

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 25, 2017
3:30 – 4:45 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: J. Ankrum, J. Barker, C. Barnhardt, C. Benson, R. Boudreau, J. Buckley, G. Buettner, K. Culp, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, A. Deshpande, P. Dilley, A. Durnev, B. Eckstein, B. Elias, R. Ganim, E. Gidal, L. Glass, D. Gooblar, D. Hall, A. Hosmanek, A. Jung, C. Kletzing, J. Kolker, B. Kyles, K. Lamping, M. Lehan Mackin, J. Logsdon, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, U. Mallik, T. Marshall, K. Messingham, T. Midtrod, J. Moore, R. Oral, L. Ostedgaard, T. Peters, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, P. Romitti, G. Ryan, R. Sah, E. Sander, J. Scott, A. Stapleton, J. Streit, J. Szot, K. Tachau, C. Thomas, T. Treat, S. Vigmostad, S. Vos, E. Wasserman, J. Welburn, D. Wesemann, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, D. Wurster.
- Officers Present: E. Dove, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: F. Ahmad, P. Brophy, D. Caplan, J. Colgan, T. Gallanis, S. Harwani, Z. Jin, A. Kwitek, L. Segre, J. Yockey.
- Senators Absent: L. Allen, R. Balakrishnan, M. Blumberg, C. Brochu, B. Dixon, S. Duck, F. Durham, M. Foley Nicpon, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, I. Grumbach, J. Klesney-Tait, W. Maury, M. Nikolas, A. Saftlas, D. Segaloff, J. Taylor, H. Udaykumar, M. Voigt, J. Wang.
- Guests: S. Assouline (Belin-Blank Center), C. Bohannon (College of Law/Office of the Provost), J. Estrada (*Daily Iowan*), A. Hesseltine (Office of the General Counsel), R. Hichwa (Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development), M. Payne (*Daily Iowan*), D. Reed (Vice President for Research and Economic Development), N. Rohlman (*Daily Iowan*), T. Villhauer (Office of Student Life), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).
- I. Call to Order – President Vaughn 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 – President Vaughn explained that two additional presenters were added to the *Intellectual Property Policy Revision* agenda item after the agenda was distributed last week. Professor Marshall moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (February 14, 2017) – President Vaughn reminded the group that one edit had been suggested at the last meeting. New wording is highlighted on page eight. Professor Thomas moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the revised February 14, 2017 minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
Faculty Senate Minutes (March 21, 2017) – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the March 21, 2017 minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Tom Vaughn) – President Vaughn presented the results of the 2017 Faculty Senate and Faculty Council elections. Professor Tachau moved and Professor Ganim seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. 2017-18 Committee Recommendations (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Snyder presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2017-18 academic year. Professor Vigmostad moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the 2017-18 committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2015-16 Motion Summary – Vice President Snyder presented the 2015-16 motion summary. Professor Marshall moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *President's Report (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn explained that several changes had been made to the copyright section of the revised Intellectual Property policy after it was distributed; a new version of the policy would be handed out today. The changes are in red.

Noting that the Faculty Senate presidents of the three Regents institutions are annually invited to speak at a meeting of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, President Vaughn read a short version of the remarks he made at the April 19-20 Regents meeting:

You are the governing body for three unique universities, each with its own mission and strategic plan. I want to take this time to comment on the University of Iowa's shared priorities as expressed in our strategic plan and highlight one critical component of these priorities that can be pursued as we continue our advancement as a world-class university. These priorities are addressed in a strategic plan that emerged from a consensus of faculty, staff and students. The process of creating the strategic plan involved more participants from across campus than any plan adopted since I have been at the university. They reflect the University of Iowa's mission and status as a research one university.

We have labeled the three priorities research and discovery, student success, and engagement. President Harreld regularly states that excellence should be our criterion in all we do in pursuit of these priorities. I believe the faculty are committed to these strategic priorities and share President Harreld's focus on excellence as the foundation for our future as one of the premier universities in the United States.

