

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, September 16, 2014**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present: P. Abbas, F. Abboud, M. Adamek, A. Amendola, J. Bates, C. Benson, P. Brophy, K. Brown, G. Buettner, S. Campo, D. Caplan, D. Dawson, B. Eckstein, A. Ersig, N. Fethke, C. Fox, E. Gillan, K. Glenn, T. Havens, J. Iverson, J. Klesney-Tait, A. Kwitek, G. Lee, W. Maury, D. Murry, M. Nikolas, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, L. Segre, P. Snyder, C. Sponsler, L. Storrs, C. Swan, B. Thompson, T. Treat, H. Udaykumar, S. Vos, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, R. Williams, P. Windschitl, E. Ziegler.
- Officers Present: C. Bohannan, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: S. Ali, M. Blumberg, J. Buatti, J. Colgan, S. Daack-Hirsch, D. Drake, F. Durham, J. Foote, K. Kieran, N. Langguth, K. Light-McGroary, U. Mallik, A. Merino, P. Muhly, P. Romitti, J. Wang, T. Yahr.
- Senators Absent: S. Baker, T. Burstain, Z. Jin, A. Lee, T. Mabry, J. McNamara, J. Murry, E. Prussing, R. Rocha, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, D. Segaloff, S. Seibert, M. Voigt.
- Guests: B. Butler (Provost), J. Florman (Center for Teaching), R. Fumerton (Philosophy), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Moeller (Office of the Provost), K. Ward (Human Resources), E. Wasserman (Psychology), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.  
[http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.09.16.14\\_000.pdf](http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.09.16.14_000.pdf).

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Treat moved and Professor Ziegler seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 29, 2014) – Professor Campo moved and Professor Treat seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Christina Bohannan, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Dan Caplan (Preventive & Community Dentistry) to replace Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2014
  - David Drake (Dows Institute) to replace Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2014

- Kyle Brown (Internal Medicine) to replace Jane Paulsen (Psychiatry) on the Faculty Senate, 2014-15
- Kathleen Kieran (Urology) to fill the unexpired term of Heather Bartlett (Pediatrics) on the Faculty Council, 2014-16
- James Bates (Anesthesia) to fill the unexpired term of Heather Bartlett (Pediatrics) on the Faculty Senate, 2014-16
- Theresa Hegmann (Physician Assistant Program) to the University Safety and Security Charter Committee, 2014-17
- Jay Christensen-Szalanski (Management & Organizations) to the Financial Aid Advisory Charter Committee, 2014-17

Professor Gillan moved and Professor Campo seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

President Thomas welcomed newly-appointed Associate Provost for Faculty Kevin Kregel and newly-appointed Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Lon Moeller to the meeting, as well as the new senators.

### III. New Business

- *Update on Performance-Based Funding (Barry Butler, Provost)*

Provost Butler began his presentation by providing some background on the performance-based funding model, a formula for distribution of state appropriations to the three Regents institutions. In the current fiscal year (FY2015) that began on July 1, the total sum of appropriations to the three institutions was \$500 million; the University of Iowa's portion of that was about \$230 million. The new performance-based funding formula was developed by a Board of Regents, State of Iowa task force, appointed about eighteen months ago. The task force met throughout the 2013-14 academic year and discussed how the state appropriations are distributed among the Regents institutions. The task force was made up of two Regents and an alum from each of the three institutions. Their recommendation was then forwarded to the Regents, who voted to approve the recommendation at their June meeting. The formula is based on several different components including total resident student enrollment (60%); resident graduate and professional student enrollment (5%); progress toward and attainment of degrees by resident undergraduates (15%); access, as measured by a diverse student body (10%); sponsored research (5%); and a final category based on Regent-selected metrics (5%).

Provost Butler continued, noting that the Regents' budget request for the next fiscal year (FY2016), which begins on July 1, 2015, is based on the performance-based funding model. The budget request is always submitted annually in September to the governor and legislature. He indicated that this year the Regents have requested appropriations cost-of-living increases for all three institutions at a rate of 1.75%. For UI this equates to \$4 million. The Regents have also requested \$13 million for UI to offset funding lost through the application of the performance-based funding model. Implementation of the performance-based funding model depends on the actions of the governor and the legislature during the upcoming legislative session.

