

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, September 2, 2014**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre**

**MINUTES**

Councilors Present: F. Abboud, S. Ali, P. Brophy, S. Campo, D. Caplan, S. Daack-Hirsch, C. Fox, E. Gillan, K. Kieran, P. Muhly, S. Seibert, P. Snyder, H. Udaykumar, S. Vos, J. Wilcox.

Officers Present: C. Bohannan, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.

Councilors Excused:

Councilors Absent: M. Voigt.

Guests: B. Bradley (Office of the Provost), M. Braun (Office of the President), S. Fleagle (Information Technology), M. Jesse (Information Technology), L. Moeller (Office of the Provost), K. Saunders (Office of Governmental Relations).

I. Call to Order – President Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm,  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultyCouncil.09.02.14.pdf>.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Fox moved and Professor Campo seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 8, 2014) – Professor Ali moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 16, 2014) – Professor Campo moved and Professor Snyder seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Christina Bohannan, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Dan Caplan (Preventive & Community Dentistry) to replace Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2014
  - David Drake (Dows Institute) to replace Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2014
  - Kathleen Kieran (Urology) to fill the unexpired term of Heather Bartlett (Pediatrics) on the Faculty Council, 2014-16
  - James Bates (Anesthesia) to fill the unexpired term of Heather Bartlett (Pediatrics) on the Faculty Senate, 2014-16
  - Theresa Hegmann (Physician Assistant Program) to the University Safety and Security Charter Committee, 2014-17
  - Jay Christensen-Szalanski (Management & Organizations) to the Financial Aid Advisory Charter Committee, 2014-17

Professor Abboud moved and Professor Fox seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

President Thomas welcomed the new Councilors for the 2014-15 academic year, as well as newly-appointed Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, Lon Moeller.

### III. New Business

- *Possible New Learning Management System “Unizin” (Steve Fleagle, Chief Information Officer; Lon Moeller, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Maggie Jesse, Senior IT Director)*

Mr. Fleagle began his presentation by explaining that Unizin is a consortium of universities that the University of Iowa has been invited to join. He indicated that he was looking for feedback from the councilors regarding whether the university should participate in the consortium and launch a pilot project. He further explained that the Unizin learning ecosystem model is comprised of three components: content, interaction, and analytics. Unizin is not software, it is a service that supports these three components. Unizin will integrate both open-sourced and commercial software, creating a flexible platform to accommodate a range of faculty activity. Although a number of universities are now part of the consortium, the founding members are Indiana University, the University of Michigan, the University of Florida, and Colorado State University. Unizin’s actual service provider will be an organization called Internet2 which runs a large research and educational network of which the UI is already a part.

Of the three components (content, interaction, and analytics), the UI already has an established interaction system, ICON. Many other universities have robust interaction systems, as well, so Unizin’s major efforts will be focused on content management and analytics. Regarding content management, sharing, both *what* and *with whom*, will be a significant feature. The content could range from a single item, such as a diagram, to the materials for an entire course. Sharing could take place with any individuals or groups (e.g., a department, a professional society). A repository will also be created so that content could be presented in a variety of venues, from traditional to online courses. Aspects of the analytics piece are less clear at this time, but there is the potential to collect much data on student interactions with digital content and to compare this data across institutions. Other benefits of Unizin include the ability to keep content, interaction, and analytics independent and therefore more flexible. Also, the university can save money by working with the consortium to negotiate contracts with software and content providers. And, the university will have greater control over the components of the learning ecosystem.

Mr. Fleagle noted that there were a number of key questions for the campus to consider before deciding whether to join the consortium. Some of these questions revolve around cost and future needs, but Mr. Fleagle indicated that for him, the central question was whether faculty members would find enough value in the content management and analytics components of Unizin to offset the costs of transitioning to the new system. Mr. Fleagle and his colleagues are in the process of gathering feedback from as many faculty groups as possible and he invited suggestions for other groups and individuals to speak with. The goal is to gather enough feedback to determine if the university will undertake a pilot project in the spring semester.

In response to a question, Mr. Fleagle commented that while the university was not performing poorly in content management or analytics, this would be an opportunity to improve in those areas. Professor Brophy asked if there were currently any institutional regulatory guidelines that might prohibit sharing hardware, platforms, etc. Mr. Fleagle responded that Unizin was a service, a cloud-based entity that would be operated by Internet2, so the university would merely be a subscriber, as it already is to other services. He did not anticipate any concerns with that aspect of Unizin, but regarding content and data, the university would need to be careful that future developments fit UI's environment. The platform does enable sharing of institutional databases, but it does not require it. Professor Muhly asked for more detail about the use of open-sourced material, as this is key to cost saving. Mr. Fleagle responded that Unizin had decided to use existing interaction software, since such software is already mature. A vendor was chosen, however, that could make available common, open-sourced interfaces, giving the consortium members greater flexibility. Professor Wilcox observed that these systems are best when they are seamless and invisible. Right now, faculty members are limited by the capabilities of ICON.