We can only effectively pursue our strategic goals and meet the challenge of achieving excellence if we are able to attract and retain faculty who engage in innovative, impactful research and scholarship. New knowledge created through these pursuits is used to educate our students in ways that go beyond the mere textbook. New knowledge also improves the lives of our citizens across Iowa in many ways. We prepare the physicians, dentists, teachers, and entrepreneurs that work in every county of the state. Our research and scholarship contributes to a cleaner environment, safer workplaces, and opportunities to enjoy the arts that would not otherwise be available.

I believe that at this point in our journey as a premier university we need to reinvest in our graduate programs. I believe our graduate programs are the foundation for excellence in pursuing the research and discovery, student success, and engagement priorities of our strategic plan. And investing in our graduate programs means investing in the faculty who are engaged in innovative, impactful research and scholarship. Attracting and retaining these faculty is highly dependent on the reputation of our graduate programs. Creative faculty are attracted to and remain with universities where they can collaborate with other faculty who are engaged in cutting edge research and scholarship. These productive faculty, in turn, are the individuals who create research programs and engage in scholarship in the arts and humanities that attract the most promising graduate students.

The strongest graduate students seek opportunities where they are supported and mentored in pursuing their own development as future researchers and scholars by nationally renowned faculty. The best of these faculty also provide opportunities for undergraduate students to become involved with their research and scholarship, which enhances the student's educational experience. Finally, our graduate programs also function as a pipeline to develop faculty to teach and mentor future generations of students.

Pursuing excellence in graduate programs requires resources in order to provide competitive salaries, equip and staff labs and creative spaces, and provide stipends for graduate students and opportunities for undergraduates. In the face of declining state appropriations for the universities, our ability to obtain these resources is increasingly challenged.

As I noted earlier, each of the Regents universities has a unique strategic plan. I would like to suggest that this calls for flexibility in salary and tuition policy across and within the universities. For example, the Carver College of Medicine and the University of Iowa's College of Dentistry are units where the cost of instruction is much higher than in the nonprofessional colleges. I suspect the same is true for the Iowa State Veterinary College. There are numerous other examples. For instance, one does not become a world-class violinist in a class of 50 violinists; nor does one become a world-class sculptor in a class of 300.

Let me conclude with another of President Harreld's maxims. Higher education, indeed all education, is an asset to be leveraged, not an expense to be managed. I believe we need greater investment in salaries in general to recruit and retain our best faculty and to build upon the strengths of our graduate programs. I also believe the Regents universities need the flexibility

in both salary and tuition policy so we can each successfully pursue our unique missions and strategic goals.

- *AAUP Sanction Update (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Ad Hoc AAUP Sanction Removal Committee)*

Professor Daack-Hirsch indicated that the committee is now ready to draft a best-practices document to guide future presidential searches. This document will be in response to the AAUP's sanction report *College and University Governance: the University of Iowa Governing Board's Selection of a President*. The committee did a content analysis of this report and identified areas and opportunities for improvement.

Recently, Professor Daack-Hirsch and Professor Tachau, President of the UI Chapter of the AAUP, spoke with Hans-Joerg Tiede, Senior Program Officer in the Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, & Governance of the national American Association of University Professors, regarding the strategy that the committee is taking. Dr. Tiede was supportive of that strategy and offered to review drafts of the committee's best-practices document. Professor Daack-Hirsch added that the committee will now seek to engage with the Board of Regents.

- *UI Alcohol Harm Reduction Update (Susan Assouline, Professor and Director of the Belin-Blank Center and Tanya Villhauer, Associate Director for Student Wellness & Harm Reduction Initiatives)*

Professor Assouline explained that the Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee is an advisory committee to the Vice President for Student Life, Tom Rocklin. The committee was formed in 2009, and Professor Assouline has chaired the committee since that time. She said that it has been an honor to work with the Office of Student Life on this initiative. The staff there have done a fantastic job of supporting the efforts and goals of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Plans. The third version of the plan (2016-19) was distributed to Senators at the meeting. Professor Assouline urged Senators to take the plan back to their colleges and share it with their colleagues, in order to increase awareness of this topic.

