

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 28, 2020
3:30 – 5:15 pm
2390 University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

- Councilors Present: J. Buckley, M. Cunningham-Ford, L. Erdahl, M. Foley Nicpon, L. Glass, M. Lehan Mackin, A. Merryman, M. Pizzimenti, G. Russell, C. Sheerin, D. Wurster (by phone).
- Officers Present: T. Marshall, J. Yockey.
- Officer Excused: S. Daack-Hirsch.
- Councilors Excused: C. Bradley, A. Deshpande, C. Lang, N. Nisly, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez.
- Councilors Absent: A. Gerke, S. Vigmostad.
- Guests: W. Dlouhy (*Daily Iowan*), P. Matthes (Vice President for External Relations), M. Payne (*Daily Iowan*), A. Skores (*Daily Iowan*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – Vice President Yockey called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm. He explained that he would preside over the meeting because President Daack-Hirsch was away at a conference. He reminded the group that Past President Ganim has been appointed Associate Provost and Dean of International Programs and so would no longer be attending Council and Senate meetings.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Pizzimenti moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (November 19, 2019) – Professor Lehan Mackin moved and Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (February 11, 2020) – Professor Foley Nicpon moved and Professor Russell seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Joe Yockey, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (German) to fill the unexpired term of Anne Stapleton (English) on the Faculty Senate, Spring 2020
 - Gary Russell (Marketing) to the Faculty Council, 2020-22Professor Lehan Mackin moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously. Vice President Yockey welcomed Professor Russell to the Council.

III. New Business

- *Roundtable Discussion: Developing an Allocation Process for Resources Generated from the P3 (Pete Matthes, Vice President for External Relations)*

Mr. Matthes reminded the group that the university completed a commercial close with the energy services company Engie on December 10, as part of a public-private partnership (P3) involving the campus power plant (financial close will take place on March 10). The university will soon be receiving an up-front payment of about \$999 million from Engie. The up-front payment will be placed into an endowment; revenue from the endowment will then fund elements of the university's strategic plan. Mr. Matthes indicated that the strategic plan will help the university to deal with anticipated demographic challenges over the next decade. There is currently a \$15 million annual gap in available resources to fund the strategic plan initiatives. Revenue from the endowment is expected to fill that gap. A grant process for allocation of the \$15 million has been proposed but not finalized. A task force, chaired by Provost Fuentes and Vice President for Research Scholtz, is being created to devise the rules for the grant allocation process, with significant input from shared governance. The process should be in place by the end of the spring semester. The first call for proposals will go out in the fall semester. In FY21, only \$7.5 million is expected to be allocated, because we must allow time for the endowment to grow. The full allocation of \$15 million is expected to occur for the first time in FY22.

Mr. Matthes noted that grant proposals in the four focus areas of the strategic plan will be considered. Those focus areas are student success; research and discovery; engagement; and diversity, equity, and inclusion. The grant duration will last from one to five years. Professor Glass commented that the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has already sent out a call for proposals. He then questioned how funding for a proposed faculty line would be sustained beyond five years. Mr. Matthes responded that the dean would need to provide a guarantee of continued funding, but added that the new faculty member would likely bring in additional revenue to the college through increased research or tuition dollars. This revenue could then support the faculty line. Mr. Matthes reminded the group that the new budget model allows for colleges to retain more of the revenue they generate. He emphasized that the university cannot "cut its way to success;" instead, it must invest in the future, hence the pursuit of a P3 agreement.

Professor Foley Nicpon asked if deans would decide individually when and how to communicate with their faculty members regarding opportunities to submit proposals. While Mr. Matthes indicated that this was the case, he added that broad communication was desired. Once the rules for the grant allocation process are in place, all the colleges will likely move ahead with development of proposals. Professor Foley Nicpon then asked if funds would be allocated to colleges based on the size of the colleges. Mr. Matthes responded that this was not the intention. Funding would be allocated depending on the impact of the proposed projects. Mr. Matthes also anticipated that the allocation process would evolve over time as we gain experience with the process. Professor Erdahl asked how funding decisions might be made if equity among colleges is not necessarily a goal. Mr. Matthes responded that this was something still to be worked out.