Vice President Bohannon commented that one of the biggest current issues in sharing data is copyright, as many people do not know what can and cannot be shared. If the system can make available to others only those items that the creators have decided to share, it would be very helpful for users. Mr. Fleagle commented that it was his understanding that the system would indicate what material could be shared and in what way. Vice President Bohannon wondered if third party information and data could also be shared and she observed that many intellectual property questions would need to be resolved if the university moves forward with Unizin. Mr. Fleagle indicated that he would look into these issues. Professor Gillan commented that clarification of the line between the content a university controls and the content that a faculty member controls is crucial.

Mr. Fleagle then turned to the benefits for the university of being involved in the pilot project. Since Unizin is still in the initial phases, UI personnel have the opportunity to sit on the governing board and participate in working groups, thereby ensuring that the university's interests are represented in future developments. After the pilot project, the university can decide whether to join the consortium. Professor Seibert asked how much money the university spends on ICON. Mr. Fleagle commented that expenses are currently projected to be similar for ICON and Unizin and indicated that a large portion of the expense is for people's time. Licensing costs would be roughly the same. Membership in the consortium for the first three years would be an additional cost. Professor Seibert wondered why we shouldn't wait to see how well Unizin works and then join the consortium. Mr. Fleagle responded that the university would then not be able to give input on the development of Unizin. He added that some university personnel would have valuable insight to provide early on in the development. Some ways that the university may differ from other institutions involved in the consortium are our large number of graduate and professional programs along with a relatively smaller size overall; these varying characteristics could lead to divergent perspectives from those of the other schools. Councilors indicated an interest in hearing from faculty members on how they might use this system, as

well as an interest in receiving an update on the Unizin initiative, if the university moves forward with it.

- *Update on Performance-Based Funding (Keith Saunders, Director of State Relations)*

Mr. Saunders indicated that a model reallocating funding among the three Regents institutions will come before the Board of Regents, State of Iowa at their September 10 meeting. The model prescribes how resources (a maximum of approximately \$12.9 million) will be shifted from the University of Iowa to Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa. He added, however, that two items embedded in the Board's proposal to the legislature for funding will be beneficial to the UI. These items are a request to "backfill" any amount of funding taken away from the University of Iowa, as well as a request to allocate an inflationary increase to all three campuses of 1.75% (for the UI, this would be about \$4 million). If both of these requests are granted, then the UI would actually see an increase in funding for the next fiscal year. The Board will adopt this legislative recommendation at the September 10 meeting, then pass the recommendation on to the governor. The governor will release his budget recommendations to the legislature early in the 2015 session and then the legislative appropriations process will begin. Vice President Bohannon asked if it is certain that the Board will approve the budget proposal with the additional funding for UI; Mr. Saunders responded that it is very likely, since the proposal appears on the meeting docket. He further commented that he is often asked what the university community should be doing in response to the proposed funding model. He said that it would be best to focus efforts on asking for the additional funding, in order to keep the university strong and poised for future growth. He encouraged everyone to remain optimistic and project a positive message.

Professor Gillan asked if there were plans to review the effectiveness of the new funding model at various points in the future. Mr. Saunders responded that the Board will periodically look at the effects of the funding model. Professor Wilcox asked whether the increased funding requested by the UI represents a significant expense for the state. Mr. Saunders said that budget requests invariably lead to negotiating and that the extra amount requested is certainly an additional expense for the state. For context, he indicated that the overall annual allocation to the UI is about \$220 million and that the entire annual state budget is approximately \$6 billion. Because of a slight downturn in the agricultural economy, among other reasons, the state's financial position is not robust, but it is still strong enough to absorb a request of this amount. Professor Abboud asked if there would be a venue for Councilors to request that the Board undertake a review of the funding model in several years. Mr. Saunders encouraged the Councilors to do this through the Senate leadership if they wished. Professor Seibert questioned what metrics were used to determine the funding model and why the other two institutions have been favored. Mr. Saunders responded that enrollment, sponsored research, and degree attainment, among other criteria, were all figured into the formula. He added that the likelihood of this current formula being adopted by the legislature is high.

