

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, August 29, 2017
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Seminar Room (2520D), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: P. Brophy, A. Deshpande, F. Durham, A. Durnev, M. Foley Nicpon, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, R. Oral, E. Prussing, J. Szot, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman, D. Wurster, J. Yockey.

Officers Present: R. Ganim, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn, R. Williams.

Councilors Excused: G. Ryan, C. Thomas, S. Vigmostad.

Councilors Absent: None.

Guests: S. Curry (Interim Provost), S. Daack-Hirsch (College of Nursing; AAUP Sanction Removal Committee), J. Keller (Office of the Provost; Graduate College), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), S. McGuire (School of Art & Art History; Committee on Academic Values), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Snyder called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. Councilors introduced themselves.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Durnev seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 11, 2017) – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Szot seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 12, 2017) – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Brophy seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Russ Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Warren Darling (Health & Human Physiology) to fill the unexpired term of Marian Wilson Kimber (Music) on the Conflict of Interest in Employment Committee, 2017-18
 - Adam Hooks (English) to fill the unexpired term of John Beldon Scott (Art & Art History) on the Faculty Senate, 2017-19Professor Yockey moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Academic Structure 2020 (Interim Provost Sue Curry)*

Interim Provost Curry thanked the four deans (John Keller, Graduate College; Dan Clay, Education; Sarah Gardial, Business; Alec Scranton, Engineering) for their work gathering information from a range of constituents. Former Provost Butler, who had initiated this process, wanted to obtain feedback regarding who we are, what our principles are, what themes might emerge in relation to future university organization, and what issues of concern exist. His original goals included looking at how the university might be more nimble and forward-looking, while focusing limited resources on academic excellence. It is important to review periodically the university's organizational structure.

Summarizing progress thus far, Interim Provost Curry commented that the four deans had engaged with the academic leadership of the university and with faculty constituency groups, among others, in order to gather information. She stressed that she had changed the name of this initiative from *Academic Reorganization 2020* to *Academic Organization 2020*, because the former might imply pre-determined conclusions. The four deans have collated a lot of information and will formulate a Phase I report. To initiate Phase II, this report will be disseminated to the campus. Professor Durnev asked for an example of a change proposed in the report. Interim Provost Curry responded that the report will not make any recommendations. Suggestions made by constituents will be reported, however. The report is organized around principles and will identify themes and issues that emerged from feedback. Professor Durham noted that a committee from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences contributed feedback to the four deans. Interim Provost Curry commented that the CLAS committee's report will inform the four deans' report. Professor Tachau noted that the Senate had advocated for the inclusion of faculty in the committee that conducted the gathering of information and the writing of the report. Faculty involvement in shaping the conversation is crucial, she added. Interim Provost Curry commented that there will be considerable faculty involvement in Phase II.

Professor Wasserman asked for clarification regarding what kind of information was collected. Interim Provost Curry responded that the four deans held open-ended discussions with a range of university constituents, focusing on what is important for the campus to consider and to preserve as we envision how the university might be organized in the future. For example, she noted, one person urged that the student experience not be disrupted by any future changes. The flexibility within majors in CLAS was cited by this person as one aspect of the student experience that has been very positive for students. Professor Wasserman commented that over 20 years CLAS has lost 70 tenure-track lines while gaining 5500 undergraduate students. We must strike a balance between vision and reality, staying rooted in this type of factual information. He added that when we contemplate a 41% increase in tuition over the next five years, identifying what percentage of that would go to the student experience would also be factual information. Interim Provost Curry commented that impressions, opinions, and aspirations, along with facts, were collected as part of a broad information-gathering process. Professor Wasserman suggested that the structure of other institutions be examined. Interim Provost Curry indicated that this would be part of the process, as well.

