

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 23, 2019
3:30 – 4:45 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: F. Ahmad, J. Ankrum, G. Bardhoshi, E. Bayman, S. Bodine, C. Bradley, J. Carlson, A. Chauhan, J. Colgan, K. Culp, M. Cunningham-Ford, A. Curtius, R. Curto, F. Durham, S. Elangovan, B. Elias, M. Foley Nicpon, E. Gillan, L. Glass, C. Grueter, D. Hall, A. Jung, C. Kletzing, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, K. Lamping, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Long, D. Macfarlane, L. MacGillivray, T. Marshall, M. McDermott, M. McQuistan, M. Nikolas, H. Parrish, T. Peters, M. Pizzimenti, E. Prussing, J. Reinhardt, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, C. Sheerin, S. Sosale, A. Stapleton, V. Steelman, K. Tachau, T. Treat, A. Vikram, E. Wasserman, D. Wurster.
- Officers Present: S. Daack-Hirsch, R. Ganim, P. Snyder, J. Yockey.
- Senators Excused: S. Ashida, D. Caplan, S. Harwani, C. Lang, J. Logsdon, K. Messingham, G. Russell, C. Thomas, S. Vos, J. Welburn.
- Senators Absent: L. Allen, R. Balakrishnan, J. Barker, R. Boudreau, J. Buckley, A. Deshpande, B. Dixon, A. Durnev, E. Finzel, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, D. Gooblar, P. Goswami, I. Grumbach, A. Hooks, A. Hosmanek, D. Jalal, P. Kaboli, B. Kyles, U. Mallik, T. Midtrod, R. Oral, E. Sander, J. Streit, J. Szot, D. Wesemann, D. Whaley.
- Guests: K. Brown (ACE Review Committee, Tippie College of Business), S. Bruch (Charter Committee on Diversity, Sociology), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), A. Flaming (Center for Teaching), B. Gage (Office of Admissions), C. McKinney (Office of Strategic Communication), F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Ganim called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. He requested that current senators move into the center section of chairs, while all others move into the side sections.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Kwitek moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 26, 2019) – Professor Glass moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the March 26, 2019 minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Russ Ganim) – President Ganim presented the results of the 2019 Faculty Senate and Faculty Council elections. He noted that this was a particularly challenging year to recruit Senate candidates and that several seats still need to be filled. Also, the Faculty Council election in the Carver College of Medicine has not been held yet, but will be in the next few weeks. Professor Marshall moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the 2019 election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. 2019-20 Committee Recommendations (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Daack-Hirsch presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2019-20 academic year. She noted that there are still some vacancies to be filled. These appointments will be approved in the fall. Professor Gillan moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the 2019-20 committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2017-18 Motion Summary – Vice President Daack-Hirsch presented the 2017-18 motion summary. Professor Long moved and Professor Ahmad seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Diversity Survey Results (Sarah Bruch, Faculty co-chair, Charter Committee on Diversity and Diane Finnerty, Assistant Provost for Faculty)*

President Ganim explained that Professor Bruch and Assistant Provost Finnerty would be reporting on a recent diversity, equity, and inclusion survey and the subsequent action plan. Assistant Provost Finnerty indicated that during the presentation, she and Professor Bruch would give an overview of the action plan development process and of the survey findings, along with next steps. At the conclusion of the presentation, Professor Bruch and Assistant Provost Finnerty would offer suggestions for faculty leadership in advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus.

Assistant Provost Finnerty noted that work began on this endeavor in fall of 2017. Interim Chief Diversity Officer Lena Hill convened a forum attended by vice presidents, deans, and shared governance and campus diversity leaders to look closely at how to keep moving forward with diversity, equity and inclusion efforts on campus. This leadership team decided that we must assess the current climate, increase coordination of effort, and articulate why diversity, equity, and inclusion matter. As a result of the forum, a statement was released in January 2018 affirming that the university is striving for excellence through diversity, equity and inclusion, which are inextricably linked to academic excellence, not tangential to the academic mission. As an example of recent efforts to foster diversity, equity, and inclusion on campus that especially impact faculty, Assistant Provost Finnerty drew the group's attention to a handout detailing related activities in the Provost's Office in the areas of faculty recruitment, retention, and advancement.

