

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, October 9, 2018
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: F. Durham, A. Durnev, M. Foley Nicpon, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, R. Oral, E. Prussing, C. Sheerin, J. Szot, K. Tachau, C. Thomas, S. Vigmostad, E. Wasserman.

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

Councilors Excused: A. Deshpande, A. Gerke, D. Wurster.

Councilors Absent: K. Glenn.

Guests: J. Anthony (Urban and Regional Planning), R. Blair (Rhetoric), W. Jacobson (Office of the Provost), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), D. Thomas (International Programs), J. Troester (University Human Resources), K. Yows (Office of the Provost), 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 Sheerin moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (August 28, 2018) – Professor Durham moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (October 23, 2018) – Professor Tachau noted that the revised Intellectual Property Policy does not appear on the Council and Senate agendas. President Ganim confirmed that this item has been postponed to later meetings; he planned to give an update on the policy in the President’s Report. Professor Tachau moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - None at this time. Professor Tachau observed that the membership lists on the Faculty Senate website for the Committee on Academic Values and the Committee on Awards and Recognition have not been updated yet for the current academic year. President Ganim responded that the Senate officers are still working on confirming the new membership of those committees.

III. New Business

- *Paid Parental Leave (Joni Troester, Assistant Vice President, Total Rewards, University Human Resources)*

Ms. Troester explained that a policy update regarding paid parental leave had been initiated by a request from Staff Council and the President's Office. A committee, comprised of faculty and staff, examined the issue and determined that implementing an entirely new benefit was not feasible at this time. Instead, after reviewing current university policy and state code, the committee advocated for expanding the use of regular sick leave accruals in support of paid parental leave. Specifically, up to 120 hours per calendar year of existing regular sick leave accrual would be available for use for parental leave. Ms. Troester added that this use would apply to a non-birth biological parent, surrogate parent, adoptive parent, and foster parent. Regents approval would be required for this change. Human Resources has also been in conversation with the other Regents institutions because the three universities prefer to be in alignment on such policies.

Professor Vigmostad commented that faculty have expressed concern about inconsistent application of leave policies across departments. She asked if any progress had been made in addressing this issue. Ms. Troester responded that policy language would be revised to make the policy more clear and that Human Resources would work with the Provost's Office to ensure consistent practice. Vice President Daack-Hirsch asked why the revised policy did not call for a full six weeks of leave. Ms. Troester responded that the call for 120 hours is an initial step. The committee did not advocate for six weeks of leave yet since this situation is not related to a disability. State or federal legislation may then be needed to increase leave beyond six weeks.

Turning to an overview of the timeline, Ms. Troester explained that an initial committee held multiple conversations with the Human Resources community early in the process; this committee then developed the recommendation. The President's Cabinet vetted the recommendation in December of 2017 and then charged a small committee with exploring the expansion of the sick leave definition. A proposal was shared with the Board of Regents office in the summer. At that time, the Regents had asked for feedback regarding what all three institutions were considering. Human Resources is in communication with ISU and UNI on this topic. Regents approval will be sought after the final proposal has gone through the President's Office. Professor Tachau asked if UNI's faculty bargaining unit agreement contained a similar policy. Ms. Troester did not have information immediately at hand about this because of the recent Chapter 20 changes. She added that ISU has just begin conversations on this topic. Policies vary across the Big Ten institutions and between faculty and staff. In response to a question from President Ganim, Ms. Troester noted that the policy presents some challenges to nine-month faculty because of the way those faculty accrue sick leave.

- *Newly-Proposed Study Abroad Fee (Downing Thomas, Associate Provost and Dean, International Programs)*

Associate Provost Thomas explained that a proposal will soon be presented to the Provost requesting a new study abroad fee. This proposal originated with the Council of Deans last year in an effort to increase participation not just in classroom learning abroad, but also in internships, service learning projects, etc. Associate Provost Thomas cited a recent study indicating that study abroad has a positive effect on academic outcomes. He added that a

number of other institutions have already established study abroad fees. UI's proposal calls for a \$15 per semester fee for undergraduates. This would be in the lower tier of our fee structure. One hundred percent of the revenue would go back to students in the form of scholarships awarded based on information provided on the FAFSA. Associate Provost Thomas anticipated that the scholarships would have the greatest impact on underrepresented students and first-generation students. Increasing student participation in study abroad is a component of several colleges' strategic plans. Associate Provost Thomas added that he is seeking the support of UISG for this new fee.

