FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, October 13, 2015
3:30 – 5:30 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present:	S. Ali, C. Benson, S. Campo, C. Fox, E. Gillan, P. Muhly, H. Udaykumar, S. Vos, J. Wilcox, J. Yockey.
Officers Present:	C. Bohannan, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
Councilors Excused:	P. Brophy, S. Daack-Hirsch, J. Kolker, G. Ryan, S. Seibert, M. Voigt.
Councilors Absent:	
Guests:	L. Cox (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee), S. Fleagle (Chief Information Officer), C. Hartley (Anti-violence Coalition), K. Kregel (Provost's Office), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals
   A. Meeting Agenda –Professor Campo moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the agenda be approved.   The motion carried unanimously.
   B. Faculty Council Minutes (September 1, 2015) – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Fox seconded that the minutes be approved.   The motion carried unanimously.
   C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (October 27, 2015) –Professor Muhly moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   D. Committee Appointments (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees)
      • Ned Bowden (Chemistry) to fill the unexpired term of Rachel Williams (GWSS) on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2015-19
      Professor Campo moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

• *OneIT TIER Update (Steve Fleagle, Chief Information Officer)*
   Chief Information Officer Fleagle reminded the group that the Transparent Inclusive Efficiency Review (TIER) conducted by Deloitte had produced four recommendations related to information technology. These recommendations were to *centralize commodity and infrastructure services on campus*; *restructure ITS to accommodate new environment*;

consolidate applications across campus and between universities; and *implement virtual desktops, reduce local printers and printing*. ITS submitted a proposal to carry out implementation of the recommendations. This proposal was accepted by the Board of Regents, although a consulting firm, Chazey Partners, has also been engaged to lend expertise and provide assistance. Throughout the implementation process the goal of ITS will be to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of information technology services across campus. The Board has also called for more IT collaboration among the Regents institutions, to increase the visibility of projects and services. Much progress has been made toward creating a single IT organization for the three institutions. CIO Fleagle referred the group to the website, http://oneit.uiowa.edu/, for a comprehensive description of the sixteen projects currently underway.

Addressing some rumors that have been circulating, CIO Fleagle stated that all IT staff will not be re-located. He recognized the importance of having IT staff in close proximity to the people they support; only a few IT staff members will likely be re-located. Although a recommendation was made to move IT services offshore, this will not be done, as it would probably have disastrous consequences for the university. There is a concern that purchasing of IT equipment will become more bureaucratic, but efforts are being made to keep the process as simple as possible. There will also not be a "one size fits all" approach to IT for the campus. CIO Fleagle said that he is well aware of the many circumstances across campus that would require specialized equipment and services; this is appropriate for a great higher education institution. While additional centralization will occur in some areas of IT, this will mainly involve behind-the-scenes activities, such as data centers, servers, etc., and will not affect most faculty and staff.

Regarding end-user support, CIO Fleagle commented that there are four types of this support: help desk, device management, general support, and discipline-specific support/consulting. While discipline-specific support must remain local, the other three will be bundled together as one service. Staff will still be located within units, but they will use consistent technologies and system processes across campus. This should lead to the achievement of efficiencies. Several units, including the College of Law, are already testing this new model. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is next. As more units are brought into the system, problems with the model can be worked out. Several series of listening posts have been and will continue to be scheduled; ITS has gathered much valuable feedback through these events.

Vice President Vaughn asked for clarification whether someone would be available to assist him on site if he experienced problems with his computer. CIO Fleagle responded that there would be. Moreover, if the IT staff member who would usually do this is unavailable, a different IT staff member could step in and take over because of greater consistency in technologies and processes across campus. This would also help even out IT workload distribution among units. Professor Wilcox expressed concern about the local availability of end user support. CIO Fleagle commented that currently, an IT staff member within a unit is often a "jack-of-all-trades." He added that staff members who provide the four types of end user support mentioned earlier will remain in the units. Some will become specialists in discipline-specific consulting, while others will focus on providing more general support. President Bohannan commented that her

experiences with the new IT support model within the College of Law have been very positive. She noted that the first step to obtain IT assistance is to call a central help desk location. If the problem cannot be resolved over the phone, then a local IT staff member will come to assist you. CIO Fleagle added that the majority of issues are successfully resolved over the phone. Professor Yockey concurred that the new IT support model is working well in the College of Law.