Assistant Provost Finnerty stressed that the university is making a paradigm shift from *diversity* to *diversity, equity, and inclusion*. While *diversity* may be a familiar term to the

campus, the other two concepts may be less clear. She explained that *equity* relates to examining our “business as usual” policies and procedures to determine whether they contribute to a climate in which everyone on campus can thrive, no matter what their previous individual experiences have been. *Inclusion* relates to understanding how different individuals on campus perceive their experiences here and then fostering a culture in which everyone has a sense of belonging. Assistant Provost Finnerty noted that a new position, Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion has been established and will be filled at the end of June. This position will replace the position of Chief Diversity Officer. Turning to the process of the development of the action plan, Assistant Provost Finnerty explained that it was necessary to listen, understand and act. As part of the listening phase, the Charter Committee on Diversity collaborated with the Chief Diversity Office and the Office of the Provost to conduct a comprehensive survey to assess campus climate.

Professor Bruch explained that faculty, staff and students all received some form of the survey. Also, ten listening sessions with faculty and staff were held last spring. About twenty listening sessions with undergraduate and graduate students were held last fall. Currently sessions with professional students, post-docs, and residents and fellows at the hospital are underway. She indicated that the data she planned to share came from survey results for faculty, staff, undergraduate students and graduate students. The response rate for faculty and staff was 22%. For the undergraduate survey, the response rate was 20% and for the graduate student survey, 35%. While these numbers may seem low, Professor Bruch commented that such response rates are typical for these types of surveys. Two analyses were performed on the data, a representative analysis to confirm that the demographics of the survey sample match the demographics of the campus population, and a generalizability analysis, to determine if similar responses could be found to similar questions on other university surveys, in this case, the Working at Iowa survey. On April 4, the survey reports, along with the action plan, were released. The action plan and the highly-detailed reports can be found online, <https://diversity.uiowa.edu/action-planning>.

Professor Bruch then turned to a discussion of the survey findings in relation to the action plan’s goals, which were created based on feedback from the survey and the listening sessions. The four goals are *Create and sustain an inclusive and equitable campus environment; Recruit, retain, and advance a diverse campus community of faculty, staff, and students; Integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into the university’s core academic mission of teaching, research, and service; and Enhance campus-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion accountability, effectiveness, and collaboration*. One of the survey questions, related to the first goal, was *Over the past twelve months, how satisfied have you been with the overall campus climate or environment you have experienced at the University of Iowa?* About 70% of undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and staff responded that they were somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate. This data can be further broken down by social identity or social demographic groups. Multi-racial faculty and staff and faculty and staff who are members of underrepresented racial minority (URM) groups (African-American/Black, Hispanic/Latinx, Native American and Pacific Islander) were less likely to report that they were somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate, compared to their Asian or white counterparts. Less than 50% of international undergraduate students (a separate category of

student, not broken down by racial or ethnic identity) reported being somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate. The same question was disaggregated by gender identity and responses indicated that, among faculty, women were less likely than men to say they were somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate. When the same question was disaggregated by sexual orientation, those who identified as LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, queer, or questioning) were less likely than their heterosexual counterparts to say they were somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate. When the data was broken down by ability status, faculty members with a self-identified disability were less likely than those without a self-identified disability to report being somewhat or very satisfied with the campus climate. When broken down by political ideology, the data indicated little significant difference in satisfaction with the campus climate. Professor Macfarland asked about the size of each of these groups. Professor Bruch responded that she could get that information to him after the meeting.

Turning to the second goal, *Recruit, retain, and advance a diverse campus community of faculty, staff, and students*, Professor Bruch reported that input from the listening sessions indicated strong support for diversifying the faculty. One of the survey questions related to this goal was, *Over the past twelve months, have you seriously considered leaving the university?* About 1500 people, approximately 39% of faculty and staff respondents, answered that they had considered leaving the university in the past twelve months. Among faculty members, 60% of URM faculty members had considered leaving the university in the past twelve months. Almost 50% of women faculty members had considered leaving the university in the past twelve months. Professor Bruch pointed out that both of these numbers are striking. For those who had answered this question affirmatively, a variety of reasons were given, including departmental climate, lack of professional support, campus climate, etc. Professor Bruch noted that retention efforts often focus on career advancement and salary considerations, but not much on these other factors, even though departmental climate was one of the most common reasons given by both faculty and staff for considering leaving the university. Two additional survey questions asked *Does your college/unit make genuine efforts to recruit and retain female faculty and staff?* and *Does your college/unit make genuine efforts to recruit and retain URM faculty and staff?* Women were less likely than men to answer the former question affirmatively, and only 54% of URM faculty members answered the latter question affirmatively. One more question related to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff members, *Have you observed employment practices at the university that you perceive are unfair or that get in the way of diversifying the faculty, staff, and administration?* elicited an affirmative response from over 1,000 people, or about 28% of respondents. The most common reported unfair practice was hiring bias; other reported practices included inequitable distribution of work and lack of effort to diversify the applicant pool.

