

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 8, 2015
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: P. Abbas, M. Adamek, S. Ali, S. Baker, C. Benson, P. Brophy, J. Buatti, G. Buettner, S. Campo, D. Caplan, J. Colgan, D. Dawson, B. Eckstein, A. Ersig, J. Foote, C. Fox, T. Gallanis, A. Gerke, E. Gillan, K. Glenn, T. Havens, Z. Jin, J. Klesney-Tait, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, G. Lee, M. Lehan Mackin, K. Light-McGroary, W. Maury, A. Merino, K. Messingham, P. Muhly, M. Nikolas, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, P. Romitti, Y. Sato, D. Segaloff, S. Seibert, C. Sponsler, L. Storrs, K. Tachau, C. Thomas, T. Treat, H. Udaykumar, S. Vigmostad, S. Vos, J. Wang, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, J. Yockey.
- Officers Present: C. Bohannon, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: J. Bates, S. Daack-Hirsch, A. Lee, T. Mabry, D. Murry, J. Murry, J. Paulsen, G. Ryan, W. Schmidt, L. Segre, B. Thompson, M. Voigt, T. Yahr.
- Senators Absent:
- Guests: W. Afifi (Communication Studies), M. Ascoli (Pharmacology), B. Ayati (Mathematics), C. Brochu (Earth & Environmental Sciences), R. Bryant (Campaign to Organize Graduate Students), A. Butler (Social Work), C. Creekmur (English/Cinematic Arts/GWSS), D. Cuning (Philosophy), R. Curto (French & Italian), M. Dailey (Biology), E. Dove (Biomedical Engineering), A. Dutta (GWSS/ASLL), B. Ekdale (Journalism & Mass Communication), M. Foley Nicpon (Psych & Quant Foundations), T. Foster (EES), R. Ganim (Division of World Languages, Literatures and Cultures), L. Gardinier (Libraries), E. Gidal (English), L. Glass (English), S. Golz (Comparative Literature/German), D. Gooblar (Rhetoric), M. Habashi (Psychological & Brain Sciences), A. Hasan (Philosophy), E. Heineman (History), G. Hope (French & Italian), E. Irish (Biology), J. Kayle (Dance), P. Kempchinsky (Spanish & Portuguese/Linguistics), M. Khandelwal (Anthropology/GWSS), J. Kinsey (Art History), C. Kreiter, G. Landini (Philosophy), C. Lang (Physics & Astronomy), V. Lim (Internal Medicine), J. Livingston (Cinematic Arts), J. Logsdon (Biology), D. Macfarlane

(Internal Medicine), K. McGregor (Communication Sciences & Disorders), K. McLeod (Communication Studies), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), M. Mills (Russian/Asian & Slavic Languages & Literatures), B. Neel (Psychological & Brain Sciences), T. Oates (SJMC/American Studies), J. Pascoe (English), G. Penny (History), J. Prineas (Physics), R. Schiff (English), M. Schlutter (Religious Studies), L. Schwalm (History/GWSS), J. Selby (Dermatology), V. Sharp (Urology), T. Simmons (English), J. Solow (Economics), G. Stewart (English), K. Thomas (Internal Medicine), V. Thomas (RCE, College of Education), J. Throgmorton (Emeritus Faculty), A. Van Horne (CSD), S. Vlastos (History), S. Voyce (English), E. Wasserman (Psychological & Brain Sciences), T. Weingeist (Emeritus Faculty), R. Weiss (Internal Medicine), J. Welburn (Sociology and AFAMS), R. Williams (GWSS), K. Yuen, L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Bohannon called this special meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. New Business

- *Discussion of Presidential Search*

President Bohannon addressed the Senate, remarking that the university is undergoing one of its most difficult, heartbreaking times in recent years. She stated that, in her opinion, the university has been betrayed. Faculty, staff and students have all been betrayed. The search committee members, Faculty Senate members, and the Faculty Senate officers have been betrayed. She stressed that it was necessary for the university community to talk about how we feel about this and what we do as a university to deal with this, and try somehow to move forward. She commented that whenever a traumatic event like this occurs, it is natural to wonder *how* it could have occurred and *who* is responsible.