In response to a question, Associate Provost Thomas clarified that the fee would be charged to all undergraduates every year, whether or not a student actually studied abroad. Associate Provost Thomas added that this is consistent with other fees which are assessed whether or not a student chooses to use those services. Vice President Daack-Hirsch asked how many opportunities exist for students to study abroad and whether there would be enough scholarships to cover all who wanted to participate. Associate Provost Thomas responded that scholarships would be awarded based on financial need. Anticipated revenue from the fees would be \$770,000 annually, boosting currently available aid by 66%. Our current rate of study abroad participation is 17.6% of undergraduates. To match the highest participation rates in the Big Ten, we would need to reach 30%. Associate Provost Thomas noted that there is an increasing number and diversity of opportunities for programs abroad. The increasing number of short-term experiences is especially important; these experiences work well for students whose on-campus programs or housing arrangements have little flexibility. Although long-term experiences have the greatest impact, the availability of short-term programs provides accessibility to a larger number students. Associate Provost Thomas went on to indicate that financial need is the obstacle most frequently cited by students as the reason for not studying abroad. Students would be informed early and often about the new scholarship program. Potential donors would also be made aware of opportunities to fund scholarships. In response to a question, Associate Provost Thomas added that the new fee might also serve to encourage more students to consider the possibility of studying abroad.

Professor Lehan Mackin asked how the fee is aligned with the university's new budget model. Associate Provost Thomas responded that student fees are outside of the new budget model structure, because they are intended for a specific purpose. Secretary Yockey commented that there may be students who do not meet the threshold for aid as determined by the FAFSA, but who may still lack the means to study abroad. Would this group of students be eligible for any kind of financial assistance? Associate Provost Thomas answered that donor-funded aid could be available and that there are scholarships targeted for students in specific majors. He estimated that about 85% of students currently studying abroad qualify for some type of financial assistance. Also, standard financial aid, such as Pell Grants, can be applied to study abroad. Noting that faculty members can apply for travel funds, Professor Tachau suggested making aid available for airfare. Associate Provost Thomas responded that the intention is to target need and therefore increase access. President Ganim commented that student support of this new fee is essential to its success. Associate Provost Thomas added that, if the new fee is implemented, the new scholarship opportunities must be communicated widely.

- *Governmental Relations Committee Update (Jerry Anthony, Urban and Regional Planning; Chair, Governmental Relations Committee)*

Professor Anthony explained that the charge of the committee is to promote the faculty's relationships with legislators at the local, state and federal level. Most of the committee's efforts have been directed towards state legislators because of the funding the university receives from the state. Last year, the committee initiated an effort to meet with legislators on a more frequent basis during the legislative session. Professor Anthony, then-President Snyder, and other faculty members traveled to Des Moines while the legislature was in session for individual meetings with legislators. This year, during the fall semester, the committee intends to meet with legislators in their home districts. Committee members will be accompanied by faculty members and local undergraduate students conducting outreach and engagement projects in those districts. Plans also call for representatives of local agencies involved in these projects to join the meetings, along with other students from those districts. The committee is working with staff in the university's Office of Governmental Relations to identify a list of legislators to visit. The Office of Outreach and Engagement is also participating in this initiative. A second initiative calls for identifying UI alumni working in various cities and counties and designating them as "alumni ambassadors," who would advocate for the university in the local press. This effort is being carried out with the assistance of the UI Center for Advancement.

Professor Thomas asked if many faculty members are involved in projects across the state. Professor Anthony responded that there are indeed many projects being carried out by UI faculty throughout Iowa. Professor Oral asked how these faculty members are identified. Professor Anthony indicated that the Office of Outreach and Engagement has provided data on numerous projects; this data has been shared with the Office of Governmental Relations to identify the relevant legislators. Eventually, the electronic CV initiative will also be a significant source of data. President Ganim observed that, while meeting with legislators in Des Moines is useful, visiting with legislators in their home districts is even more effective. Professor Durham asked how messaging is being handled. Professor Anthony responded that last year the Office of Governmental Relations had put together a set of talking points. This year, those talking points will be refined to apply to specific districts. Reflecting on last year's experiences, Past President Snyder commented that legislators care about education, so it is helpful to talk about faculty research in the context of education. It is also important to talk about what projects faculty members are doing in legislators' districts. President Ganim stressed that these projects are dedicated to improving the lives of Iowans throughout the state. Professor Anthony invited faculty members with projects around the state to come forward and participate in these visits to legislators in their home districts.