Professor Vos asked about the timeline to fully implement the changes in all colleges. CIO Fleagle indicated that the sixteen projects are all being implemented at different paces. Regarding the changes to end user support, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is next on the list. Work with CLAS should last through the end of the calendar year. It is about a three-year project, with the rest of the colleges to be completed during the remaining 2½ years. He noted that the transition in the College of Law took three months. Professor Gillan stressed that different departments in CLAS have different needs. He cited the example of the automatic updates that cannot be turned off and that have led occasionally to the loss of research data from experiments that require computers to be left on. CIO Fleagle agreed that this can be frustrating. He added, however, that security threats to universities have become far more frequent and dangerous in recent years as hackers hunt for intellectual property to steal, so timely security updates are essential.

- *TIER Recognition Program (Christina Bohannan and Susan Vos)*
  Professor Vos, who is serving on the TIER Communications Committee, referred the group to the handout describing the proposed Semi-Annual Excellence in Innovation Awards. Both faculty and staff would be eligible for these awards, which would recognize those who have taken a lead role in advancing TIER initiatives on campus. The Communications Committee has already received the endorsement of Staff Council for these awards and now the committee is seeking Faculty Council's endorsement. President Bohannan observed that there was some concern early on about the impact of the TIER review, but the outcomes of the review have generally been positive thus far.

Professor Udaykumar moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Faculty Council endorse the TIER recognition program and co-sponsor the Semi-Annual Excellence in Innovation Awards. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct (Carolyn Hartley, Chair, Subcommittee of the Anti-violence Coalition)*
  Professor Hartley indicated that the Anti-violence Coalition is an initiative of the Office of the Vice President for Student Life; she serves on the survey subcommittee along with two other faculty members and two students. Professor Hartley explained that the federal government has been encouraging higher education institutions to conduct campus climate surveys on sexual misconduct. It is likely that such surveys will become mandatory in 2016, so many universities, including UI, have decided to initiate this process early. The UI survey will roll out on October 26. The subcommittee was charged with reviewing available survey instruments and recommending one; the subcommittee chose a census type of survey that will be transparent in the release of its data. Several other Big Ten institutions are expected to use the same survey instrument and mutual sharing of results is anticipated. The survey is comprehensive and uses a

broad definition of sexual misconduct, to include sexual harassment, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault. It includes questions on perpetrating behavior, risk factors such as alcohol use, and student perceptions of university climate (resources and supports available, as well as impressions regarding how the university deals with sexual misconduct).

A marketing campaign will be launched about three days before the survey opens. All degree-seeking students will be invited to participate in the survey, which will be administered via Qualtrics. Notification will begin with an initial email message from the University President. Then, an email invitation to participate will arrive the same day as an additional message from the student's dean or the Vice President for Student Life encouraging the student to take the survey. Follow-up email messages will also be sent. Informational tables will be set up around campus, and banners and Visix screens will also promote the survey. The survey is anonymous and voluntary, and has been widely reviewed by various individuals and groups across campus. The fall campaign to promote the survey is called *Speak Out Iowa*. An analysis of the data results will be made widely available in the spring; this campaign will be called *We Heard*. A website for the fall campaign will soon go live. Promotional materials can be printed from the website for posting. Resource information for victims of sexual misconduct will be available through the email notifications, the marketing campaign, and the survey itself.

Professor Muhly asked if the survey results would be shared with other offices on campus, to see how the results compare with data those offices may already possess. Professor Hartley responded that the data will initially be given to the Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator. She added that the data would then be widely disseminated to the campus community in a transparent process, even if the data does not reflect well on the university. The Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator will then lead a dialogue on addressing what we have learned from the survey. Vice President Vaughn asked if any new initiatives to combat sexual misconduct would be launched as a result of the survey. Professor Hartley responded that a number of initiatives are already underway. These initiatives will likely be reviewed and perhaps expanded after the survey data is analyzed.

In response to a comment, Professor Hartley acknowledged that institutions that have been willing to be transparent with their survey results can sometimes put themselves at a disadvantage, for example, in having their number of applications drop. With the probable federally-mandated survey process next year, any disadvantages should disappear. In response to other questions, Professor Hartley indicated that the survey takes about 30 minutes to complete and will remain open for approximately 45 days. The survey does not need to be completed in one sitting, as long as the respondent returns to the survey from the same computer. Pilot projects with the survey instrument on other campuses have shown that most students complete the survey in one sitting and that the survey length does not seem to be a drawback. Incentive prizes will be offered when the survey goes live on campus to further encourage participation. A response rate of 30% is the goal for UI. Secretary Snyder questioned how representative a response rate of 30% might be. Professor Hartley responded, based on her research on domestic violence, which is highly under-reported, that even if the numbers are high, they would still likely be on the low side. She did express concern about reaching male students because of the perception that this is a women's issue. There has been an effort to

include male students in the marketing campaign. Professor Udaykumar followed up on Secretary Snyder's point, commenting that perhaps only those students who have a particular motivation for completing the survey would do so. Professor Hartley acknowledged this possibility, but added that one of the advantages of a census survey, instead of a sample survey, is that the results can be made public without compromising the confidentiality of the survey respondents. President Bohannan suggested that someone involved with the survey present the results to the Council when the data becomes available in the spring.