Acknowledging the Faculty Senate's role in the search process, President Bohannon explained that at the beginning, there was a question whether the presidential search process should be open or closed. The Faculty Senate advocated for an open search, to ensure maximum faculty involvement, participation, and influence. The Senate wanted to be sure that faculty voices were well-represented and that faculty were given credibility in the process. At every step along the way, these were the goals of the faculty members closely involved in the search (search committee members and Senate members). However, these efforts did not lead to the results that faculty wanted. And no one is more upset about this than those faculty members, who poured so much time, energy, and emotion into the search process.

President Bohannon added that, in retrospect, one of the most painful and divisive issues about the search is that it should have been a closed search, because we would have arrived at the exact same result. Instead, we had a so-called open search that dragged a lot of faculty down with it. Not surprisingly, people are looking askance at the members of the search committee and the Senate officers, wondering what role they played. President Bohannon stated that the faculty members involved in the search acted with the utmost integrity, and represented faculty

interests to the best of their ability. But, the search process failed. The Regents did not listen. The Regents said that they wanted faculty involved in this process, that they wanted to hear from faculty, and that they respected faculty viewpoints. At the end, however, they clearly did not. The faculty involved in the search process, on the other hand, did hear what faculty wanted, but the search process was moving very quickly and for every person who weighed in one side, there would be one or two others who would weigh in on the other side. They went forward trying to do the best they could for the best result and to represent faculty voices. President Bohannon said she was sorry that it didn't work.

President Bohannon explained that she had written a message to the Regents the day before the decision was made, in a last-ditch attempt to be absolutely clear about the choice before them and what was at stake. She had stated in no uncertain terms that there was just no support for the fourth candidate. She had also stated that the choice of a candidate who lacked any faculty, staff, or student support would destroy any relationship between the faculty and the Regents. Following the Regents' selection of Mr. Harreld, President Bohannon sent a message to Regents President Rastetter stating that he had betrayed the university – the faculty, staff, students, along with the search committee, the Faculty Senate officers, and her. She reminded him that they had talked about the value of faculty feedback, but clearly it didn't matter. She indicated to him that any trust that may have existed between Faculty Senate and the Regents had been broken and that she would not be communicating further with the Regents until she learned how the Senate wanted to proceed. This is the purpose of today's meeting. President Bohannon hoped that the faculty could come together today, decide how they want to move forward, and support each other.

President Bohannon indicated that Professor Dove, a former Faculty Senate President, would moderate the comments portion of the meeting so that the Senate officers could concentrate on hearing faculty feedback. She concluded her remarks by thanking everyone for coming to the meeting, the large attendance at which was a clear indication of the importance of this issue.

There was lengthy applause at the end of President Bohannon's remarks.

Professor Dove introduced himself to the group, mentioning that he was only one of two faculty members (Professor Tachau being the other) to have held all four offices in the Faculty Senate leadership. Unlike Professor Tachau, however, Professor Dove has the distinction of having served as past president *twice*. Professor Dove noted that the faculty have devoted their lives to intellectual pursuits, and that although opinions today may vary, he hoped that we would try to move the university forward with grace and in a civil manner, as would be fitting for an institution such as ours. Professor Dove then invited comments and discussion from the assembled group.

Professor Cuning commented that he didn't find the issue here to be whether a person with business experience could be helpful to the university; of course such a person could. The issue was with this particular candidate. He then expressed gratitude to the Faculty Senate officers for communicating the almost unanimous decision from faculty regarding the fourth candidate. He

commented that he had mixed feelings at this point. On one hand he wanted to find some way of disqualifying Mr. Harreld, given the false claims on his CV, for example. On the other hand, however, he wanted to be magnanimous and find some way of moving forward. If, in a year or so, we feel that things are not working out, we can think about our options. In conclusion, he expressed extreme frustration with the Regents, stating that we don't do things like this here in Iowa.