Ms. Villhauer presented statistics on the scope of the problem on campus. Data from the National College Health Assessment, collected annually from UI students, indicates that the 30-day alcohol use rate for all UI students is currently 72.7%. While this statistic does not show how much students drank within that timeframe or how often they drank, it does give us an idea about our students' usage of alcohol. Since 2009, there has been a general downward trend among various subgroups of students (women, men, Greek students, under age 21 students), with some subgroups at higher risk than others. Ms. Villhauer pointed out that students' perceptions of other students' drinking are inaccurate. Students believe that 91.1% of students drank in the past 30 days, but the reality is that only 72.7% did so. Students also believe that 61.7% of students drank on ten or more days of the past 30 days, when only 23.2% did so. Identifying these misperceptions is important for creating effective messaging to students. Of particular interest in alcohol harm reduction efforts is the high-risk drinking rate. Risky drinking is defined as *five or more drinks per occasion in the past two weeks*. The rate of risky drinking on campus has declined from about 72% in 2009 to 50.9% in 2016. While this decline is promising, there is still much work to be done. The national average is 33.2%.

Ms. Villhauer commented that the purpose of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan is to reduce harm so that students can succeed on campus and fulfill their goals. Students themselves are reporting negative consequences from alcohol usage. About 58% of students have had at least one negative consequence from alcohol in the last year. The top two consequences were forgetting where they were or what they did and doing something they later regretted. On the positive side, about 85% of students reported practicing at least one protective behavior regularly while drinking. These behaviors include staying with the same group of friends, eating before/during drinking, and using a designated driver.

As part of the National College Health Assessment, students are asked to identify impediments to learning that they have experienced in the previous 12 months. Stress and anxiety top the list of the ten most common impediments, but alcohol use came in at number seven, indicating that students are becoming aware that alcohol can negatively impact their studies. The number of non-drinkers, i.e., students who indicate that they have not had an alcoholic drink in the past 30 days, has risen from about 12% of undergraduates in 2001 to about 27% in 2016. More information about the attitudes of students towards the alcohol/party culture can be found in the responses to the Excelling@Iowa survey that first-year students take during their third week of class. Nearly 300 responses to the survey question *What do you least like about college?* mentioned disliking the alcohol/party culture.

Ms. Villhauer commented that, as mentioned earlier, the 2016-19 version is the third version of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Plan. The metrics of success for the plan have remained the same since 2009. Significant progress has been made in three areas: *percent of students engaging in high-risk drinking in past two weeks* (23% decrease from 2009 to 2015), *average number of drinks per occasion* (22% decrease from 2009 to 2015), and *percent of students drinking 10 or more days per month* (28% decrease from 2009 to 2015). The current plan includes five goals: *attract more low-risk/abstainers and fewer high-risk drinkers to UI, more students remain low-risk/abstainers at UI, more high-risk drinkers lower their drinking while at UI, expect greater accountability for upholding community expectations, and institutionalize commitment to harm reduction.*

Ms. Villhauer briefly described some of the strategies identified for each goal. Regarding attracting more low-risk/abstainers and fewer high-risk drinkers to UI, she noted that marketing of the university to prospective students plays a key role. The Office of Admissions has recently made efforts to emphasize that UI is an academically rigorous institution. In order to ensure that more students remain low-risk drinkers/abstainers, messaging is going out that reinforces those behaviors and attitudes and a committee is identifying ways to build social support for these students. To encourage high-risk drinkers to lower their drinking, more classes on resiliency are being offered (research has shown that more resilient students are less likely to engage in high-risk drinking). The university is working collaboratively with the Partnership for Alcohol Safety and the Iowa City Downtown Association as one effort to reinforce greater accountability for upholding community expectations. And, as part of institutionalizing the commitment to harm reduction, members of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee are communicating about the plan widely across campus.

In conclusion, Ms. Villhauer commented that faculty members can exert a beneficial influence on student behavior through formal and informal interactions with students and through promoting healthy norms. We must all work together to change campus environmental conditions and redefine the college experience.