- *Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Feedback (Wayne Jacobson, Director, Assessment, Office of the Provost; Rebecca Blair, Rhetoric; Kris Yow, Manager, Business Analysis, Office of the Provost)*

Dr. Jacobson explained that the university is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The university's last accreditation occurred in 2008, shortly before the flood. The accreditation process has changed since that time, Dr. Jacobson indicated, for institutions with a long history of continuous accreditation, such as UI. This more streamlined process allows for recognition and affirmation of our history of successful accreditation reviews. The process still

involves a ten-year cycle, but no voluminous self-study is required. Now, universities must address a list of twenty-one accreditation criteria instead in a document known as the assurance argument. There is also a requirement for annual online reports. A separate review of federal regulatory requirements has also been implemented. However, all of these highly specific reporting requirements do not allow for institutions to showcase particular campus success stories. Therefore, HLC now calls for documentation of a university-selected quality initiative over a three-year period early in the review cycle. UI chose to focus on student success among first-generation and underrepresented student groups for its quality initiative. HLC has commended this effort. UI is now in the tenth year of the review cycle, when both the assurance argument and the federal compliance review are due. A site visit will occur on March 25-26. President Ganim, who has also served as an HLC reviewer, emphasized that the accreditation process allows for an opportunity for an institution to assess what it does well and what it needs to improve. Dr. Jacobson added that the site visit will include several open forums along with meetings with various campus constituencies. President Ganim commented that information regarding shared governance at the university, specifically regarding the AAUP sanction and our schedule of central administrative reviews, has been included in the assurance argument.

Professor Thomas asked if any institutions fail their accreditation reviews, and if so, what is the penalty? Dr. Jacobson responded that institutions with long histories of accreditation and established campus systems in place do not tend to fail. Rather, a series of steps will be undertaken to guide the institution toward remedying unsatisfactory aspects of its operations. Professor Blair commented that the premise of the HLC process is continuous improvement over time. It is important that institutions engage in continuous improvement, even if criteria goals have not yet been met. She explained that the HLC Institutional Actions Council makes the final decisions regarding accreditation. The Council looks for evidence that an institution has engaged in a comprehensive good faith effort to address issues noted by successive review teams. There are monitoring and review team visit protocols that would be put in place before an institution would actually fail the accreditation.

Professor Tachau commented that there have been several instances in the news over the last few years when threats of removing accreditation from institutions have protected those institutions from political forces. Dr. Jacobson observed that HLC does not attempt to micromanage institutions, but instead to ensure that institutions live up to their obligations to their students, their faculty members, etc. HLC reviewers realize that institutions occasionally run into problems, but they are looking for evidence that institutions recognize and address those problems. He added that an HLC review does not have the tight focus of accreditation reviews that occur in specific disciplines such as engineering and medicine. Professor Blair stressed that this is a peer review, with our peer reviewers typically coming from other public research institutions, often from the AAU or Big Ten. Professor Tachau asked if the financial problems experienced by the newly-constructed children's hospital might come under examination by the HLC, with the intention of preventing such problems in the future. Professor Blair responded that HLC reviewers look for the presence of durable processes and systems in place. Gaps in these processes and systems could be a cause for concern to reviewers.

President Ganim asked for a description of next steps after the site visit concludes. Dr. Jacobson indicated that the review report will be completed soon after the site visit. The institution then has the opportunity to correct factual errors before the report is sent to the Institutional Actions Council. President Ganim added that in his experience, reviewers begin working on their reports even before the site visits. Turning to a timeline for the fall semester, Dr. Jacobson noted that in September and October, members of the campus community have been invited to review the draft assurance argument and suggest areas for improvement. In November and December, feedback will be incorporated into the document. By the end of December, the assurance documents will be finalized for submission to HLC. Concluding his remarks, Dr. Jacobson invited feedback on the assurance argument, including suggested additions, from the group. He said that we want to make sure that we tell the university's story well. Professor Ganim thanked Dr. Jacobson, Professor Blair, and Ms. Yows for their extensive work over many months.

- *BTAA Academic Governance Conference (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim reminded the group that this year is UI's turn to host the BTAA Academic Governance Conference, which will take place October 25-27 on campus. The conference will begin on Thursday evening, October 25, with a reception hosted by President Harreld. Conference sessions will run all day on Friday, October 26, with topics to include fixed-term and part-time faculty, the AAUP censure of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and the removal of the AAUP sanction on UI, along with a session set aside for discussion of various other topics, such as controversial speakers and faculty mentoring, suggested by the attendees. The day will conclude with a dinner held at the Stanley Café in Hancher Auditorium. Saturday's half-day program will include two conference sessions on the topics of Purdue Global (Purdue University's new online entity, the former Kaplan University) and the promotion of shared governance within colleges. President Ganim invited Councilors to drop in on the conference if they are available. He clarified that the attendees of the conference are presidents and vice presidents of their respective Faculty Senates. Some staff members attend, as well.