Professor Schlutter commented that he didn't think anyone present wanted to blame any faculty members for what happened; we want to blame only the Regents. He expressed the hope that during the meeting we could come to agreement on some course of action that shows the Regents what we think. Ms. Bryant, Press & Publicity Committee Chair for the Campaign to Organize Graduate Students (COGS), commented that COGS absolutely supports actions taken by the Faculty Senate. COGS members are outraged, disgusted and very hurt by this situation. Faculty members' teaching environments are COGS members' learning environments; therefore we must all work together. Ms. Bryant advocated for swift action. Professor Simmons acknowledged all that the Senate officers have done and said so far on behalf of faculty, but added that Professor Cunning's remarks have hit home for him. Action is needed based on serious communal outrage. Professor Simmons expressed the opinion that Mr. Harreld is not qualified to lead the university and has falsified his resume; this constitutes fraud. We have been defrauded by the man the Regents chose as our new president. He urged the Senate to take a vote that indicates our refusal to cooperate with the new president and shows that we will not tolerate this man leading us. If he does become president, we will organize a secondary leadership that will actually have the confidence of the faculty. Stating that we have been cheated, defrauded and made fun of, he also advocated for a vote of no-confidence in the Regents today. Professor Simmons further commented that the faculty are not opposed to business acumen in our leaders and cited the example of former UI President David Skorton.

Professor Brochu commented that he had been away at another institution when the Regents appointed Mr. Harreld and that his colleagues there were incredulous that a candidate who was not only unqualified but who had actively disqualified himself had been chosen. He stressed that we must do something soon to show that we are not simply going along with this. It is unlikely that we can do anything to prevent Mr. Harreld from taking office, but we can publicize the wastefulness of the search process. It is ironic that we are currently undergoing an efficiency review; the Regents should look to themselves first for greater efficiency. Professor Christie Thomas asked for clarification of the fraud to which a previous speaker had referred. Professor McLeod responded that an article in the *Gazette* had reported that the Secretary of State in Colorado had no record of the business which Mr. Harreld had listed on his resume as his current place of employment. Additionally, Professor McLeod observed that Mr. Harreld did not list the co-authors of several of his publications. A member of the audience expressed shock that the day after Mr. Harreld was chosen as president, the Board of Regents announced that it would request an additional state appropriation of \$4.5 million for UI. She stressed the need to take action now. Professor Gidal commented that the key to that action should be putting the spotlight on the Board of Regents. We should highlight the structural and personal elements that led to the decision to hire Mr. Harreld. We should keep long-term focus on the Regents

through teach-ins, research, and public outreach, in order to investigate why the Regents system is set up in such a way as to work counter to the university's interests.

Professor Heineman read excerpts from the Board of Regents Strategic Plan from 2010-16, noting that the plan affirms the Regents' commitment to core principles such as "academic freedom, academic quality, access, student success...ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, accountability, transparency..." She stressed that the faculty must make clear that they hold themselves to upholding those ideals, as well as committing themselves to working with any partners when they slip from those ideals, in order to bring them back to the core values of the university. Faculty must remind themselves that this is about the fundamental mission of the university, the crown jewel of the state of Iowa and a necessary element of a democratic society. This is about fundamental principles of what a university is. Professor Glass urged that we forge alliances not just with the staff and students, but with other groups across the state. We should not simply follow the script that the Regents have written for us. Professor Penny encouraged the group to reach out to the people of Iowa. This is not about how the Regents have treated the UI in this particular instance. After all, this is not the first time that the UI has had difficulty with the Regents. The Regents are undercutting the ability of Iowans to send their children to a Research I university. This is about the role of the university in the state and what the Regents are taking away from the state's citizens.