Professor Mallik noted a slight upward trend for 2016 for some subgroups on the graphs illustrating alcohol use. Ms. Villhauer did not think that these trends were statistically significant. Professor Mallik asked if students who lived with their families were included in the data. Ms. Villhauer responded that the data included a wide range of undergraduate students, but did not specifically separate out students who live with their families. Professor Treat commented that she researches connections between sexual aggression and heavy episodic drinking on college campuses. She asked if efforts were being made to integrate prevention initiatives for these phenomena. Ms. Villhauer responded that such efforts are under consideration. She and Professor Treat both acknowledged the difficulty that this may present, but Professor Treat encouraged the committee to pursue efforts in this direction. Professor Assouline added that both the Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee and the Partnership for Alcohol Safety are well aware of these issues.

Professor Oral asked if there were any staff members designated to carry out the initiatives proposed by the Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee, many members of which likely are volunteers. Ms. Villhauer responded that she herself works on the committee's initiatives. Professor Assouline indicated that having a staff member dedicated to these efforts was one of the initial proposals of the committee, and that this support has been a reason why so much progress has been made. She invited other faculty members to volunteer to serve on the advisory committee and commented that faculty interest in this topic has clearly grown since her first presentation to the Senate years ago. Professor Oral noted that some of the top issues affecting academic performance (stress, anxiety, sleep difficulties, depression) – as indicated by the National College Health Assessment responses – are related to mental health. She asked if there was a mental health advisory committee with a dedicated staff person for its initiatives. Professor Assouline responded that the University Counseling Service (UCS) is under the umbrella of the Division of Student Life. She was unaware if UCS had an advisory committee, but she noted that its many staff members are dedicated to improving mental health on campus. Professor Mallik requested an update at a future meeting regarding the university's efforts to improve mental health services on campus.

- *Intellectual Property Policy Revision (Adwin Hesseltine, Deputy Counsel; and Richard Hichwa, Senior Associate Vice President for Research; and Dan Reed, Vice President for Research and Economic Development)*

President Vaughn indicated that, following the Faculty Council meeting at which the revised policy was approved two weeks ago, feedback the Senate officers received from faculty members had led to a further revision regarding royalty-bearing licenses (new language was removed and the previous language was reinstated) that was reflected in the version distributed electronically to senators. Further discussion of this issue will take place in the fall. He added that a newer version of the revised policy was being distributed to senators today; this version contains two clarification changes to the copyright section of the policy.

Vice President Reed explained that there are two kinds of intellectual property generally produced at universities, creative works, covered by copyright law, and inventions, covered by patent law. He indicated that the policy revisions to be described today primarily deal with the latter type of intellectual property. He then provided some historical background regarding intellectual property policy. Before 1980, the United States government had ownership rights of all inventions created using federal funding sources. There was little incentive to develop these inventions and by 1978, the government had licensed only a small fraction of the 28,000 patents that it owned. The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, however, permitted non-profit organizations (including universities) to elect title to their inventions created with the support of federal funding. It was at this time that technology transfer offices, including the University of Iowa Research Foundation (UIRF), began appearing on university campuses. The UI is required to report all inventions to the government once those inventions have been disclosed to the UIRF.

The UI created an intellectual property policy in 2005; this policy covers both patents and copyrights. The primary objective of the patent portion of the policy is *to enable the public to use and benefit from inventions originating at the University*. The policy applies to qualifying inventions, i.e., inventions created by University employees *in the course of their employment or appointment or in a field or discipline reasonably related to the... employment or appointment*, or inventions created using significant University resources. Disclosure of the creation of a qualifying invention to the UIRF is required as a condition of employment. Vice President Reed commented that most of the UI's patents arise from basic research primarily funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The vast majority of inventions are biomedically-related, usually drugs and medical devices. Because these inventions are often in early stages of development, bringing them to market is expensive and risky. After disclosure, there is a lengthy and costly process involved in obtaining a patent. Because of the expense and the risk, the UI can pursue only a small number of patents.