Vice President Yockey wondered who would be eligible to write grant proposals for P3 funding. He speculated that it could be any individual on campus or that eligibility could be limited to colleges or academic units. He noted that the central service units have the central service advisory committee/budget review board process available to them, so they could have access to two separate funding streams if they were also allowed to submit proposals for P3 funding. Mr. Matthes emphasized that these are two very separate processes. The P3 process is for one-time investments (such as for the purchase of a large piece of equipment), while the budget review board process is for continuous funding (such as for additional staff to run the equipment). Secretary Marshall asked if a cap on the number of proposals from each college was anticipated. Could a dean have control over which projects were submitted and by whom? Mr. Matthes said that this is another issue for the task force to work out, but that the intention was for the field of proposals to be “wide open,” with good ideas and possible collaborations to be sought as widely as possible. Professor Pizzimenti asked if a campus-wide communication plan would be created, in order to cast a wide net for proposals, or if communication was expected to flow only through the deans. Mr. Matthes indicated that a skeleton communication plan already existed, but that it was subject to change based on the input of the task force.

Professor Foley Nicpon asked if the diversity post-doc initiative was part of the P3 funding. Mr. Matthes indicated that this is a separate initiative, but that diversity-related proposals could be submitted through the P3 process. Professor Lehan Mackin asked if the task force has already been formed. Mr. Matthes responded that it has not been formed yet. Vice President Yockey asked for clarification whether the task force was focused only on creating the proposal-submission process, or if it would address wider issues about which individuals and units could submit proposals. Mr. Matthes commented that the task force should have as wide a focus as possible, and that the process would be continually refined over time. Professor Russell asked if a process for evaluating the success of funded projects would be created. Mr. Matthes responded that such a process would definitely be created, along with various types of reporting mechanisms. He stressed that all stages of the process should be as transparent as possible, so that credibility is established.

Professor Buckley asked if the university had researched best practices for funding allocation at other institutions that had established a P3. Since P3 agreements have been in existence for some time now, this type of data likely exists. Mr. Matthes commented that the P3 agreements nationwide have all been very different. The P3 at The Ohio State University is most like ours, but the process there involved a percentage of the revenue being put directly toward specific projects, without a campus-wide grant process such as we are creating. Other institutions appear to be funneling their P3 proceeds directly into their general education funds. The UI, therefore, is breaking new ground with its grant process. In response to a question, Mr. Matthes added that The Ohio State University did not lose any state funding following implementation of its P3. He emphasized that the UI must stress to legislators that the P3 revenue is not a substitute for our annual state appropriation.

Returning to the discussion of how decisions would be made regarding which projects to fund, Professor Sheerin asked if proposals would be chosen based on the amount of revenue they might generate for the university. Mr. Matthes stated that proposals would be chosen based

on their alignment with the institution's values. He cited the example of the UI's international reputation for writing excellence. Writing programs may not be a lucrative endeavor for the university, but they are central to the institution's identity.

Vice President Yockey asked to whom questions regarding the grant allocation process should be addressed. Mr. Matthes indicated that, since Provost Fuentes and Vice President Scholtz are co-chairing the task force, they are best positioned to answer questions. He added that questions could also be directed to President Daack-Hirsch, who could then follow up with the task force. Professor Russell asked for clarification regarding how long the P3 revenue would last. Mr. Matthes responded that an approximately \$15 million annual income from the endowment has been projected over the fifty-year life of the agreement. He added that oversight of the endowment would be performed by a three-person board consisting of a Regent, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations, and a Faculty Senate appointee. This board will determine the exact amount of the allocation annually. Professor Glass asked if there would be any ethical constraints on the endowment's investments. Mr. Matthes indicated that there have been ongoing conversations about these concerns.