Secretary Williams expressed appreciation for Interim Provost Curry's efforts to slow down the process and make it more consultative. Professor Durham asked how the Strategic Implementation Team fit into the conversation about organization. Interim Provost Curry

responded that the Path Forward initiative, which encompasses the Strategic Implementation and Operations Teams, is changing. The guidepost for both the Academic Organization process and the Path Forward initiative is the university's strategic plan. The strategic plan is both operational and aspirational and was created through an inclusive process. We must think about the university as a whole, and consider who we are and who we aspire to be. If we decide to do something different, it should be done with reference to the quality of faculty life, the career opportunities that we provide, the quality of the student experience, and the use of resources in ways that are focused on our core mission. Professor Durham asked if the principles in the Academic Organization initiative are the same as the pillars in the strategic plan. Interim Provost Curry responded that these are our core missions.

The goal of Phase II, Interim Provost Curry explained, is to broadly engage the campus in an exchange of ideas, impressions, information, feedback, etc. There will be several components, the first of which is the creation of a small steering committee with representation that reflects shared governance. Professor Tom Rice, currently director of the Iowa Center for Higher Education, will serve as chair of the steering committee and steward of the process. The Phase I report will be posted online at a new website. This website will also provide opportunities to submit comment and feedback, as well as to post links to readings and resources for the steering committee. Town hall and constituent meetings will also be held. Members of the steering committee may also make site visits to other institutions. The steering committee and the website are projected to be in place by the end of September. Opportunities for feedback will take place through the end of the calendar year. This will be a respectful, inclusive, thoughtful, and aspirational process. The steering committee will be charged with collecting, synthesizing and creating a Phase II report. That report will likely have specific recommendations and emerge from the conversations on campus. This report will then go to the Provost and the President at the beginning of the spring semester. Interim Provost Curry added that we want to have the flexibility to take advantage of inspiring ideas. We do not want this to be an exercise in angst. Professor Durham asked what the role of the university budget would be in this endeavor. Interim Provost Curry responded that the focus of the Academic Organization study is on asking who we are and whether we are organized in a way that allows us to be the best that we can be.

- *AAUP Sanction Removal Committee Update (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair)*

President Snyder reminded the group that a little over a year ago, the University of Iowa had been sanctioned by the National American Association of University Professors because of the 2015 presidential search. Professor Daack-Hirsch has been chairing a committee that is charged with working toward having that sanction removed.

Professor Daack-Hirsch, from Nursing, indicated that the other four members of the committee are Ed Gillan (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Justine Kolker (Dentistry), Frank Durham (Liberal Arts and Sciences), and Russ Ganim (Liberal Arts and Sciences and Faculty Senate Vice President). She explained that the committee had begun its work by reviewing the sanction document and trying to determine what actions would need to be taken to have the sanction removed. The committee then drafted a principles-based best practices document regarding presidential searches. In creating this document, the members gathered input from a variety of sources. Using newspaper reports, meeting minutes, etc., they reviewed procedures from past UI

presidential searches going back to 1995. They also studied the AAUP's Redbook and the guidebook of the Association of Governing Boards for Universities and Colleges, *A Complete Guide to Presidential Search*, for relevant policies and guidance. The committee is planning for the drafting of the best practices document to be an iterative process that involves stakeholder input early on. The committee will bring the draft to the Faculty Senate officers, the Executive Committee of the local AAUP chapter, and the Faculty Council for feedback. President Harreld has been informed about the process and has indicated his support. Recently Professor Daack-Hirsch and President Snyder spoke with the leadership of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa and found support for the committee's efforts among the Regents, as well. Another meeting with members of the Board of Regents is planned for next month. At this time the committee intends to bring the best practices document to the Faculty Council for review and input in November. The document should be finalized by the end of the semester, so that it can be submitted to the national AAUP in the spring for review and a site visit, with a vote taking place in the summer.

Professor Tachau expressed gratitude for the work of the committee. Vice President Ganim, a member of the committee, commented that the committee is pleased that the Board of Regents seems willing to collaborate on this effort. Professor Durham, another member of the committee, added that in its interactions with the Regents, the committee is taking a forward-looking approach that emphasizes improving future presidential searches. President Snyder expressed appreciation for the work of the committee.