Mr. Hesselstine next discussed recent developments in case law that have precipitated this revision of the intellectual property policy. The 2011 Supreme Court case *Stanford vs. Roche* has caused university technology transfer offices to reevaluate their assumptions about the Bayh-Dole Act. The case involved a Stanford researcher who signed the university's copyright and patent agreement, which stated that he *agreed to assign* to Stanford rights to inventions he created there. He also conducted research at a company, Cetus, for which he signed a visitor's confidentiality agreement, stating that he *will assign and does hereby assign* to Cetus rights to inventions he created there. Both Stanford and Cetus, later acquired by Roche, filed patents and Stanford then sued Roche for patent infringement. The Supreme Court ruled in Roche's favor, however, finding that the Bayh-Dole Act does not automatically grant title to inventions to federal contractors (universities receiving federal research grants, in this situation). Rather, the inventor initially retains rights to the invention and can assign those rights to another entity (Cetus, in this situation). Because Cetus' agreement stated that the researcher *does assign* rights to Cetus, rather than merely *agrees to assign* (at some indefinite future time) rights, as the Stanford agreement stated, the Court found in favor of Roche. Universities are now updating their policies so that employees *do assign* their rights to the institution. Professor Macfarland expressed surprise that a visitor's confidentiality agreement could be that binding. Mr.

Hesseltine responded that it was. Vice President Reed added that it is important that faculty members read carefully any agreements that they are asked to sign while engaged in consulting activity.

Vice President Reed then turned to a discussion of the intellectual property policies of peer institutions. He noted that they are generally similar to ours. Our peer institutions typically claim ownership of an invention if it is created during the natural course of employment, if it is done under the terms of a research grant or contract, if it is reasonably related to the inventor's work or research area, if significant university resources were used in its creation, or if the university needs to assert ownership in order to protect previously-made rights and commitments. Most institutions grant copyrights to the faculty, staff or student creators except in specific circumstances, e.g., if the publication is a contract deliverable created by someone the university has hired or if the university substantially supported the creation of educational material. Vice President Reed then explained that the revision and review of the policy had been carried out by the Intellectual Property Strategy Implementation Team, composed of faculty, staff, and student representatives with experience in this realm. Presentations about the revision were made to and feedback was sought from Faculty Senate (at a previous meeting), Staff Council, Research Council, the newly-formed Intellectual Property Council (which advises on identifying the disclosed inventions with the greatest potential for commercial success), and the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, among others.

Revision of the Intellectual Property policy is being carried out in two phases, continued Vice President Reed. The current phase includes the proposals made today, primarily focused on bringing the policy into compliance with recent case law regarding assignment of rights. The second phase will occur later and will focus on distribution of royalty income from inventions. Currently, income from university inventions is split into three parts. Two streams go to the university. One stream supports arts and humanities research and scholarship, as well as providing seed funding for new ideas. The other stream funds the university's prosecution of patents. There is also a sliding scale of income distribution to the inventor, to the inventor's department, to the inventor's college, and to the institution. The UI does differ from some peer institutions in this aspect of its policy. Vice President Reed commented that about 80% of university technology transfer offices lose money. The UIRF has made money primarily from one invention that generated about \$160 million in profit. The average license makes less than \$500. Conversations about revising this portion of the policy will take place next fall.

Mr. Hesseltine then discussed specific revisions to the policy. He reminded the group that the Intellectual Property policy has two parts, a patent policy and a copyright policy. No substantive changes are proposed for the copyright policy, but there are two clarifying changes of note. An existing case example regarding software created by a university subcontractor has been expanded to show how the university might claim copyright for the software. Updated language elsewhere clarifies that the university could claim rights to works of visiting scholars if they use significant university resources or to works that the university contracts with a third party to produce.