Professor Afifi questioned what a vote of no confidence in the Regents would accomplish. He preferred to take the long view, noting that appointed governing boards across the nation have failed their universities in recent years. The UI could become the hub for action against these failures, through conferences and conversations, bringing as much heat as possible to this topic nationally over the long term. Returning to the core values and principles enumerated in the Regents' strategic plan, Professor Williams remarked that among these are "civility, collaboration, diversity..., ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, transparency and public accountability." She stated that if we feel that the Regents had acted in compliance with their core mission through this process, that's great. But if we don't, we need to let them know that they have strayed from their mission. Professor Livingston suggested not looking at our options as "a vote of no confidence *or...*" but as "a vote of no confidence *and...*" He commented that this was a case of Iowa pork meeting a Boston chicken and stressed the need for action. He disagreed with speakers who had commented that nothing could be done about Mr. Harreld's hiring and cited a situation in New York City in which a newly-appointed chancellor stepped down in the face of public outrage.

Professor Schwalm commented that expressing ourselves even more clearly and thoroughly than we already have to the Regents is not going to get us anywhere, and that we should direct our efforts instead to communicating with the residents of Iowa. We must let Iowans know how the Regents have acted illegally and unethically, and how they have stolen Iowans' legacy. This is more important to our mission. Professor Tachau reminded the group that in President Bohannon's letter to the Regents she had predicted a no-confidence vote if Mr. Harreld were chosen, so we should follow through on that. Professor Wasserman commented that during his time as Faculty Senate President, he had participated in a campaign to counter allegations that faculty were not engaging with students. He then praised the members of the UI Chapter of the

American Association of University Professors for conducting a survey evaluating each of the presidential candidates. He credited their courage and dedication for our presence here today. Professor Wasserman then posed the question, why would the Regents ram someone down our throats whom they already knew to be unacceptable as president? They must be up to some real shenanigans. He noted that Mr. Harreld has publicly stated that he believes in “public hangings.” Professor Wasserman added that Mr. Harreld is dedicated to destroying culture in business. He warned Mr. Harreld that he would not take our culture away from us. Our culture includes freedom of inquiry, protected by tenure. He questioned whether someone who had never earned tenure would protect it for anyone else. Professor Wasserman commented that Mr. Harreld had parroted “shared governance” throughout his presentation, but look what the Regents thought of shared governance. He urged those present to think long and hard about the ultimate objective here. He expressed the opinion that the objective is to turn the UI into a non-tenure-track university, where faculty are contingent on contracts, where student input determines salary and duration of appointment, and where learning outcomes become what we spend all of our time trying to generate. Look to Purdue to see what we might become. The Regents would not have gone to this much trouble to manufacture this man for president if they weren’t up to some serious no good.

Professor Udaykumar stated that as an educational institution, we should take advantage of this teaching moment for our students, to show them how to fight oppression, because that is what this is. He agreed with Professor Afifi that we should hold conferences on government intervention in education and we should write scholarly pieces on exactly how the Regents have failed the state of Iowa. We should also talk about it to our students in our classes and instruct them that this is not the way things are done. We need to take concrete steps throughout the next year to talk incessantly about this event as a travesty.

Professor Treat moved that the Senate entertain the following motion of no confidence in the Board of Regents:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents to wisely govern our institution.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Wilder suggested adding the phrase,

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa *and the citizens of Iowa* and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents to wisely govern our institution.

To precipitate discussion of the motion, Professor Storrs asked if anyone saw any drawbacks to passing this motion of no confidence. Professor Menninger commented that since the Regents have not done their self-proclaimed job, this should be part of the motion. Professor Solow

