. He noted that central administrators have seemed receptive to the Senate's concerns. Perhaps we could wait until the next Senate meeting before deciding whether to put forth the resolution. Councilors approved of this course of action.

- *President's Report (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim informed the group that Montserrat Fuentes has been appointed as the new provost and will begin work on June 28. Regarding the position of Vice President for Research, the candidate of choice has made a second visit to campus. A final decision is expected shortly. Negotiations are underway with the candidate of choice for the position of Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

Regarding the faculty role in the new budgeting process, President Ganim summarized a discussion among departmental executive officers (DEO's) that took place during the Higher Learning Commission's site visit to campus in March as part of the university's reaccreditation process. At that time, the DEO's felt that it was too early to form an opinion of the new model. Several budget cycles would likely be needed until the model could be fully evaluated. President Ganim added that the Path Forward committee, charged with implementing the strategic plan, is looking for ways to tweak the budget model. Suggestions from the campus community are welcome.

Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement Linda Snetselaar had requested that President Ganim announce the theme for the spring 2020 semester – *Flow Together*. The focus of the semester will be on three main elements: *a celebration of the 100<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of the establishment of the IIHR—Hydroscience & Engineering center, the rivers and waters within our state, and the idea of unification through our examination of how the flow connects us.*

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 23, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.

VI. Executive Session

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the Council move into executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

President Ganim announced the recipients of the 2019 Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa. He also thanked the departing Councilors for their service.

Professor Wurster moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the Council move out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Adjournment – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Szot seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Ganim adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.