

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, September 22, 2015**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present: M. Adamek, S. Ali, B. Ayati, S. Baker, J. Bates, M. Beck, C. Benson, G. Buettner, S. Campo, J. Colgan, R. Curto, M. Dailey, D. Dawson, B. Eckstein, A. Ersig, M. Foley Nicpon, J. Foote, C. Fox, T. Gallanis, A. Gerke, E. Gillan, J. Klesney-Tait, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, G. Lee, M. Lehan Mackin, K. Light-McGroary, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, A. Merino, K. Messingham, P. Muhly, D. Murry, J. Murry, M. Nikolas, J. Paulsen, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, P. Romitti, D. Segaloff, L. Segre, J. Selby, C. Sponsler, L. Storrs, K. Tachau, C. Thomas, T. Treat, H. Udaykumar, S. Vigmostad, M. Voigt, J. Wang, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, J. Yockey.
- Officers Present: C. Bohannon, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: P. Abbas, P. Brophy, D. Caplan, S. Daack-Hirsch, Z. Jin, G. Ryan, T. Yahr.
- Senators Absent: J. Buatti, K. Glenn, T. Havens, A. Lee, W. Maury, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, S. Seibert, B. Thompson, S. Vos.
- Guests: W. Jacobson (Office of the Provost), S. Johnson (Office of the Ombudsperson), C. Joyce (Office of the Ombudsperson), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Moeller (Office of the Provost), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Bohannon called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Campo moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 28, 2015) (September 8, 2015) – Professor Wilder offered one correction to the September 8, 2015 minutes. Professor Gillan moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees)
- Christopher Benson (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Kathleen Kieran (Urology) on the Faculty Council, 2015-16
  - Michael Dailey (Biology) to replace Usha Mallik (Physics & Astronomy) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-16

- Roxanna Curto (French & Italian) to replace Jennifer Iverson (Music) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-16
  - Margaret Beck (Anthropology) to replace Frank Durham (Journalism & Mass Communication) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2015
  - Bruce Ayati (Mathematics) to replace Mark Blumberg (Psychological and Brain Sciences) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2015
  - Donald Macfarlane (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Ned Amendola (Orthopaedics) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-17
  - John Selby (Dermatology) to fill the unexpired term of Kathleen Kieran (Urology) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-16
  - Megan Foley Nicpon (Psych & Quant Foundations) to fill the unexpired term of Nancy Langguth (Teaching and Learning) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-16
  - H.S. Udaykumar (Mechanical Engineering) to fill the unexpired term of Bruce Justman (Endodontics) on the Council on Teaching, 2015-16
  - Michael Hill (English) to fill the unexpired term of Suely Oliveira (Computer Science) on the Diversity Committee, 2015-17
  - Mériam Belli (History) to fill the unexpired term of Kathryn Gerken (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations) on the Diversity Committee, 2015-16
  - Barbara Eckstein (English) to the Sustainability Committee, 2015-18
  - Heather Sander (Geography) to the Sustainability Committee, 2015-18
  - David Dowling (Journalism & Mass Communication) to the Student Publications Board, 2015-18
  - Sandra Daack-Hirsch (Nursing) to the Elections Committee, 2015-18
  - Edward Gillan (Chemistry) to the Rules & Bylaws Committee, 2015-18
- Professor Kolker moved and Professor Fox seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

- *Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Accreditation Process (Wayne Jacobson, Director of Assessment and Lon Moeller, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education)*

Dr. Jacobson indicated that HLC accreditation review is on a ten-year cycle. The last review for UI had taken place in 2008, so we are due for our next review in 2018-19. He explained that review procedures have changed since 2008 because it had become clear that the previous process was not working well. The previous process included a site visit at year 10. In preparation for this site visit, an enormous amount of hard copy documentation was collected and a comprehensive self-study was prepared. This effort required the participation of numerous faculty and staff members over the twelve-month period leading up to the site visit. While the accreditation process will continue to take place on a ten-year cycle, there will now be a review of an Institutional Assurance Argument at years 4 and 10. The comprehensive site visit will take place in conjunction with the year 10 Assurance Argument review. Annual updates of institutional data and organizational changes will be required and a separate review of institutional compliance with federal regulations will be conducted. A three-year Quality Initiative will be completed during years 5-9. A specific timeline for UI can be found at <http://provost.uiowa.edu/university-accreditation>.