noted that this was not the first time that the Faculty Senate had voted no confidence in the Board of Regents. A previous such vote had occurred following the failed search of 2006. In his opinion, that vote had made no difference whatsoever. He suggested that the Senate take a vote of no confidence in Mr. Harreld. He added that he was not suggesting this out of spite, but because it is a fact that none of us have confidence in Mr. Harreld's ability to run the university. He further commented that during his many years at the university, he understood his job to consist of teaching, research, and service, but not of educating the president of the university, as one would assume that a president would be provided who already knew something about how a university operates. Professor Christie Thomas expressed concern that a vote of no confidence in the Regents could lead to a loss of support from legislators and from the citizens of Iowa. He added that taking a vote of no confidence in Mr. Harreld at this time, before he has had any chance to prove himself, could be even more detrimental to the university. Professor Throgmorton commented that the Regents likely expected a no-confidence vote, so we should think strategically about our response to their response. We should also give some thought to the person responsible for appointing the Regents, Governor Branstad. Professor Throgmorton advocated for eliciting the support of a particularly strong constituency, the alumni.

Professor Williams reminded the group that faculty are citizens of Iowa, also, and that we should make that clear as we move this motion forward. Professor Vlastos emphasized a point made earlier, that the Regents have not upheld their own standards. He added that the Regents have not done what they are committed to doing. The list of their specific failed duties should be included in our motion. Professor Seibert suggested forming a committee to craft a more detailed motion, as well as forming committees to elicit support from other constituencies. The motion could then be presented for a vote when we have clear support from other groups. Professor Macfarlane returned to the issue of potential damage to the university from the no-confidence vote. If perhaps the vote leads to the withdrawal of Mr. Harreld and the eventual collapse of the Regents, the faculty will be regarded as the cause of all these disasters. The university will then appear to be ungovernable. A better way for the Senate to proceed would be to accept the fact that we have been hurt, but also to realize that we are bigger than this insult and bigger than the Regents and the university president. Our mission is more important than any of those and we will uphold our mission, if necessary working with Mr. Harreld to do so. If he turns out to be a good president, that's great; if not, we can work to unseat him. But until we have facts on the ground, we should move cautiously. Any no-confidence motion should be carefully crafted and perhaps brought to a later meeting.

Professor Romitti asked for clarification whether Mr. Harreld met the qualifications listed in the job description for the UI president. He asked how a vote of no-confidence could be taken if Mr. Harreld had met the qualifications and if the Regents had done their job in choosing a new president. Professor Logsdon urged Senators to act swiftly on this motion and stated that we should align ourselves with the student government which has already made a very strong statement and has been brave, powerful, and swift in that statement. He expressed the opinion that further deliberation on this issue was unnecessary. Professor Storrs commented that a hasty vote that was not appealing in its wording to the citizens of Iowa could be less effective. She also suggested reaching out to the other Regents universities for support. She urged that the no-confidence vote not become an end point; we must continue to do many other things, as well.

Professor Treat made a friendly amendment to her motion, presenting a revised version of the motion incorporating suggestions to include the Regents' specific failed duties:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa and the citizens of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, and

WHEREAS the Regents have failed to act according to their own strategic plan's core values, namely civility, ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, public accountability, stewardship and service, and transparency, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents to wisely govern our institution.

Professor Merino suggested adding more details about the specific dates when these events occurred to the motion in order to strengthen it. Professor Buatti suggested that the vote go forward, but that it be followed up with a more detailed open letter, perhaps to the governor and the legislature. Professor Weiss thanked the Senate and its leadership for its efforts. He commented that out of a sense of fairness, he felt that he should emphasize some of the positive aspects of the presidential search process conducted by the Board of Regents; he continued that, unfortunately, he was unable to think of any positive aspects. He observed that it has been made clear that the Regents do not care what we think. If the no-confidence vote does go forward, it is the next steps that are most important. We must make abundantly clear that we are not going away. Professor Voyce commented that he had submitted an open records request for emails associated with the presidential search; such requests are a concrete step that can be taken going forward.