- *Controversial Speakers and Campus Climate (Steve McGuire, Chair, Committee on Academic Values)*

President Snyder commented that in the past few years there have been incidents on various campuses that emphasize the difficulty we have balancing free speech with the creation of a civil and inclusive environment. Most of these incidents have involved controversial speakers invited to a campus. Bills have appeared in several state legislatures proposing that students be punished for disrupting campus events at which controversial speakers appear. A demonstration earlier this month at the University of Virginia that turned violent has caused universities to reconsider their policies regarding controversial campus speakers. Many are now refusing to host such speakers because of the risk of violence. The issue may well play out in court. Incidents of faculty members targeted because of their scholarship have also occurred across the country and on our campus. With all of these events in mind, the Faculty Senate's Committee on Academic Values is now considering how the university can best prepare for and respond to these types of incidents.

Professor McGuire explained that the committee began its work by studying the responses of other institutions when incidents, especially spontaneous and unexpected incidents, happened on those campuses, with the intention of identifying best practices. The committee then considered how the university might operationalize a response to such an incident here. A high level of coordination is required among multiple campus entities in order to respond in a thoughtful manner to unanticipated events. The University of Virginia events earlier this month increased the impetus for developing our own response guidelines. Conversations were held during the summer with representatives from UI Police, the Office of the Provost, Student Life,

UISG, etc., regarding how to operationalize a response and how to structure a chain of communication.

The University of California, Berkeley recently created a principles and values statement in the context of executing a detailed operational plan that specifies who contacts whom, who releases a statement, etc. The principles and values statement, with its discussion of freedom of speech and academic freedom, guides how Berkeley administrators respond. Members of our Committee on Academic Values are currently engaged in composing our own principles and values statement, which will eventually be brought to the Council and Senate for approval. Professor McGuire commented that another aspect of this issue is the situation of faculty members who may be singled out and threatened because of their scholarship. Associate Provost for Faculty Kregel noted that recently a faculty member had received threatening messages likely related to a course that he was planning to teach, and on the first day of that course a student in the class behaved in a way that the faculty member and the other students found disturbing.

Professor McGuire noted that we must have a consultative and inclusive approach as we work through all of these issues. He added that many students appear not to understand the concepts of academic freedom and freedom of speech. President Snyder commented that the Office of the Provost is conducting workshops on difficult classroom conversations. The workshops offer guidance on setting up a classroom environment in which students can have robust but civil classroom discussions and on dealing with situations that may arise. President Snyder added that, although faculty members may not directly take part in responding to an incident on campus, it is essential that they be deeply involved in developing the principles behind that response. Several Councilors noted that conflict may arise not only between faculty members and students, and among students, but also between patients and health care providers. Professor McGuire commented that many faculty and staff members are unclear about whether and when they can express their political views at work.

Professor Tachau commented that the American Association of University Professors was formed over 100 years ago in response to attacks on faculty members' scholarship and teaching. She added that members of the public may generally not be aware of the rigorous process course proposals go through before a course can be taught and the role of faculty expertise in this process. She hoped that the committee could find ways of explaining to the public the connection between faculty expertise and academic freedom. Professor McGuire observed that ambiguity in terms of position can look like equivocation, and this is where institutional responses to incidents can run into trouble. When a university administration's communications team feels confident that their talking points are consistent with the values of the campus, then equivocation and ambiguity do not happen. In fact, a sense of safety is promoted within the campus. Professor Yockey asked if any education is provided to students during orientation regarding freedom of speech and academic freedom. Vice President Ganim commented that an educational unit on these issues is being developed and should be ready next year. Professor Durnev commented that faculty members should be informed how to deal with disruptive incidents in their classrooms. Professor McGuire concluded by noting that the School of Art and Art History has developed a highly successful procedure over the years with the College of

Liberal Arts and Sciences regarding how to deal with potentially controversial art exhibits. The rest of the university will likely become more educated about how to deal with free speech and academic freedom on campus in light of recent events here and around the country.