- *Research-Track Policy Revisions (Lois Cox, Chair, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee)*
  Professor Cox explained that the purpose of these latest revisions to the research-track policy was to determine guidelines for termination of contracts and non-renewal of appointments for faculty members on the research track. While working on these revisions, the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee needed to keep in mind the stipulation that research-track faculty members cannot be paid out of the general fund, while committee members also wished to treat faculty colleagues well. Extensive discussion went into these seemingly slight revisions. At this point, only the Carver College of Medicine has research-track faculty in place (about 30 individuals out of the approximately 1,000 CCOM faculty members eligible for service on the Senate). It seems likely that the track will remain small. President Bohannan observed that the limitations on the track tend to make it less attractive. Only minimal teaching and service are currently allowed.

  Professor Cox went on to state that each college, when adopting the research track, must establish a policy for the track that covers the various points listed in the university policy. Subsection *c.(1)(d),* which requires that a description of the role of salary support in decisions to renew or terminate appointments be included in collegiate policies, was moved from elsewhere in the policy to this section, *c.,* which discusses collegiate policies. Subsection *h.* sets out requirements for notice for termination and non-renewal. Committee members learned that research-track faculty may lose their funding if their principal investigator leaves the university. Often research-track faculty members are then absorbed into other grants but there is no guarantee that this will happen. Subsections *h.(1)* and *(2)* discuss termination, the former for end of funding, the latter for reasons other than end of funding (for cause). Subsection *h.(3)* discusses non-renewal for reasons other than end of funding. A distinction was made between those research-track faculty members in their first contract and those who have been in their positions longer. Professor Cox noted that some individuals on the research track have been at the university for a long time, most likely in professional and scientific positions, well before the establishment of the research track.

  Professor Gillan, who served on the committee at the time this language was revised, commented that this version of the language represented the committee's best attempt to clarify this portion of the policy. The language is flexible and suitable for the Operations Manual. Professor Cox stressed that these points regarding termination and non-renewal need to be spelled out in the offer letters. Professor Gillan praised the inclusion of language indicating that *written* notice regarding the impending end of an appointment is mandatory. In response to a question, Professor Cox indicated that one year is the shortest permissible length for a research-

track appointment term. Secretary Snyder commented that he is involved in the generation of offer letters to research-track faculty in his department and he noted that the letters are indeed very explicit regarding the exact grant, funding source, length of funding, etc. In response to another question, Professor Cox commented that the difference in notice periods for non-renewal was linked to seniority. She indicated that this language represented a compromise among committee members. While research-track faculty members may have been employed at the university for a long time prior to their research-track appointments, acceptance of those appointments exhibits an understanding of the risks of the research track. President Bohannan commented that the prohibition against using general education funds to support research-track faculty made the task of revising this section of the policy more difficult. Professor Muhly asked if it was possible to move from a professional and scientific position to the research track and back again. Professor Cox responded that this was not a *right* of the individual and that it would depend on the reason for the termination or non-renewal.

Professor Gillan moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the revisions to the research-track policy regarding termination and non-renewal be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Executive Session: Sharing Ideas for Advancing the University*

Professor Fox moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Council move into closed session. The motion carried unanimously.

The Councilors discussed how to move the university forward following the controversial conclusion of the presidential search process.

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

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

V.   Announcements
   - Vice President for Research and Economic Development Dan Reed will give a State of Research address on Monday, November 2, at 5:30 pm in the Callahan Auditorium of the College of Public Health Building. A reception will follow in the atrium.
   - The Faculty Senate Inclusion Teach-in will take place on Friday, November 13, 9:00 am – 3:30 pm, in University Capitol Centre 2520D.
   - The annual Faculty Senate/Iowa City Area Chamber of Commerce reception for local legislators will be held on Thursday, December 10, 4:00-5:30 pm, in the rotunda of the Old Capitol.
   - The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 27, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
   - The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 17, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI.   Adjournment – Professor Yockey moved and Professor Udaykumar seconded that the meeting be adjourned.   The motion carried unanimously.   President Bohannan adjourned the meeting at 6:00 pm.