- *Roundtable Discussion: What Are the Issues in Your College? What Would You Like for Faculty Senate to Pursue in the Coming Year? (Joe Yockey)*

Vice President Yockey invited Councilors to share issues, big or small, of concern to the faculty in their colleges, as well as to suggest topics and speakers for upcoming Senate meetings. He noted that one Councilor had already requested that rethinking the teaching evaluation process be the subject of a future Senate discussion. Professor Lehan Mackin commented that an issue of great concern to faculty in the College of Nursing is the ratio of tenure-track faculty to non-tenure-track faculty. The dwindling number of tenure-track faculty in the college reflects a national shortage, so the college has turned to hiring an increasing number of clinical-track and instructional-track faculty to meet its teaching obligations. Professor Buckley commented that difficulties in recruiting and retaining faculty members of color are of particular concern in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Vice President Yockey recalled that this issue was the subject of a portion of last summer's Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat. Professor Glass noted that diversity, equity, and inclusion is a component of the strategic plan and therefore should be an important focus for P3 grant funding.

Professor Foley Nicpon commented that, in the College of Education, the new budget model, in which colleges are able to retain more of the revenue they generate, has led to some unexpected consequences. For example, it remains unclear how indirect costs from grants should be distributed among departments. This leads to an environment of competition between departments and between colleges, and a decrease in willingness to collaborate on research projects. Other Councilors indicated that they have observed this phenomenon, as well. Professor Glass asked for an update on progress to revise our catastrophic leave policy, beyond the incremental changes made thus far. Professor Erdahl recalled hearing that the Iowa Code was the impediment to more sweeping changes. Several Councilors commented that, having read the relevant portion of the Iowa Code, they were not entirely convinced that the Code prohibited the university from moving forward with larger changes. Vice President Yockey indicated that President Daack-Hirsch would give an update on catastrophic leave policy at the

next Senate meeting. He added that this interpretation of the Iowa Code had come from the Board of Regents Office and from the Iowa Attorney General's Office.

Returning to the topics of recruitment and retention, Vice President Yockey asked if colleges had developed any particularly successful strategies that could be shared across campus. Professor Pizzimenti commented that, in his experience, the university does well with recruitment of diverse faculty members up until the time that an offer is made. Often, these faculty members end up accepting positions at other institutions. It would be helpful to know the reasons behind their choices. Professor Lehan Mackin observed that diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives are going on across the country, so UI has much competition. Councilors commented that better offers, Iowa weather, and lack of job opportunities for trailing spouses could all contribute to candidates accepting positions elsewhere. Regarding retention of those faculty members who are hired, Professor Erdahl commented that it would be useful to conduct effective exit interviews with those faculty members who eventually leave the institution, as well as interviews with those faculty members who remain here, to learn the reasons for both decisions. Secretary Marshall pointed out that those who conduct exit interviews must remain entirely objective in order to obtain accurate information. Professor Merryman commented that one reason that faculty members might leave the UI is the lack of opportunity to evaluate one's supervisors and leaders, to provide input on how those individuals might better serve those they lead and the institution. Several Councilors indicated that such reviews are now being performed occasionally in their colleges, with mixed results.

Vice President Yockey asked if Councilors had any input on the format of Senate meetings. He noted that the Senate officers receive numerous requests from outside groups to make presentations at Senate meetings. Although the Senate officers do try to limit these requests, discussion time at Senate meetings can still get compressed. Professor Sheerin commented that time does seem short at Senate meetings to discuss issues of special relevance to faculty. Council meetings strike a better balance between presentations and discussions. Professor Buckley suggested shifting the Senate agenda structure to begin with discussion items and end with presentation items. Professor Lehan Mackin suggested limiting the number of outside presenters at each meeting. Vice President Yockey commented that sometimes presenters can only attend a particular meeting, or that the information they need to convey is time sensitive. He added that this relates to the larger issue of how information is communicated to faculty more broadly. Some presenters appear to feel that speaking to the Senate is the best way to disseminate information to all faculty, although it is unclear to what extent Senators pass on this information to their colleagues. Professor Lehan Mackin commented that most speakers could probably present only to the Council or only to the Senate, but not to both. She also raised one final issue for the Senate to take up – that the university's syllabus policy has not been revised in over ten years and therefore does not reference ICON and other newer teaching technology. Vice President Yockey noted that the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee could take on the task of reviewing the syllabus policy.