- *Retreat Follow-up (Pete Snyder)*

President Snyder described the annual Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat as an amazing shared governance tradition that brings the members of the Faculty Council together with the University President, the Provost, the vice presidents, and the deans. Through conversations with Faculty Senate leaders at other campuses, President Snyder has come to appreciate the strength of shared governance at UI compared to other institutions. The theme of this year's retreat was *Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching: Overcoming Barriers*. He commented that this topic fit in well with the Academic Organization 2020 study, because a core purpose of that study should be to find ways for faculty to work more easily across disciplines. At the retreat, several faculty members reported on their successful efforts to conduct interdisciplinary teaching and research. The administrators in attendance were very impressed with the work of these faculty members. However, we need to focus on identifying and overcoming the barriers that still exist to this type of work. President Snyder then encouraged the Councilors to share their thoughts and experiences.

Professor Lehan Mackin commented that whether and how interdisciplinary work is recognized and valued in the promotion and tenure process is one barrier. President Snyder noted that this is the most common barrier cited in literature on this topic. Professor Marshall noted that obtaining knowledge about which faculty members are working in which areas is also a significant barrier. Professor Deshpande pointed out that the system for counting credit hours for teaching is based on discipline. Although administrators do not seem to consider this a big problem, faculty members do. Professor Marshall commented that this may be linked to departmental resources. Some departments would not have sufficient resources to cover core teaching duties if some of their faculty members were pulled away to teach interdisciplinary classes. The new collegiate-centered budgeting model could further discourage interdisciplinary teaching, President Snyder observed. Professor Tachau noted that when financial resources are allocated to colleges based on enrollment, double-counting of students in cross-listed courses is not possible. President Snyder added that we must keep this issue in mind as we re-design our budget model.

Returning to the topic of promotion and tenure, President Snyder pointed out that this is an area over which faculty have considerable influence. Faculty within departments need to decide whether they will value and encourage interdisciplinary work. If they decide to do that, then do the department's promotion and tenure procedures reflect that decision? And finally, what is the mindset of faculty members who sit on promotion and tenure committees – rigid or flexible regarding interdisciplinary work? Professor Durham suggested that external reviewers on promotion and tenure committees be chosen who can contribute to the evaluation of interdisciplinary work. Professor Tachau suggested that faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary work be allowed to request a committee member from the other discipline in which they are working. Professor Durnev added that the faculty member's relationship with the other discipline should be formalized from the start with expectations put in writing. Professor

Snyder observed that in his experience, this situation can be problematic when two departments or colleges, with differing perspectives, disagree on a faculty member's promotion or tenure decision. Professor Marshall suggested that the faculty member become officially affiliated with the second department only after obtaining tenure. Professor Oral added that a junior faculty member doing interdisciplinary work could be assigned mentors in both departments who can provide guidance on each department's expectations.

Professor Lehan Mackin commented that she is currently working with colleagues in several different colleges on an interdisciplinary, community-engagement research project. Because of the relationships that must be built, it is taking time to get the project moving. All the faculty members in the project have struggled with their collegiate administrations in order to have the work recognized as scholarship. This is a particularly difficult situation because so many disciplines are involved, without clear boundaries. Professor Oral asked if interdisciplinary teaching and research would be addressed by the Path Forward or Academic Organization 2020 initiatives. President Snyder responded that these issues are central to the latter effort. He added that we need to examine and perhaps change our structures to remove barriers to this kind of work. Professor Tachau stressed that there should still be a role for disciplines in any future organizational structure. Professor Marshall suggested that scholarly publications now appear to be more open to interdisciplinary work than in the past.