Turning to enrollment issues, Provost Butler commented that President Mason has declared the intention to grow enrollment by 4,000 students over five years. She has indicated that the university will aggressively compete for resident undergraduate students while also increasing

financial aid for undergraduate students. The university will still continue to recruit high-performing out-of-state and international students, however. Enrollment growth supports the university's overall budget. The university's general operating fund is composed of three components, state appropriations, tuition revenues, and indirect cost recoveries from external grants. Colleges that experience enrollment growth will receive financial incentives. Reiterating recent points made by President Mason, Provost Butler indicated that the university will continue to identify efficiencies across campus and meet the new general fund budget targets. The university will continue to offer competitive performance-based compensation to faculty and staff. And, the university will continue to invest in areas of particular strength as well as to support the overall research mission. Reallocation of funds may be necessary to cover the additional costs for collegiate and student services that enrollment increases may cause.

Provost Butler stressed that the university is committed to maintaining quality and its national reputation, while pursuing enrollment growth. The university will maintain the quality of our students and the strength of graduate and professional programs, and recruit the best possible faculty to the institution. The UI will continue to attract high-achieving undergraduates who have aspirations of graduate and professional study. The reputation of institutions of this caliber depends on the reputations of our graduate and professional programs, the reputation of the faculty, the quality of the students we attract, and the size of the institution. While aspects of the budget planning process may change in the years ahead, UI will remain true to its mission as a highly-ranked research institution that places a high priority on educating our students and serving the people of Iowa. Provost Butler noted that UI has risen in national rankings to number 27 among public universities. Ten UI graduate and professional programs are ranked in the top ten nationally. Twenty-seven are in the top twenty-five. He ended by commenting that UI is a great university and will continue to improve.

Professor Gillan asked if there were plans to increase the number of resident graduate and professional students. Provost Butler responded that the university must return to a focus on growing its enrollment in these areas. Professional student enrollment has remained relatively stable, but graduate student enrollment has dropped. Another senator asked about the Regents' \$13 million supplemental budget request for UI. She wondered what the likelihood was of the university actually receiving these extra funds and whether such supplemental budget requests would be made in subsequent years. Provost Butler responded that it was hard to predict the answers to those questions, but he noted that the performance-based funding model prohibits a drop in funding of more than 2% annually for each institution. Future enrollment growth is a currently unpredictable factor that will affect subsequent budget numbers. Professor Wilcox asked if there was any intention to publicly emphasize the UI's reputational excellence and to revisit the performance-based funding model formula, because it favors enrollment of resident undergraduate students heavily over research achievements. Provost Butler commented that he and President Mason take every opportunity to publicly praise the achievements of UI faculty. He added that setting policy is the task of the Regents, so questions about revisiting the formula should be addressed to them.

Professor Wilder asked how admission criteria compare among the three institutions. Provost Butler explained that some years ago the Regents approved the Regents Admission

Index (RAI), which assigns a score to each applicant, using a formula that factors in criteria such as class rank, grade point average, etc. If a student receives a score of 245 or higher, s/he is automatically accepted to a Regents institutions upon application. If a student receives a score of less than 245, the institution can do a holistic review of the applicant. About 40-50 students in last year's freshman class of 4500 fell into this category. Because many high schools in Iowa, especially many of the larger ones, are no longer ranking students, a Regent-appointed task force is reviewing admission policy to determine how to evaluate applicants without a class rank. Provost Butler noted that overall the UI student body is of a high quality. Professor Wilder asked if the pool of potential students in Iowa is large enough for the university to increase its share of resident undergraduates. Provost Butler acknowledged that the pool is currently flat or even shrinking slightly. Therefore, the university must compete aggressively for these students.

Professor Sponsler asked how the university would be able to accommodate an increased number of students. Provost Butler responded that in terms of space, administrators are looking at how classroom space can be maximized. Colleges will receive financial incentives to grow their enrollment, with the additional funds used to increase their level of service. Professor Caplan asked about the experiences of other states with performance-based funding. Provost Butler indicated that the task force had invited a number of speakers to their meetings to report on events in different states. Those reports can be found on the Regents website. He added that there are various faculty on campus, for example Christopher Morphey in the College of Education, with knowledge of these issues. Provost Butler concluded his remarks by indicating that senators should feel free to contact him with questions or concerns about performance-based funding. President Thomas thanked Provost Butler for his presentation. She added that over the summer the Faculty Senate officers had submitted a letter to the Regents with their concerns about the performance-based funding model. That letter is posted on the Faculty Senate website, <http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/>. President Thomas also indicated that it was her understanding that the Regents planned to review the model from time to time.