- *President's Report (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim informed the group that the Senate's statement on center and institute closures is now posted on the Faculty Senate website, <https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/>. (An electronic vote on a final version had been held following the September 11 Senate meeting.) There has been little outside reaction to the statement except for a brief mention in the press. Professor Thomas asked about the reaction from the administration. Noting that the officers and the administration had discussed their differences on the center closings weeks earlier, President Ganim responded that the administration acknowledged the statement but did not critique it. He stressed that the statement was still important, even if there was little reaction. It is important for the faculty to express their views clearly, while maintaining a good working relationship with the administration, he added. Professor Tachau commented that it was also important that the administration now knows that the entire Senate supports the views of the Senate officers. Vice President Daack-Hirsch and Past President Snyder observed that the statement reflected publicly the private discussions that the officers had been having with the administration for some time. Professor Thomas questioned the need both to keep discussion private and to give advance warning about the statement to administrators, because they had

not shown faculty the same courtesy in their decision making. He expressed the opinion that it appears that administrators are not being held accountable for their actions. President Ganim acknowledged this point, but added that administrators could cut off communication with the officers at any time, and would be inclined to do so if differences are played out in the press. He added that adopting a hyper-aggressive approach to the administration is unlikely to be a successful strategy. Professor Tachau noted the importance of trust to the relationship between faculty and administrators and added that there is no point in having access to administrators when faculty views are entirely disregarded in the decision-making process.

President Ganim drew the group's attention to the list of members of the newly-created Shared Governance Advisory Task Force on Academic and Research Centers, Institutes, and Activities. The task force was created in the wake of the center closure episode to provide a process for future decisions about closures on campus. Efforts were made to strike a balance among administrators, faculty, and shared governance on the task force. There is also a disciplinary balance. Many of the faculty members selected for the task force have administrative experience. The group will likely meet twice this semester. For the first meeting, on November 9, President Ganim has asked the group to look at the task force's charge, as well as some reports pertaining to earlier such efforts. Professor Tachau asked how the non-faculty members were selected. President Ganim responded that those individuals were chosen based on the officers' proven good working relationships with them and on those individuals' experiences working with centers and institutes. The officers looked for people who are well versed in university policy, and who could be expected to take an objective approach to these issues. The officers took the sanction removal process as a guide and wanted to fill the room with thoughtful, forward-looking, and practically-minded people. Professor Tachau took issue with some of the officers' choices. She then referred the group to a document she had distributed at the meeting, an executive summary of an AAUP report on *The Role of the Faculty in Conditions of Financial Exigency*. She urged the creation of a Senate committee to work with the members of the task force, in part to gather ground-level information on curriculum, which is the purview of the faculty. President Ganim indicated that he was favorably disposed to this idea. Vice President Daack-Hirsch commented that it is still unclear whether this task force would be making decisions on future closures. At this point, its main task will be to set up a process for evaluating and implementing closures.

Professor Wasserman enquired about the fate of the 2020 Task Force. President Ganim indicated that there is nothing new to report at this time, but that the officers would bring up this topic when they next meet with administrators. He added that a formal announcement regarding the findings of the task force was needed. Several Councilors commented that faculty would not be enthusiastic about taking on service assignments if that work does not lead to valuable results, but just fizzles out, like the 2020 effort appears to have done.

Turning briefly to several other topics, President Ganim indicated that the university is in search of a Chief Entrepreneurial Officer. Two candidates have been interviewed and we are now waiting for a decision. This person will be in charge of the new Innovation Center (to be housed in the old art building). The position was created as a result of the decoupling of economic development from the Office of the Vice President for Research (VPR). In policy matters, the Council will consider a revision of the Intellectual Property policy at the November meeting. The

Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee has been providing feedback on the revision to the VPR office. Regarding central administrative reviews, Secretary Yockey is currently chairing the committee to review the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations and Past President Snyder next semester will chair the committee to review the Office of the General Counsel. The schedule for future reviews is posted on the Faculty Senate website. A periodic shared governance review of charter committees is expected to get underway soon, beginning with a focus on three committees: Campus Planning, Diversity, and University Libraries.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Wasserman raised concerns about UI’s slipping national rankings. He suggested that the officers bring up these concerns with President Harreld. Professor Szot took issue with President Harreld’s recent characterization of the student and parent perceptions of national rankings. Professor Tachau commented that the rankings drop is partially attributable to the university not having the resources to hire additional faculty.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 23, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 13, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

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