Continuing to the next goal, *Integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into the university's core academic mission of teaching, research, and service*, Professor Bruch highlighted several survey questions. When undergraduate and graduate students were asked about obstacles to their academic success at the university, the undergraduate responses included difficulty doing one's best on tests, challenges managing mental or emotional health concerns, difficulty speaking up in class, concerns about being negatively judged by other students or by the instructor, and family responsibilities. Professor Bruch commented that some of these reasons

may no doubt be surprising to faculty. The reasons vary somewhat by racial or ethnic identity. For example, 20% of Asian students expressed concern about being negatively judged by their instructor. More than 50% of transgender or non-binary students cited challenges managing mental or emotional health; this is much higher than the percentages for other student groups. Faculty were asked whether their diversity-related contributions to teaching, research, and service would be valued at time of promotion or tenure. About three-fourths of respondents answered affirmatively, although diversity-related contributions to research received lower ratings. URM faculty were much less likely to answer affirmatively, however. Turning to the fourth goal, *Enhance campus-wide diversity, equity, and inclusion accountability, effectiveness, and collaboration*, Professor Bruch noted that listening session feedback emphasized a greater need for accountability. She added that many colleges and units have not yet integrated diversity, equity, and inclusion into their strategic plans.

Assistant Provost Finnerty gave an overview of next steps. She reminded the group that a new associate vice president for diversity, equity, and inclusion would soon arrive on campus. We will also soon have a new provost who has a strong interest in diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Action Plan has now been turned over to the Path Forward group for implementation. She encouraged individual faculty members to become familiar with the action plan, as well as to engage with colleagues regarding these issues and to participate in upcoming forums and workshops on the paradigm shift to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Assistant Provost Finnerty emphasized that the campus will be looking to faculty leadership, particularly since the academic department is the engine for (but can also be an obstacle to) diversity, equity, and inclusion change.

- *Long-term Demographic and Admissions Trends (Brent Gage, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management)*

Dr. Gage began his presentation by recommending the book *Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education* by Carleton College professor of economics Dr. Nathan Grawe. Dr. Grawe created a higher education demand index to examine the likely higher education choices of students in the years ahead. While conducting his research, Dr. Grawe observed that there will be a substantial drop in the number of high school graduates starting around 2025. This drop will extend geographically from the upper Midwest all the way through to New England and cover the territory that is home to about 55% of U.S. institutions of higher education. Consequently, competition for students among these institutions will intensify, leading those institutions to seek students more widely and deeply than they traditionally have done. Elite institutions will begin to infringe on the prospective student population that would have considered national AAU universities, such as UI. This effect will then cascade down to regional four-year universities and then two-year community colleges. Although community colleges will ultimately suffer the greatest loss of students, these institutions will likely not be allowed to fail by their local legislators because of their tremendous impact on their communities. State funding for higher education is limited, so, in Iowa for example, additional resources to support community colleges will likely be taken from funds previously allocated to Regents institutions.

Dr. Gage further explained that the population drop in college-bound high school graduates beginning in 2025 can be traced to the drop in birth rates as a result of the Great Recession in 2008. The stable replacement birth rate is 2.2. Iowa, with a current birth rate of 1.61, is not replacing its population, although this is still a higher birth rate than in some states farther to the east. Dr. Gage further noted that there will be a drop in the number of white students by about 265,000 in the 2012-2030 time frame. This statistic is significant because white students are still the primary consumers of higher education. The impact of this drop will be most heavily felt in the Midwest and Northeast. All of the gains in other demographic groups will not make up numerically for the loss of white students. Small private colleges that rely heavily on students who can pay full tuition will be particularly hard hit by this decline. Dr. Gage noted that since 2008, Illinois has lost 20,000 students in its public higher education system. Only the University of Illinois campuses in Champagne-Urbana and Chicago have seen enrollment increases. To maintain its enrollment, UIUC has lowered its admission standards to attract more students; students who might have gone to the regional universities are now being admitted there. Because of this upward wave of enrollment, Illinois community colleges have lost 21% of their students in ten years. If high school students taking community college classes were removed from the enrollment pool, this percentage would be even higher. Dr. Gage further commented that there is not anticipated to be a significant increase in the percentages of African-American and Hispanic students attending college. However, by 2029, a substantially larger proportion of Americans will hold college degrees, leading to a decline in first-generation students, because one or both parents of high school graduates will increasingly hold degrees.