- *Update on TIER Efficiency Review (Richard Fumerton and Erika Lawrence)*

President Thomas noted that Past President Lawrence and former Senate president Professor Fumerton both sit on the TIER Sounding Board, a group that has offered immediate feedback to the Deloitte consultants throughout the review process. The Sounding Board is comprised of faculty, staff, graduate students, undergraduate students, and administrators.

Past President Lawrence reminded senators that the Board of Regents had contracted with Deloitte, an international consulting firm, to conduct a comprehensive review of the three Regents universities. The first phase of the review took place in the spring, when a vast amount of data was collected from the institutions. On the basis of this data, Deloitte developed numerous "opportunities," or recommendations, for transformation, innovation, or efficiency. In the second phase, currently underway, these opportunities were whittled down to the most promising ideas and developed further. The third phase will be implementation; this phase has not yet begun. Deloitte has been focusing on the administrative side of the three institutions. Another firm, KH Consulting, had originally been retained by Deloitte to carry out an academic review and had completed the first phase of its review. Due to scheduling conflicts with the now

slower pace of that review, however, KH Consulting could no longer carry out its work here, so a new consulting firm will be engaged by Deloitte to conduct the academic portion of the review.

Past President Lawrence indicated that the Sounding Board has been meeting approximately monthly with Deloitte representatives. It was at the encouragement of the Sounding Board that the academic portion of the review was postponed until the fall, because many faculty members with nine-month appointments are not on campus during the summer. Just today the Sounding Board received eight business cases, or detailed recommendations, from Deloitte. On Monday, the Sounding Board will meet with Deloitte representatives to give feedback. A public release of the business cases will occur on October 2. Town hall meetings will take place on all three campuses shortly thereafter. The Regents will vote whether to adopt these recommendations at their October 23 meeting [the date of this vote was subsequently changed to November].

Professor Wilder asked if the academic portion of the review would take into account the accreditation process that some units undergo periodically. He expressed concern at a potential duplication of efforts. Professor Fumerton observed that an extensive review of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, complete with an outside consultant, was recently carried out and he expressed the hope that the academic reviewers engaged by Deloitte would look at all such recent accreditation and review reports. At this time it appears that the academic review will focus heavily on undergraduate education. Professor Wilcox asked if it was likely that Deloitte would finish their administrative review long before the academic review is carried out. Past President Lawrence responded that the administrative review is expected to continue throughout the academic year, so that it would run concurrently with the academic review. A new firm for the academic review should be identified soon. President Thomas added that a suggestion that faculty members pick up the academic review and finish it themselves was not taken up by the Regents. She commented that faculty members should engage as proactively as possible with the new firm so that they can shape the outcome of that review.

Another question from Professor Wilder concerned how best to respond to recommendations that faculty members consider questionable ideas. For example, there may be a suggestion that all information technology services be outsourced. Past President Lawrence acknowledged that there might be some recommendations that localized services become more centralized. Vice President Bohannon stressed that faculty members must make their voices heard throughout the academic review process. She added that the Regents had built in more time for feedback for these latest business cases as an effort to hear from as many people as possible. Professor Abboud asked what units the current business cases would cover. Professor Fumerton responded that the cases cover information technology, human resources, facilities management, and finance across the university. President Thomas suggested that faculty members might be most interested in the recommendations regarding information technology and human resources. Professor Wilder asked if there would be any recommendations regarding licensing and technology transfer. Past President Lawrence commented that nothing regarding administration was off limits at this point.

- *Working at Iowa Survey (Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration)*

Mr. Ward explained that the university last conducted the Working at Iowa survey in 2012. This year's survey will be available October 14-28. The survey will contain 20 items on a six-point scale, so it will not be time-consuming to complete. It is confidential and, Mr. Ward stressed, it matters. He urged senators to participate and to encourage others to do so, as well. He indicated that the overall purpose of the survey is to support strategic success at the university. Mr. Ward noted that Professor Eean Crawford, of the Tippie College of Business, researches employee engagement, and has lent his expertise to Human Resources in connection with the survey.

Mr. Ward continued, explaining that research has shown that the most successful organizations have a high percentage of engaged employees. Such organizations also have better retention, performance, and attendance, as well as fewer work injuries. Past Working at Iowa surveys have indicated that UI employees have a high level of engagement. Employee engagement reflects an individual's alignment with the mission of the organization in terms of whether s/he has meaningful, challenging work in an environment characterized by openness, trust, and mutual respect. Engagement also supports organizational resilience in the face of change or adversity. Mr. Ward added that knowing more about our workforce can lead us to focus on and develop our strengths, rather than try to change or modify weaknesses.