The main revision to the patent policy, as mentioned earlier, is an adjustment to the language from indicating that an employee *agrees to assign* to indicating that the employee *hereby assigns* rights to an invention to the university. Under the current version of the policy, the assignment of rights occurs when the UIRF actually applies for a patent. As shown by the *Stanford vs. Roche* case, this could be too late in the process. Compliance with this requirement will be sought in various ways depending upon the individual's status within the university. Mr. Hesseltine then summarized additional changes to the policy. The policy did not previously define *invention*, but a definition has now been included. The definition of a *qualifying invention* has been narrowed to cover inventions employees create in the scope of their employment, including inventions *viewed as an extension of the inventor(s)' University research* (rather than more broadly as in a field related to the inventor(s)' field of employment). The definition of *qualifying invention* also now includes inventions that are valuable but not necessarily patentable. A definition of *visiting scientist/scholar* has been added. And, the revised policy clarifies how the use of pre-existing intellectual property qualifies as a significant use of University resources.

A senator asked if faculty members were involved in the review of the revised policy. Vice President Snyder responded that faculty members were involved, including some from the College of Law. Professor Macfarland commented that the purpose of this policy should be to encourage inventors to invent. The policy should help, not hinder, the difficult process of invention. Vice President Reed observed that inventions are not currently linked to tenure and promotion. He added that his office strives to formally recognize faculty members who make invention disclosures. A senator asked for an example of an invention that is not patentable but is still valuable. Mr. Hesseltine suggested germplasms. Vice President Reed added that there is a separate policy covering material transfers. Professor Kletzing asked for clarification regarding how compliance with the revised policy will be sought from current employees. Mr. Hesseltine responded that many faculty members would do this through the internal routing of sponsored projects or through the annual conflict of interest disclosure. Vice President Reed added that state employment law would require that employees actively indicate agreement with the policy.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the revised Intellectual Property Policy be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. From the Floor –

Professor Daack-Hirsch moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Vaughn:

WHEREAS President Thomas Vaughn has served effectively and with exemplary dedication as Senate Vice President and President; and

WHEREAS President Vaughn has worked tirelessly and skillfully to represent the interests of shared governance with respect and good cheer; and

WHEREAS President Vaughn has demonstrated steadfast leadership in maintaining positive engagement with UI administration and the Board of Regents; and

WHEREAS President Vaughn has demonstrated flexible leadership and generously provided guidance in navigating us through new budgeting and administrative models; and

WHEREAS President Vaughn has been a role model in setting a tone of civility even when challenging by being thoughtful, adaptable, collaborative, and genuinely nice; and WHEREAS President Vaughn constructively, thoughtfully, and masterfully made positive contributions to Faculty Senate interactions with other campus governance groups; BE IT RESOLVED that We the Senate express our most profound gratitude to President Vaughn for his enthusiastic leadership and service to us all.

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

V. Announcements

- **Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence (Tom Vaughn)**
President Vaughn announced the recipients of the 2017 Regents Award for Faculty Excellence: Joseph Kearney (Computer Science), William Liu (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations), Michael O'Hara (Psychological & Brain Sciences), Edith Parker (Community & Behavioral Health), Richard Shields (Physical Therapy & Rehabilitation Science), and Edwin Stone (Ophthalmology & Visual Sciences).
- **Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (Tom Vaughn)**
President Vaughn announced the recipients of the 2017 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Peter Rubenstein (Biochemistry) and Larry Weber (Civil & Environmental Engineering).
- **Concluding Remarks of the 2016-17 Faculty Senate President Tom Vaughn**

President Vaughn announced the names of those individuals who were completing their Senate service. He also led the group in applause honoring the service of Past President Dove, who would be retiring at the end of the academic year.

President Vaughn opened his concluding remarks by stating how grateful he was for the hard work and camaraderie of his fellow officers, Pete Snyder, Christina Bohannon, Ed Dove and Ed Gillan. He also thanked Faculty Senate Administrative Services Coordinator Laura Zaper for her work. President Vaughn noted that Vice President Snyder has raised important questions, provided sound advice and consistently offered his assistance, particularly through involvement with the Strategic Initiative Teams and the new budgeting process. Former Past President Bohannon was an inspiration to President Vaughn when he served as vice president. She had a broad overview of the issues confronting the university while also paying attention to details, in order to keep the Senate moving forward. She led the Senate through some very difficult times last year. During the semester that she served as past president, she was a sounding board and a source of perspective for President Vaughn. Past President Dove, in his third stint in that role, possessed great wisdom, a firm commitment to shared governance, and tremendous dedication to the university and its advancement. Secretary Gillan brought to his role a wealth of experience on Faculty Senate committees, and the officers frequently relied on his talent for policy analysis.