Dr. Jacobson explained that in the past universities were asked to prepare a self-study with few guidelines offered regarding what to include. The new Assurance Argument will require that

institutions address five specific accreditation criteria, with 3-5 components each, making for a more focused, relevant document. Supporting documents are linked to the Assurance Argument and stored in an Evidence File. The online HLC Assurance System allows for both the Assurance Argument and the Evidence File to be compiled and submitted in electronic format. As in the past, however, assistance from faculty and staff will still be needed, in this case to create the components of the Assurance Argument and locate documents for the Evidence File. Turning to the Quality Initiative component, Dr. Jacobson noted that the streamlined Assurance Argument does not allow much latitude for each institution to present information about what makes it unique. Therefore, the purpose of the three-year Quality Initiative is to give institutions the opportunity to take on an improvement project appropriate to their current circumstances and goals. This initiative allows for institutions “to take risks, aim high, and if so be it, learn from only partial success or even failure.” The Quality Initiative must be of institution-level scope and significance, must align with the implementation of other institutional priorities, and must be meaningfully assessed at the end of the three-year period. Success will be measured by how the initiative is sustained and assessed, regardless whether the goals were accomplished. Because of where we are in the ten-year accreditation cycle, UI now has slightly less than three years remaining to conduct a Quality Initiative.

Associate Provost Moeller explained that the UI Quality Initiative Committee, comprised of faculty from across campus, has been looking at various efforts already underway on campus, particularly the improvement of first-year student retention. The university has already implemented a range of programs, such as first-year seminars and living-learning communities, at the institutional level, as well as at the collegiate and program level, with the goal of improving the retention rate among all students. However, these programs are primarily optional and students participate on a first-come, first-served basis. Our retention rate currently hovers around 85%, one of the lowest in the Big Ten. The Quality Initiative Committee looked at subsets of the student population that are having the hardest time persisting from the first year to the second. First-generation college students have a significantly lower retention rate than non-first-generation college students (81% vs 87%). Therefore, the committee has decided to focus on efforts specifically geared toward raising the retention rate of first-generation students.

Dr. Jacobson enumerated some of the challenges faced by first-generation students. These students are more likely to have financial struggles related to paying for college and to have little informational support from their families, who are unfamiliar with higher education. They are less likely to have taken college prep courses in high school and less likely to sign up for optional opportunities at the university. They are more likely to report not feeling socially integrated on campus. The Quality Initiative will identify those students who are most at risk of not persisting and encourage them to participate in those programs that have proven to lead students toward engagement and success. Possible areas of activity include pre-enrollment academic success messaging to set expectations; recruitment to existing programs that address academic or financial needs; and examination of the role of first-year courses with a high level of in-class engagement for their effect on student persistence. Dr. Jacobson concluded the presentation by asking for assistance in identifying faculty members who are already engaged in these types of efforts and who are willing to serve in advisory roles and in working groups. Suggestions for next steps to explore can be submitted to <http://www.uiowa.edu/assessment/suggestion-box>.

Professor Tachau praised this effort and suggested that the connection between the success of undergraduates and the success of professional and graduate students be made clear when efforts to improve retention are explained to the Board of Regents. Professor Christie Thomas wondered about the enormous expenditure of faculty and staff efforts on the HLC accreditation review. Dr. Jacobson responded that this would need to be calculated in terms of person hours, but fortunately with the recent changes to the process, the review should not require as much work as before. Provost's Office staff will also be maintaining and updating information on a regular basis. Associate Provost Moeller stressed that, through the accreditation process, we can let people outside of Iowa know what a great job we are doing here at UI.

Professor John Murry observed that some of our Big Ten peers have a more highly selective admissions process than UI does and this undoubtedly impacts our retention numbers. We should make it clear in our accreditation report that the Board of Regents has adopted a different stance on admissions. Associate Provost Moeller commented that this makes our efforts to improve retention even more worthy of notice. Dr. Jacobson added that we want to improve our retention numbers in relation to ourselves, in order to serve at-risk students even more successfully, and not necessarily to improve our retention rate in comparison to other schools with different admissions criteria. Professor Macfarland commented that, to improve the retention rate, we could persuade the 15% to stay, or advise them not even to start. He questioned how anyone benefits by retaining students who probably should not have been admitted to the university in the first place. On the one hand, we are making a quality education available to a wider range of students. If they do not persist to graduation, however, they reap limited benefits from their experience here. Associate Provost Moeller responded that we must make sure that UI is the right fit for each student who enrolls, and that each prospective student receives appropriate advising regarding their course of study, as well as their financial costs of attendance. In response to another question, Dr. Jacobson commented that, for those students who leave the university before graduation, we can obtain information about whether they move to a different institution. Otherwise, it is difficult to find out what has happened to them.