Professor Adamek asked if President Bohannon feels she has sufficient specific information to back up the motion, particularly that part of the motion that states that the Regents have failed to act according to their strategic plan's core values. President Bohannon responded that there were very serious problems here and they do relate to the values expressed in the strategic plan, in particular the promise given to the Faculty Senate leadership and to the search committee that campus feedback on the candidates would be, not just *heard*, but *valued*. It is hard to see that this occurred. There are other issues around civility and efficiency. The search process has been terribly wasteful of time and energy of faculty members who spent hours involved in the process. President Bohannon continued, commenting that she agreed with those speakers who have said that any vote taken here today should not be the end of our reaction. There are more than sufficient grounds to vote no confidence. But more needs to be done. We must communicate to the people of Iowa who the faculty are – thoughtful and hardworking people. We also need to think about how we will relate to Mr. Harreld. We need to be careful and articulate about how we present our views. We need to tell our story in the best possible way, to Iowans, to the higher education world, and to Mr. Harreld. Hasty drafting does not usually lead to a well-told story; this is her only hesitation about taking a no-confidence vote today. It is important to consider how faculty will emerge from this situation. President Bohannon wanted to convey that the faculty are better than this situation, that the faculty have strong values, and that they want to move the university forward.

Professor Heineman commented that she appreciated President Bohannon's concerns. She added that, because of the current national debate regarding higher education, we have audiences outside of Iowa, as well. To speak to all these various audiences, it may be helpful to carefully review the Regents' strategic plan with the goal of showing how the Regents' actions may make it impossible for the mission of educating the citizens of Iowa to be fulfilled. She suggested removing the reference to shared governance in the motion, because this is not as important to our many audiences as it is to us. Professor Storrs concurred and also advocated for removing the reference to "civility" in the motion, because that focuses attention on the faculty's reaction, rather than the Regents' actions.

Professor Storrs made a friendly amendment to remove the word *civility* from the motion:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa and the citizens of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, and

WHEREAS the Regents have failed to act according to their own strategic plan's core values, namely ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, public accountability, stewardship and service, and transparency, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents to wisely govern our institution.

Professor Klesney-Tait questioned the need for a rapid response, such as a no-confidence vote today, to the Regents' actions and she wondered what would be gained by it. She added that the Regents could make the argument that they did value campus feedback; they simply disagreed with it. It could then look like the faculty are angry that the Regents disagreed with them and that would hurt the public's perception of the faculty. We should take time to compose a document that would, for example, show exactly how we think Mr. Harreld does not meet the job description. She suggested that the Senate leadership speak with the governor, because we may be more effective behind the scenes rather than playing this out in public. Professor Pascoe urged that a vote of no-confidence be taken today, pointing out that the graduate students had issued a strong statement the same day that Mr. Harreld was chosen as president. Our pace seems glacial in comparison. She suggested that we take swift action today, and also take a vote of no-confidence in Mr. Harreld, given the misrepresentations in his CV. These votes should be followed up with a longer and more eloquent letter to the governor, expressing all of our issues with the search process. We should also elicit the support of the faculty and student governments at the other Regents institutions and join with Professor Voyce in requesting release of documents related to the search. She concluded by saying that, although we need to keep telling our story, we still need to do something right away. Professor Brochu suggested dropping the word *honesty* from the motion, since we cannot prove dishonesty on the part of the Regents.

A professor from History cited the preferred qualifications in the presidential job description. These qualifications include an earned doctorate or terminal degree and administrative experience demonstrating the ability to lead a complex academic research

institution and medical center. Clearly, the Regents did not follow their own marching orders when choosing a president. He added that this is a case of political cronyism, emanating from the top of the Branstad government. At least one of the Regents has financial connections to Governor Branstad. This cronyism permeates the entire political structure of the state of Iowa. The issue that we are facing now is not just a UI issue, it is a state of Iowa issue. A professor asked for some details from the search committee; for example, was Mr. Harreld actually their fourth choice, and if so, was he a distant fourth? Was it possible that he was merely inserted into the final pool? President Bohannon (who was a member of the search committee) explained that the committee members had signed confidentiality agreements and therefore could not reveal such details about the search. She apologized for her inability to answer the question. Professor Tachau pointed out that, regardless what the search committee felt about the candidates, the AAUP survey of the campus community revealed that Mr. Harreld had no greater than 2% agreement on any question regarding his job qualifications from the hundreds of faculty, staff, and students who took the survey. Professor Merino pointed out that the selection of Mr. Harreld as president is the last in a lengthy list of recent disagreements with the Regents. She suggested expanding the motion to include these other disagreements, such as the attempt to move funding away from UI to UNI and ISU as part of the proposed performance-based funding model. Professor Dove commented that this motion would not preclude other and more detailed forms of communication. President Bohannon added that how and what we communicate to the state is extremely important. Professor Weingeist expressed concern about the long-term effects of the vote and suggested taking additional time to think it through.