- *Faculty Councilor Membership on Central Service Advisory Committees (Joe Yockey)*

Vice President Yockey explained to the group how financing for the central service units works under the new budget model. Central service units (ITS, the Provost's Office, the Libraries, etc.) are unable to generate their own revenue, whether through tuition or through

research grants. Instead, they are reliant on the 30% allocation of new tuition dollars from the colleges that the new budget model established as a source of revenue. That funding is then allocated through a two-stage process. Each central service unit is assigned to one of six central services advisory committees (CSAC's). Each CSAC is chaired by two deans. The membership is mostly comprised of administrators and staff members, but the Senate officers have been sitting on one CSAC each, as well. Within each CSAC, the members develop proposals for funding that are then submitted to the Budget Review Board (BRB). The BRB includes all the deans and all the members of the President's cabinet, along with the shared governance presidents. CSAC proposals are then voted on by the BRB. Proposals that receive a majority positive vote are funded.

The Senate officers are looking for more faculty members to sit on the CSAC's, Vice President Yockey indicated. Currently, he sits on the Provost Office CSAC, President Daack-Hirsch sits on the ITS CSAC, and Secretary Marshall sits on the Research Office CSAC. The remaining CSAC's are for Central Administration, Facilities Management, and Student Life. He requested that any interested Councilors contact him or one of the other officers. Also, he added, if Councilors know of other faculty members who would be a good fit for one of the remaining CSAC's, please forward that name to the officers. Professor Pizzimenti asked what the approximate time commitment was. Vice President Yockey indicated that in his CSAC, the most activity took place in April, just prior to the last BRB meeting of the academic year in May (the BRB meets three times per academic year). In Secretary Marshall's experience, her CSAC has met twice so far, in the fall semester. The term of service is one year and would begin on June 1, Vice President Yockey added.

- *Vice President's Report (Joe Yockey)*

Regarding the coronavirus outbreak, Vice President Yockey reported that some UI students had returned this month from China (where the outbreak began) and other parts of Asia, but there have been no cases of coronavirus on campus. UIHC has announced that it is fully prepared to deal with any cases that might emerge. The International Programs website contains additional information and resources for anyone who is concerned about the virus.

Summarizing recent news from around campus, Vice President Yockey announced that the new Psychological and Brain Sciences building has opened. Former Councilor and Senator Professor Joe Szot has been named Associate Dean for Continuing and Integrated Medical Education in the Carver College of Medicine. Another former Senator, Professor Ana Merino, from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, has won Spain's prestigious Premio Nadal for her first novel, *El mapa de los afectos*, set in a small American town. The UI Graduate College has been selected by the Association of American Universities to participate in a grant-funded pilot program to evaluate Ph.D. education, <https://www.grad.uiowa.edu/news/2019-09-12/ui-gc-selected-for-national-initiative>.

Turning to executive searches, Vice President Yockey noted that the internal search for the next Vice President for Student Life is underway. Senior Advisor to the President and Associate Vice President for External Relations Laura McLeran is serving as the interim Vice President for Student Life. The candidates for the position will participate in open forums early next month.

Provost Fuentes has announced that a national search for the new Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will begin in April. The search firm Isaacson, Miller will assist with the search. Regarding central administrative reviews, Vice President Yockey noted that the review of the Office of the General Counsel has been completed. The review report is now posted on the Faculty Senate website, <https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/about/administrative-reviews>. The review of the Office of the Vice President for Medical Affairs is ongoing, while the review of the Office of the Vice President for Research will get underway later this semester. Secretary Marshall will chair that review committee. Members of the committee include Professors Weimin Han (Mathematics), Sarah Vigmostad (Biomedical Engineering), Jason Barker (Internal Medicine), Peter Thorne (Occupational & Environmental Health), and Rebekah Kowal (Dance). An external reviewer has yet to be named. The self-study is due in February.

Vice President Yockey noted that this is award season for faculty and reminded the group that a call for nominations has gone out for the Faculty Senate's own Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa, <https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/faculty-awards/michael-j-brody-award>. This is one of the most prestigious awards for faculty and 1-3 awards are given each year. Recipients are honored at a reception hosted by the President and the Provost. They also receive \$1,000 and an original piece of artwork created by graduate students from the UI Printmaking Department.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Foley Nicpon thanked Vice President Yockey for giving Councilors the chance to discuss topics of concern today.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 11, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 3, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390 UCC.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pizzimenti moved and Professor Glass seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. Vice President Yockey adjourned the meeting at 4:40 pm.