Turning to enrollment strategies in this approaching highly competitive environment, Dr. Gage indicated that we have some time to prepare ourselves and he enumerated some options. We must look toward expanding our pool of international students, a market that is continually in flux. We must also grow our non-resident student markets. UI currently has full-time Admissions representatives in California, Texas, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and Chicago. We could look toward establishing a presence in Colorado and Georgia metropolitan markets, for example. As part of this effort, the university brings about 40 high school counselors each year from around the country to campus to show them the benefits of studying here. UI must also consider creating destination programs that distinguish us from competing institutions. This is an opportunity for faculty to work with the Admissions Office to develop value propositions, so that Admissions officials can advertise specific, unique programs to prospective students around the country.

Dr. Gage noted that there are many factors, such as birth rates, outside the university's control. We must concentrate our efforts on the components we can control, such as our strategies for recruiting and retaining students. He indicated that we must be very strategic and precise in how we go about recruiting students. In the past few years, the university has decreased its search budget by \$100,000 while still increasing the number of prospects that become inquiries by 50% through using data-driven research to find prospects who would be the right fit for the university. The Admissions Office has partnered with data scientists at the College of Public Health to do in-depth statistical analyses of potential recruits. Research has found that there are six types of prospective students; UI can tailor messages to each of these types. And, UI must standardize and strengthen its brand. Finally, we must retain and graduate

our students at higher rates to stabilize our enrollment. Dr. Gage emphasized that we must be strategic and data-driven as we identify potential recruits that meet our institutional goals.

Professor Steelman asked if online, for-profit educational programs figured into Dr. Grawe's analysis of future higher education demand. Dr. Gage responded that Dr. Grawe's analysis focused primarily on traditional higher education paths because of the wide variety of online educational options. Nevertheless, online programs are a source of competition for UI. Professor Macfarland asked for further clarification of the concept of value propositions for educational programs. Dr. Gage explained that this related to the specific, unique value that a UI program might possess compared to a similar program at another institution.

- *ACE Review Committee Process (Ken Brown, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Program in Business, Tippie College of Business)*

President Ganim commented that for a long time there has been dissatisfaction with the ACE course evaluation process on campus. A task force has been formed recently to design a uniform template that would streamline the evaluation process and increase student participation. Associate Dean Brown further explained that this large task force has been meeting for over a year. The group began with a simple charge from the Provost's Office to review the evaluation process. There have been very low response rates to the ACE evaluations, rendering them an ineffective tool for assessing faculty teaching. The task force recognized that high-quality teaching is essential to attracting students to the university and that a rigorous assessment process will assist us in improving our teaching. The task force developed three driving principles to guide their work: improve assessment of teaching to facilitate improvement over time, increase student voice in the process by maintaining their input and increasing response rates, and reduce known bias in ratings and comments against women and under-represented instructors.

Turning to the process that the task force has used to carry out its work, Associate Dean Brown noted that this large task force of twenty members has three active subcommittees. The task force reviewed literature on evaluation and examined recent efforts by peer schools. Task force members surveyed DEO's and held focus groups with students. There were also consultations with shared governance representatives. Four preliminary recommendations have now been developed. Associate Dean Brown indicated that the first of these preliminary recommendations is to *revise end-of-course student ratings*. A core set of university-wide items with low bias will be created. In keeping with student preferences, these will be simple, standardized questions, numbering fewer than ten. Open-ended questions will be maintained, however, because these items offer the most constructive feedback to instructors. While departments will still be free to customize evaluations to a certain extent, there will be limited centralized support for department/program specific items.