- *Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report (Susan Johnson and Cynthia Joyce, Ombudspersons)*

The Ombudspersons presented highlights from the Office's 29<sup>th</sup> annual report (2014-15). The report can be accessed online at <http://www.uiowa.edu/ombuds/reports-and-documents>. Professor Johnson reminded the group that the Office of the Ombudsperson is confidential, neutral, informal, and independent. While the number of visitors has gradually increased over the Office's years of operation, for the past few years the number of visitors has held steady at about 600. Faculty members have made up 15-20% of the Office's visitors in the past five years; in 2014-15 this represented about 4% of the total number of faculty on campus. A disproportionate number (relative to their representation on campus) of visitors are women or members of ethnic and racial minorities.

Ms. Joyce explained that among the total number of visitor concerns, 49% involved evaluative relationships. A similar percentage of faculty concerns, 48%, involved evaluative relationships. Other major faculty concerns were peer relationships (13%), career/academic

progression (13%), and policy violations (10%). Concerns about disrespectful behavior were raised by 27% of the total number of visitors. This is a similar percentage as last year. Disrespectful behavior complaints have been tracked by the Office over the past several years, as the number of these complaints has gradually increased. Interestingly, this seems to be at odds with the Working at Iowa survey results related to respect on campus. Professor Johnson commented that the Working at Iowa survey would provide a more accurate generalization of the entire campus. Ms. Joyce continued, noting that 9% of Office visitors had concerns about discrimination and harassment, the same percentage as last year. Six percent of total visitors had concerns regarding sexual misconduct and harassment, a much higher percentage than in the past. This includes people who believe they are experiencing sexual harassment, who have concerns about reporting sexual misconduct or harassment, and who have been accused of violating the university's policy on sexual misconduct and harassment. Ms. Joyce reported that this year for the first time the Office attempted to measure organizational risk related to the cases they have handled. Every visitor was assigned to one or more categories of risk based on their initial report to the Office. Out of this year's 599 visitors, 367 (61%) indicated an organizational risk possibility. Among the specific risks are loss of productivity due to pervasive conflict, significant policy violations, staff turnover, and safety concerns.

Professor Johnson explained that each year the Office highlights particular trends among visitor concerns and strives to bring those trends to the attention of the university community. In the past few years, a number of female faculty, staff and students have come to the Office "with concerns and fears about how pregnancy and childbirth might affect their position on campus." Professor Johnson noted that the obligations of the university around this issue are clearly stated in federal law and the university itself has good policies in place. The reported problems seem to arise locally, where there may be some misunderstanding and miscommunication. She added that pregnancy discrimination is a nationwide problem. Professor Johnson encouraged faculty and administrators to be aware of this issue if it arises in their departments. Another trend of particular relevance to faculty relates to pre-tenure faculty joint appointments (appointments in which there is actual splitting of effort and resources between departments). A Memorandum of Understanding prepared by the departments prior to the hiring is instrumental in heading off conflict, although it is still possible for misunderstanding to arise in the presence of an MOU, leaving the faculty member caught in the middle. Professor Johnson concluded the report by indicating that the Ombudspersons regularly make many presentations across campus and that the Office has received generally positive evaluations by visitors who have responded to the Office's follow-up survey. The majority of respondents have indicated that they have learned skills to deal with future conflict.

Professor Christie Thomas questioned what action the Ombudspersons would take if they discovered that a particular unit over time was developing a hostile climate for its employees. Professor Johnson responded that the Office's first responsibility is to preserve the confidentiality of its visitors. The Ombudspersons would approach the leadership of the unit if the visitors give permission to do so (even if the visitors' names are not used). If many people from that unit come to the Office with concerns, however, then the Ombudspersons may feel able to approach the unit leadership without requesting permission (but still not using names). Referring to the growth in the number of Office visitors over the past years, Vice President

Vaughn asked what might have caused that increase. The Ombudspersons were not sure, but have speculated that the greater visibility of the Office may well have led to the increase in visitors.

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

Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Wilder seconded that the Senate move into closed session. The motion carried unanimously.

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

Professor Christie Thomas moved and Professor Fox seconded that the Senate 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 next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 13, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 27, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Wilder moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.