Building engagement enhances recruitment and retention, along with health and productivity. How we feel about our work also impacts our relations with students, patients, and the public and whether those individuals have a positive experience on campus. Fostering engagement is a shared responsibility. At the organizational level, the university needs to convey its mission and values through its leadership, to provide accountability and recognition, and to create opportunities for development and mobility. Supervisors and managers can have the most impact on engagement. They are also in a position to identify untapped strengths in employees. Conversation in units regarding how to create a better workplace is essential to developing engagement. Individuals bear responsibility for being at work and able to engage, so workplace programs to promote health and well-being are essential to fostering engagement. Individuals also impact the work environment through how they interact with their colleagues.

Returning to the specifics of the survey, Mr. Ward indicated that responses to questions are arranged on a six-point scale. Questions deal with the individual's job, unit, and the university at large. The survey should generally take three to five minutes to complete. Employees will receive an email message on October 14 inviting them to take the survey. The email message will contain a link to the survey. Periodic emails will be sent out during the duration of the survey to remind those who have not yet taken it to do so. The survey will close on October 28. University-wide results should be available by the end of the semester. Colleges/divisions and departments should receive their results in January. The report format will be the same as in 2012, with data illustrated in table and graph format for all items. Seven of the items will be trended for all the years of the survey (going back to 2006). The 2012 participation rate was 67%; this time Human Resources is aiming for about 70%. Reaching such a high rate will require the active encouragement of colleagues by colleagues.

Mr. Ward expects to report on the university-wide results at a Faculty Senate meeting early in the spring semester. Colleges, divisions, and departments will be encouraged to share results internally and create dialogue regarding strengths and opportunities for improvement. Regarding actions to follow upon these dialogues, Mr. Ward suggested that units identify one focus to help achieve the unit's goals and then take two action steps to address this focus. Communicate about these activities at least three times to those directly impacted; this will also show that the unit is responding to the feedback received from the survey. A variety of strategies are needed to improve productivity and effectiveness through engagement. Units need to build on their strengths and look towards long-term change, but smaller, more immediate methods include simply recognizing and appreciating effort on a daily basis. In conclusion, Mr. Ward encouraged those with questions about the survey to contact him.

Professor Abboud suggested that tangible results of previous surveys be highlighted. Mr. Ward agreed and indicated that examples would be promoted as the survey time approaches. He noted, however, that units may be hesitant to share their success stories as that might entail revealing challenges that previously existed in the unit. He added that increased supervisory training and development are some of the tangible results of previous surveys. In response to various questions, Mr. Ward indicated that email reminders would only be sent to those who have not taken the survey, and that confidentiality would be maintained. It will be possible to know who has taken the survey, but not how those individuals have responded. Mr. Ward pointed to the Tippie College of Business as a unit that had achieved an exceptionally high response rate in 2012, in the midst of the college's strategic planning process.

- *Faculty Learning Communities (Jean Florman, Director, Center for Teaching)*

Ms. Florman indicated that the Center for Teaching is now part of a new unit called the Office of Teaching, Learning, and Technology, which is under Information Technology Services, and has moved from the main library to the University Capitol Centre. She explained that faculty learning communities are cross-disciplinary faculty groups, in which the participants create an active, collaborative program to enhance teaching and learning on campus. The communities are year-long and faculty-driven. Faculty members propose both the topics and the membership, although Ms. Florman is available to make suggestions regarding the latter. The groups meet on a regular basis, monthly or more frequently, and hold intellectually-engaging seminars about teaching and learning. A required component is an outcome for the broader community, such as a publication, a new course, or a conference presentation. Funding of five hundred dollars is available to each learning community, to be used for items such as meals together, books, or field trips.

Most of the CIC institutions already have had similar faculty groups. The readings are chosen by the participants and tend to be from the popular, rather than scholarly, press. For example, a Michigan State University faculty learning community focused on leadership skills for faculty in a team-taught curriculum. One of their readings was *Shackleton's Way: Leadership Lessons from the Great Antarctic Explorer* by Margot Morrell and Stephanie Capparell. UI's first faculty learning community met last week and is focusing on team teaching in the "big questions" courses. Ms. Florman urged senators to let their colleagues know about this new opportunity.

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

V. Announcements

- President Thomas announced that the review of the Office of the Provost was recently completed and the final report will soon be posted on the Faculty Senate website, <http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/AdminReviews/index.html>.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 28, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Treat moved and Professor Campo seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 4:53 pm.