Associate Dean Brown explained that the second preliminary recommendation is to *encourage mid-course student feedback*. Although some instructors already do this, expanding the practice to all instructors will create a culture in which students become comfortable giving useful feedback throughout the semester. A pool of potential questions will be shared with instructors campus-wide. Instructors can choose items that are of particular interest to them

and then survey their students to solicit feedback that is most relevant to their specific courses. Instructions will be provided to assist instructors in interpreting student responses. The task force's third preliminary recommendation is to *promote systematic peer review*. Structured forms will be developed for reporting peer observations, along with standardized guidelines for the teaching observation process. Policies will also be proposed for consistent use of peer teaching review in the promotion and tenure process. The task force's fourth and final preliminary recommendation is to *offer comprehensive educational resources*. This would include the creation of instructional videos for students, instructors, and administrators. These videos would clarify to students what type of feedback is being sought from them and why, demonstrate to instructors best practices for administering evaluations, and explain potential biases to administrators. Training programs for DEO's and associate deans for faculty would be developed to address teaching effectiveness and biases in measures. Associate Dean Brown concluded his presentation by commenting that through implementing these four recommendations, we can create an environment at UI in which we can continually improve the teaching that is done here.

- *Committee on Academic Values Free Speech Document (Pete Snyder)*

Past President Snyder reminded the group that extensive discussion of this document had taken place at the last Senate meeting. He acknowledged the dedicated work, spanning nearly two years, of the Committee on Academic Values to construct the document. He specifically praised former committee chair Professor Steve McGuire and the drafters of the document, Professors Lois Cox and Richard Fumerton. Past President Snyder noted that the document was developed in the wake of various incidents regarding controversial speakers on other campuses. The committee felt the need for a grounding document that stated our values around free speech and academic freedom and provided guidance to inform our responses if such an incident ever occurred here.

Following the March 26 meeting, at which the first reading of the document took place, the Committee on Academic Values met again to slightly revise the document and to incorporate some of the feedback received at the Senate meeting. The document was subsequently approved unanimously by the Faculty Council on April 9. Past President Snyder was now presenting the document for Senate approval.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the University of Iowa Faculty Senate Statement on Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom be approved.

Professor Macfarland asked for clarification of the word *challenge* in line 20, *In university-connected events both inside and outside the classroom or laboratory, members of our community must be free to **challenge** and question accepted wisdom*. He commented that *challenge* here could mean physical obstruction of speech or an invitation to terminate speech. Past President Snyder responded that this was not the intent here. *Challenge* was simply a stronger synonym for *question*. Professor Macfarland expressed concern that this document as worded could be used to justify rude behavior that prevents a controversial speaker from completing his/her speech.

Professor Macfarland moved and Professor Carlson seconded that the word *challenge* be deleted from the document.

Professor Tachau commented that *question* alone gave this sentence too narrow of a meaning, adding that people must be able to protest and disagree. The original sentence does not condone physical violence or the shouting down of a speaker. A senator pointed out that lines 25-8 indicate that threats of violence are not protected speech.

In a voice vote, the motion did not carry.

The group returned to the original motion.

In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

- *Update on Benefits Discussion (Russ Ganim)*

President Ganim reminded the group that senators had voiced many concerns regarding a proposed second health plan option when it was presented to them at the March 26 Senate meeting. The primary concerns involved the accelerated timeframe for implementation of the second health plan and the lack of forecasting data with which to estimate potential future premium cost increases for employees. The Faculty Senate officers subsequently conveyed these concerns to central administrators. As a result, the timeline has been extended somewhat. More data is becoming available and the Senate officers will have a chance to review this data in the next several weeks. President Ganim indicated that the officers feel confident that central administrators understand the Senate's concerns. The officers will keep senators informed of any new developments over the summer.

- *President's Report (Russ Ganim)*

Regarding the proposed public-private partnership (P3), President Ganim reported that the university, in conjunction with Wells Fargo, has released a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) from specialists in the field of public-private utility partnerships. Two open forums to provide more information about this initiative to the campus community will take place in the next couple weeks.

Turning to administrative searches, President Ganim indicated that the new provost, Montserrat Fuentes, and the new Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, TaJuan Wilson, will both take office on June 28. We are still awaiting a final announcement in the search for the new Vice President for Research.