Professor Ganim, chair of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Faculty Assembly, indicated that Faculty Assembly has a long history of working with the Faculty Senate, and would support the Senate in this case, also, and work with the Senate over the coming months towards a resolution of this problem. He stressed that it was important to do something now, to follow the lead of COGS. Professor Wilder posed the questions, at what point did the citizens of Iowa, as well as the faculty, staff, students and alumni of the University of Iowa, stop being stakeholders in this process, and at what point did ethics in Iowa become an oxymoron? Professor Creekmur advocated for taking a vote of no confidence now, after a long weekend with no direct response from us. As someone who studies symbols, he was troubled by the suggestion that this vote would be an empty gesture. He agreed that many other actions should follow this vote, but stated that symbols are nevertheless important. Professor Benson acknowledged the need to make a statement, but he commented that the people we are dealing with only recognize power, so we need to figure out a way to move ourselves into a position of power, perhaps by gathering allies and constituents to our side.

Professor Havens voiced support for a no-confidence vote, but expressed concerns about how it fits into our larger strategy and specifically about the language of the motion. He predicted that senators will be asked by the press what facts they have to back up the statements in the motion. We need to take advantage of the press cycle by having facts already collected for our use, so we need time to craft this statement carefully. Professor Wilcox advocated for an immediate, visceral, clear response in the form of a no-confidence vote today. He reminded the group of the wonderful efforts expended by our Senate leadership in working with the Regents and trying to convey to them in every possible way a reasoned argument, as well as the efforts of

the faculty to state loudly and clearly that there were three fantastic candidates and one candidate who should not be appointed. The Regents claimed to be listening, but we were completely ignored. Professor Wilcox commented that this would seem to indicate a policy of deliberative, careful reasoning doesn't always work. Therefore, we need an immediate, visceral reaction. We can continue with our deliberative, reasoned approach in the year of action ahead. A faculty member advocated for the no-confidence vote, along with other avenues of communication with Iowans; in particular, he suggested an open letter to the parents of UI students. Another faculty member suggested seeking an opportunity to respond to a recent Iowa Public Radio story about the selection of Mr. Harreld. A faculty member asked if a no-confidence vote would make it more difficult for the Senate officers to fulfill their leadership roles. President Bohannon responded that it was unlikely. She added that her main concern was what was best for the university. Given the feelings expressed here, if the vote is necessary to move forward, then we should have the vote. But, we need to decide if the vote is necessary to move forward.

A senator called the question. The final version of the motion was stated:

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has failed in its duty of care to the University of Iowa and the citizens of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of university governance, and

WHEREAS the Regents have failed to act according to their own strategic plan's core values, namely ethical behavior, honesty, open and effective communication, public accountability, stewardship and service, and transparency, we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents wisely to govern our institution.

The motion to call the question carried with 42 votes.

The motion of no confidence in the Board of Regents carried with 46 votes.

President Bohannon thanked faculty for the discussion here today. She added that it is very unfortunate that we had to get to this point and nobody regrets that more than we do. We will try to make faculty voices heard at some point. Maybe this vote will help to get that done. She stressed the need to follow up with further action. We must tell our story, that we are thoughtful and hardworking and that we care about the state of Iowa and we care about higher education. She invited conversations with faculty who want to share in that work.

III. Adjournment – Professor Campo moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.