Professor Brophy emphasized the importance of relationships formed organically across disciplines to the success of interdisciplinary work. Vice President Ganim noted that the Provost's Office is currently creating a database of faculty members' work so that those interested in collaborations can find potential partners. Past President Vaughn commented that we must simultaneously encourage interactions among faculty members and change administrative structures to foster interdisciplinary work from the bottom up and the top down. Secretary Williams added that the Senate should determine how it can promote interdisciplinary work. Professor Brophy suggested engaging alumni in support of interdisciplinary projects. Professor Tachau commented that some fields are less likely to have philanthropic support. Those same fields also tend not to be grant-driven.

Professor Wurster commented that in his view, based on his years as an administrator in the Graduate College, resources must be provided to a faculty member's home department to cover the department's loss of that faculty member's teaching contribution, while the faculty member is engaged in interdisciplinary work. This would lend significant support to the university's efforts to encourage interdisciplinary work. Professor Wasserman suggested that the faculty members involved in the recent creation of the interdisciplinary undergraduate major in neuroscience be asked to share their experiences in this successful endeavor. An infusion of resources likely played a major role. Professor Snyder concluded the discussion by indicating that he plans to ask the Senate to identify several tangible efforts it can make to reduce barriers to interdisciplinary work on campus.

- *President's Report (Pete Snyder)*

President Snyder updated the group on the Path Forward process. He reminded the Councilors that last year they had heard in considerable detail about the activities of two

committees, the Strategy Implementation Team (SIT) and the Operations Team (OT), and the new processes for strategic planning on campus. This initiative had several successes, perhaps the most important of which was that it brought together faculty, staff, students, and administrators to work together more closely than ever before on budgeting and strategic planning. However, it was also an unwieldy process, the strategic proposals were not well-coordinated, and the proposals were not tied to the strategic plan. The committee members talked through some of these issues over the summer and began reimagining the process. As a result, the two committees have merged to form the Path Forward Council, comprised of the four presidents of the shared governance bodies, Dean Scranton from Engineering, Vice President for Student Life Shivers, Senior Vice President for Finance & Operations Lehnertz, Interim Provost Curry, and President Harreld. The Path Forward Council will oversee four working groups focused on the pillars of the strategic plan (student success, research and development, engagement, and campus culture). Each year, the working groups will identify several aspects of the strategic plan to operationalize. For now, the next step will be to populate the working groups with individuals from across campus.

Regarding administrative searches, President Snyder noted that Julie Zerwic has been appointed dean of the College of Nursing. The search process is well underway for the Vice President for Medical Affairs, with candidates expected to visit campus early in the fall semester. A search committee has been named to find a new dean for the College of Public Health. Past President Vaughn is serving on this committee. Dean Agrawal from the College of Law has announced her intention to retire at the end of the academic year, so a search will occur for her replacement. Georgina Dodge has stepped down as Chief Diversity Officer to take a position at another institution. Lena Hill, Senior Associate to the President and associate professor of English, will serve as interim CDO, while Monique DiCarlo, the Sexual Assault Response Coordinator, will serve as the Title IX Coordinator.

The Board of Regents Tuition Task Force, chaired by Regent McKibben, met on each of the three campuses earlier this month to gather feedback on possible tuition increases. President Harreld has proposed 7.08% resident tuition increases and 2.08% nonresident tuition increases for each of the next five years, with the goals of moving UI to the median of its peer group and of obtaining funds to implement our strategic plan. Increases in targeted financial aid are also proposed.

President Snyder indicated that the Senate officers plan to meet with each collegiate delegation individually to learn about the needs and issues in each college.

In the wake of a lawsuit in the Athletics Department, President Harreld charged a committee with identifying a firm to review the university's employment practices relative to the Iowa Civil Rights Act. President Snyder is co-chairing the committee along with Staff Council Past President Erin Brothers. The committee has received several proposals thus far.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 12, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 10, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- President Snyder encouraged Councilors to attend the welcome reception for Melissa Shivers, the new Vice President for Student Life, currently underway at Hancher Auditorium.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Durham moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snyder adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.