President Vaughn noted that the year began with a much-needed discussion of the AAUP sanction and how best to respond to it. As a result, a committee led by Professor Daack-Hirsch was formed to identify how to have that sanction removed. The committee has been very deliberate and diligent in addressing the issues that led to the sanction. President Vaughn thanked the committee for taking on this challenge. Most recently, the Senate was asked by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development to participate in the revision of the Intellectual Property Policy, to bring it up to date regarding case law and current practice. The Intellectual Property Strategic Initiative Team and the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee worked independently and collaboratively to update the policy. In between those two efforts, President Vaughn noted, many initiatives arose in collaboration with administration and the other shared governance groups that will carry over into the next year and beyond. The Senate officers have been doing much listening and learning to determine the best ways to address a number of issues, such as the strategic initiatives proposal process and the new budgeting model. The 2020 academic organizational structure study is another initiative that requires close attention. The Senate officers have advocated for meaningful faculty representation early on in conducting the study and developing recommendations.

The various new initiatives on campus will certainly cause some angst because of the lack of clarity as we move forward, President Vaughn commented. Any significant organizational changes raise concern among those who will be affected by those changes. While it is natural to wonder how these initiatives might affect us individually, as well as our colleagues and departments, we should also be asking how these initiatives will make UI a better university and will contribute to our scholarship, to our students' success, and to the creation of a just and prosperous society. President Vaughn added that no doubt everyone present believes strongly in shared governance and its potential to improve the university. He acknowledged one regret from his time in office – that he could have identified more ways to encourage other faculty to become involved in shared governance. We can only reach our full potential as a great university if we strive to reach our full potential in shared governance. President Vaughn thanked senators for giving him the privilege to serve as president and he expressed great confidence that Vice President Snyder and the new officer group would accomplish tremendous things with the Senate's support next year.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:07 pm.

FACULTY SENATE
2017-18 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 25, 2017
4:45 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order – President Snyder called the meeting to order at 5:07 pm.
- II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (Ed Dove and Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Elections Committee)

President Snyder 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 Snyder commented that the Elections Committee, chaired by Professor Dove, had identified two outstanding candidates for the officer positions. Although the committee members were disappointed that they were unable to identify additional candidates, it was not for lack of effort. He added that it was still possible to nominate candidates from the floor and to write in candidates on the ballot.

Professor Dove announced that the candidate for Vice President was Russell Ganim (Division of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) and that the candidate for Secretary was Rachel Williams (Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies). Professor Dove 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.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

- III. Opening Remarks of the 2017-18 Faculty Senate President Pete Snyder

President Snyder began his remarks by stating that he was honored and humbled to serve as Faculty Senate President. He commented that he has been a faculty member at UI for 20 years and he cares deeply about this institution. For the past two years he has had the pleasure of working with and getting to know many senators, but for those who do not know him, he explained that he is a faculty member in the department of Internal Medicine in the Carver College of Medicine. He divides his time between his research lab, studying the genetic causes of hypertension, providing clinical care as a cardiologist, and teaching. He also serves as Vice Chair for Faculty Advancement in the department of Internal Medicine.

Reminding the group that the recipients of the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service had just been announced, President Snyder noted that Professor Brody had also carried out research into the causes of hypertension. There are several awards named for Professor Brody, but perhaps none more important than the Faculty Senate's Brody Award for service. Professor Brody was passionate about faculty participation in service to the

university and to the state. In this spirit, President Snyder thanked the assembled senators for their service. He commented that he could think of no more impactful way to serve the University of Iowa than on the Senate. He particularly welcomed new senators, noting that the Senate is broadly representative of our faculty, coming together from different colleges and representing different tracks: tenure track, clinical track, research track, and now for the first time, instructional track. On behalf of the officers and the Senate, President Snyder welcomed the instructional-track faculty to the Senate.