IV. From the Floor –

Professor Durham moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Ganim:

WHEREAS the University of Iowa faculty are members of a university community that thrives on dedicated and skillful leadership and

WHEREAS President Russ Ganim has gone above and beyond that standard by serving effectively and with ultimate dedication in his role as Senate vice president and president and

WHEREAS President Ganim has worked skillfully both with members of the administration and with faculty colleagues in every college to build the University of Iowa's faculty engagement with our fellow citizens in the State of Iowa and throughout the world through their research, teaching, service, and outreach and

WHEREAS President Ganim has worked with campus leaders, faculty, and staff to mitigate the effects of unforeseen budgetary retrenchments and to ensure campus input on future proposals and

WHEREAS President Ganim has strongly and successfully advocated to administration for faculty and campus voices to be heard in the consideration of ambitious plans to fund the university fifty years hence in a most uncertain future and

WHEREAS President Ganim has advocated carefully, thoughtfully, and masterfully for the values of all faculty at every level as essential to the university's mission and operations and

WHEREAS President Ganim has dedicated constant energy and an ever-cheerful attitude in his contributions to strengthening shared governance, which sustains the lifeblood of the university

BE IT RESOLVED that We the Senate express our most profound gratitude to President Ganim for his dedicated leadership and service to us all.

Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the resolution be approved. The resolution was unanimously approved via applause.

V. Announcements

- Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (Russ Ganim)

President Ganim announced the recipients of the 2019 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Jerry Anthony (Urban and Regional Planning), Sandra Daack-Hirsch (Nursing), Witold Krajewski (Civil and Environmental Engineering), and Thomas Vaughn (Health Management and Policy).

- Concluding Remarks of the 2018-19 Faculty Senate President Russ Ganim

In the interest of time, President Ganim confined his concluding remarks to recognizing and thanking his fellow officers. Regarding the past president, Pete Snyder, President Ganim commented that if there is a faculty member more devoted to shared governance at this university, he did not know of one. Pete is one of two Senators—Tom Vaughn is the other—who have served four consecutive years as a Faculty Senate Officer. Those of you who have served in this role know of the time commitment such duties entail. Pete has made it his mission to reestablish a strong working relationship between the Faculty Senate, senior administration, and the Board of Regents. Through his strong institutional memory, his deep knowledge of the Operations Manual, and his excellent diplomatic skills, Pete has navigated some of the most difficult challenges the Senate has faced in recent years. These include revising the Intellectual Property Policy, co-chairing the Employment Practices Review Committee, and serving on the Path Forward Steering group. Pete has done all of this while pursuing his day job of a physician scientist who runs a lab, treats patients, serves as Vice Chair of the Department of Internal Medicine, and, happens to be a pre-eminent cardiologist with an outstanding national and international reputation. How he does all this defies logic, but the Senate will remain endlessly

grateful for his outstanding service. President Ganim thanked Past President Snyder and commented that the Senate will miss him, but that he should not be surprised if, from time to time, the new officers call him for advice.

President Ganim noted that Vice President Sandy Daack-Hirsch, more than anyone else on campus, is responsible for the lifting of the AAUP sanction. While President Ganim served with her on the sanction removal committee, he did not come to fully understand Sandy's talents until this year. She demonstrates a number of skills on a daily basis but those that stand out are the ability to build relationships and establish trust between groups who neither have much in common or, may find themselves in an adversarial position to one another. Sandy's focused, but easy-going, manner sets the right tone for difficult discussions, as does her ability to see directly to the heart of any matter. Her emphasis on substance has kept the officers on task this year, and he could not think of a better successor as the Senate moves forward. And lest we forget about her day job, President Ganim noted that Sandy runs the Ph.D. program in the College of Nursing, is involved in multiple interdisciplinary ventures on campus and was recently inducted into the American Academy of Nursing. President Ganim thanked Vice President Daack-Hirsch and said that he looked forward to their continued partnership next year.

Turning to Secretary Joe Yockey, President Ganim commented that as a humanist, he prided himself on his writing and communication skills, but any talent he had in this domain is dwarfed by Secretary Yockey's. This year, Secretary Yockey took on the momentous task of chairing the committee that reviewed the Office of the Vice President of Finance and Operations. From start to finish, the charge took seven months to complete. Under Secretary Yockey's leadership, the committee did tremendous work, by conducting interviews, analyzing data, and writing a superb document that explains in a clear and sophisticated manner how Finance and Operations works and how it impacts the campus. Secretary Yockey was also an unsung hero in representing the faculty on the P3 initiative, examining the proposal from a legal perspective and providing advice as to whether or not the potential agreement could serve the university's long-term interests. President Ganim noted that Secretary Yockey regularly draws upon expertise from his day job—that of a specialist in corporate law—to help the officers understand the nuances of legislation or proposed changes in university policy. President Ganim thanked Secretary Yockey for his service and stated that the Senate is deeply indebted to him.