Vice President Bohannon reminded the group that during the summer the Faculty Senate officers had written to the Board asking for the model to be revisited. The Board did eventually make some modifications to the model. She expressed the view that it is unlikely that additional modifications will be made again soon, so efforts should now be focused on the request for

additional funds for the UI. Mr. Saunders indicated that much of his efforts during the 2015 legislative session will be focused on this extra request. Professor Fox suggested that periodic updates to the formula be called for, as circumstances change. President Thomas asked about the best approach for Councilors and other faculty members to take when contacting legislators about the university budget. Mr. Saunders commented that a positive attitude usually works best, with stress on the many benefits that the UI brings to the state.

- *Update on TIER Efficiency Review (Mark Braun, Transformation Project Manager for the TIER Study/Chief of Staff and Vice President for External Relations)*

Mr. Braun reminded the group that Deloitte had begun the efficiency study of the three Regents institutions about six months ago. The study has already gone through two phases, the initial assessment and the development of business cases for the administrative side of the institutions. Twelve administrative business cases were produced. One of the business cases concerned sourcing and procurement recommendations and these have already been approved by the Board of Regents. Contract negotiations are underway with Deloitte for the implementation of these recommendations. Three additional business cases will be considered by the Board at their September 10 meeting. These cases concern policy for the use of search committees for professional and scientific staff, a common student application portal, and a standardized calculation of the Regents Admissions Index for students without a class ranking. The eight remaining administrative business cases are still being fleshed out and will be presented to the Board at a later date. To conduct the academic portion of the review, Deloitte had contracted with KH Consulting Group; however, because the newly-extended timeline for the academic review was not feasible for KH, Deloitte is searching for a new partner in this endeavor.

Secretary Vaughn asked if there was a cost savings estimate associated with each business case. Mr. Braun clarified that the business cases were recommendations that could lead to either greater efficiency *or* greater cost savings. The three business cases coming before the Board next week are intended to create greater efficiency of operation, rather than cost savings, either for students applying to the universities or for faculty and staff to focus more of their time on core missions. The remaining eight business cases are expected to generate cost savings. The one business case already approved by the Board projected cost savings in the millions of dollars.

Vice President Bohannon asked how standardizing the Regents Admissions Index (RAI) would achieve greater operational efficiency. Mr. Braun explained that one of the components of the RAI is high school class rank, something that many Iowa high schools no longer calculate. Each Regents institution has created a different formula to evaluate applications when class rank is not available. A standardized formula will make the application procedure more predictable and transparent to prospective students. Vice President Bohannon observed that an argument could be made for each institution to have its own criteria for evaluating potential student success, based on the characteristics of the individual institution. She found this business case unlikely to lead to enhanced efficiency or cost savings. Mr. Braun commented that this could be an opportunity for the three institutions to reevaluate what might constitute predictors of student success in the absence of class ranking.

Vice President Bohannon then asked for clarification of the process of approval and implementation of the business cases. Mr. Braun responded that at the September 10 meeting, the Board will vote to adopt or not adopt the recommendations. If they are adopted, then the next step will be for the Board staff to determine with representatives from the three institutions how to go about implementing the recommendations. Vice President Bohannon commented that she had been under the impression that more opportunity would be given for feedback on Deloitte's recommendations from the university community before the Board approved any recommendations. She did not consider the few days between the public release of the meeting docket and the meeting itself to be sufficient for meaningful input from the campus community. Mr. Braun responded that the business cases had been discussed by Deloitte representatives some months ago at town hall meetings, although without the extensive detail of the documents in the meeting docket. For the remaining eight business cases, which will most likely be far more complicated, extensive time for feedback will be planned.

President Thomas asked if there was any indication at this time what topics the replacement firm for KH Consulting Group would focus on during the academic review. Mr. Braun responded that there was not. Professor Fumerton commented that it had appeared that KH was merely planning to synthesize the feedback of faculty members in the various working groups that had been formed. He asked if the Board might consider letting the working groups continue their activity and then present their recommendations directly to the Board, instead of hiring a new consulting firm. Faculty from the three institutions could collaborate when necessary to formulate system-wide recommendations. Mr. Braun said he would pass this suggestion on to Board members.

Past President Lawrence commented that she and Professor Fumerton are the faculty representatives on the university's sounding board that was formed to provide feedback to Deloitte. The sounding board is made up of faculty, staff, and students. She indicated that Deloitte personnel have informed her that they will be explaining the business cases in great detail to the sounding board, so that that information can then be disseminated to the university community. Vice President Bohannon asked when the other eight business cases would be released to the public. Mr. Braun thought that they would be released soon after the September Board meeting.

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

V. Announcements

- The review of the Office of the Provost has been completed and the review document will be posted on the Faculty Senate website soon.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 16, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 7, 3:30-5:15 pm in room 2390 of the University Capitol Centre.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Fox seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.