Turning to the role of the senators, President Snyder commented that it was not so long ago that he was a new senator, sitting in the back row at his first meeting, not even sure how he had gotten elected or what was expected of him. He did not really appreciate the meaning of shared governance until he became a Faculty Senate officer. Shared governance means participating in the governance of the university, having a seat at the table to express what is important to us, our values and our concerns. It does not mean that we get to make the final decisions; that responsibility rests with the University President and the Board of Regents. But, we have a say in those decisions. Shared governance also means shared responsibility. We must be willing to engage with President Harreld and other members of the administration and to work with them in a collaborative and trusting way. If we do not do this, we give up our seat at the table and our ability to influence the direction of the university. University governance is a collaborative endeavor.

We all come to the Senate as representatives of our individual colleges and we bring the perspectives of our colleges. In their Senate roles, President Snyder requested that senators do several things. First, ask your colleagues about the issues we face and bring that information to the Senate. Then, after Senate meetings, inform your colleagues about the Senate's activities. This two-way communication ensures that the Senate does not operate in a vacuum. Second, President Snyder requested that senators participate in discussions and debates on issues before the Senate. It is very important that we hear all perspectives. As an introvert by nature, President Snyder appreciated the difficulty of speaking out in the Senate, but he invited senators to move out of their comfort zones. Third, President Snyder indicated that he expected senators to treat each other with courtesy and respect during Senate discussions. Each of us is here because we care deeply about the university. While we debate issues and strategies, we must never attack individuals or question motives. Finally, as we make decisions, President Snyder asked that senators put aside their allegiances to their colleges and act in the best interests of the university as a whole.

President Snyder continued, commenting that over the past two years the university has faced challenges that have threatened to divide the faculty. However, we have come through this difficult time stronger and more united. In the coming year we will face a number of important issues: the AAUP sanction; academic reorganization; budget challenges (including finding ways to increase faculty participation in the new budgeting process); the balance between free speech and academic freedom, and diversity and inclusion; and public engagement (reaching out to our state and our nation to reinforce the value of higher education as a public good). The Senate officers will be working on all of these issues over the summer.

President Snyder then thanked his fellow Senate officers, commenting that it had been both a privilege and a joy to work with them. Professor Gillan has truly raised the bar for all future Senate Secretaries. He was deeply involved in all Senate issues and is a real policy wonk. As a reward for this, President Snyder has asked Professor Gillan to chair the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee next year. He hoped to convince Professor Gillan to serve as Faculty Senate President sometime in the future. As a three-time past president, Professor Dove has gone far above and beyond the call of duty. He has tremendous institutional memory and an intuitive ability to ask key questions. President Snyder and Past President Vaughn have benefitted greatly from his wisdom. Professor Bohannan was an amazing mentor and role model during her time as an officer. The faculty were truly fortunate to have her courageous and steady leadership to guide us through a very difficult year on campus in the wake of the presidential search. In her new role as a faculty fellow in the Provost's Office, she will continue to look out for the best interests of faculty. President Snyder thanked Past President Vaughn for his guidance and friendship. He commented that he has had the opportunity to observe Past President Vaughn interacting with administrators and Regents, and that he has been a strident advocate for the interests of the faculty. He has represented the faculty in a gracious, even-tempered, and good-natured way, and has been reluctant to take credit for all that he has accomplished. He is the first faculty member to have served in all four officer roles in consecutive years. This demonstrates his great loyalty to the University of Iowa. President Snyder added that he is glad that he will have Past President Vaughn by his side during the coming year. He also thanked Laura Zaper for her work in helping to make the Senate run efficiently.

President Snyder presented gifts to former Past Presidents Dove and Bohannan. Past President Vaughn presented a gift to former Secretary Gillan.

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

V. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Professor Daack-Hirsch announced that the new Faculty Senate Secretary is Rachel Williams and the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Russell Ganim. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2017-18 Meeting Schedule – President Snyder reminded senators that the meeting schedule for 2017-18 could be found in their meeting packets.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Vigmostad moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snyder adjourned the meeting at 5:24 pm.