President Ganim then thanked Laura Zaper, the Senate administrator, for organizing the BTAA Shared Governance Conference that the University of Iowa hosted in October, as well as for her work throughout the year, which in turn enabled the officers to do their work well. Concluding his remarks, President Ganim thanked senators for their support and for placing their trust in him. He commented that it had been his privilege to serve the Senate and the university this year.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Macfarland moved and Professor Kwitek seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Ganim adjourned the meeting at 5:10 pm.

FACULTY SENATE
2019-20 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 23, 2019
4:45 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order – President Daack-Hirsch called the meeting to order at 5:10 pm.
- II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (Richard Fumerton, Election Committee, assisted by Pete Snyder)

President Daack-Hirsch directed the new and continuing senators to move into the center seating area of the Senate Chamber. Although outgoing senators were free to leave, they were invited to remain, if they wished, but to be seated in the side areas.

President Daack-Hirsch invited Election Committee Chair Richard Fumerton to come forward to conduct the officer elections.

Professor Fumerton announced that the candidates for Vice President were Edward Gillan (Chemistry) and Joseph Yockey (Law). He then announced that the candidate for Secretary was Teresa Marshall (Preventive and Community Dentistry). Professor Fumerton asked if there were any nominations from the floor for Faculty Senate Vice President or Faculty Senate Secretary. No nominations were made from the floor. He thanked all the candidates on the ballot for agreeing to run for office.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

- III. Opening Remarks of the 2019-20 Faculty Senate President Sandy Daack-Hirsch

President Daack-Hirsch began her remarks by welcoming the new senators and stating that she was honored to represent the faculty as Faculty Senate President this year. She explained that she has been at the university for many years in a variety of roles, first as a student, then as professional staff, and now as a faculty member. She assured the group that the outgoing Senate officers have been extremely dedicated to maintaining and improving shared governance. She reminded senators that shared governance takes many forms and happens at many levels. The Senate officers have been deliberate in their message to those with whom they meet that our shared governance bodies are not merely for the purpose of sharing information. True shared governance is shared decision making. These formal bodies must be utilized in their full capacity for problem solving and decision making. The Senate officers have maintained strong and productive relationships with the Board of Regents and central administration. Because of these strong relationships, this past year, the officers have been deliberate in their focus and have pursued processes to facilitate transparency, positively emphasizing where this has gone particularly well and actively addressing when this has not gone so well, so that we can learn from those situations and come up with better processes.

President Daack-Hirsch indicated that, building on the work that was done this past year, in the next year she would like to focus on how shared governance is upheld within the colleges and at the unit level. This is important especially as we work with the new funding model that places more responsibility for financial and operational decisions within the individual units. Faculty representation within the colleges and departments is needed so that we can provide feedback on how this funding structure impacts our teaching and our scholarship. We need to be in the forefront of finding solutions when issues are identified. Therefore, the officers need to articulate with the governance structures within local units. President Daack-Hirsch reminded the new senators that service as a senator is an amazing opportunity to step outside one's college and work collaboratively with others to drive change and work on issues that matter to us. One of the most important principles of shared governance is the idea that within a college or university, all components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among the components, and of the force of joint action to solve educational problems. President Daack-Hirsch commented that this is one of the most important roles of Faculty Senators – to facilitate, maintain, and create capacity for faculty to enact this principle. She called upon senators to uphold this principle at the university and collegiate levels.

Recognizing her fellow officers for their work over the past year, President Daack-Hirsch commented that former president Snyder's wisdom will be missed and she thanked him for his leadership over the last four years. She noted that she and former Secretary Yockey were both new officers this past year, and that she appreciated his wit and intellect. She commented that former Secretary Yockey is committed to understanding an issue inside and out and does not hesitate to challenge the status quo thoughtfully and with respect. President Daack-Hirsch noted that she has worked on university issues with Past President Ganim for the past several years, most notably on the AAUP Sanction Removal Committee. She commented that Past President Ganim has served the faculty in many different roles and has extensive knowledge of how this and other institutions work. She thanked him for his encouragement, support, and guidance. And, President Daack-Hirsch thanked Faculty Senate administrator Laura Zaper for all her work with the officers. She concluded by commenting that she is looking forward to next year.

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

V. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Professor Fumerton announced that the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Joseph Yockey and that the new Secretary is Teresa Marshall. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2019-20 Meeting Schedule – President Daack-Hirsch reminded senators that the meeting schedule for 2019-20 could be found in their meeting packets.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Treat moved and Professor Kletzing seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Daack-Hirsch adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.