

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, September 3, 2019
3:30 – 5:15 pm
2390 University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: J. Buckley, M. Cunningham-Ford, L. Erdahl, M. Foley Nicpon, A. Gerke, L. Glass, C. Lang, M. Lehan Mackin, A. Merryman, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, C. Sheerin, S. Vigmostad.

Officers Present: S. Daack-Hirsch, R. Ganim, T. Marshall, J. Yockey.

Councilors Excused: C. Bradley, A. Deshpande, N. Nisly, M. Pizzimenti, D. Wurster.

Councilors Absent: None.

Guests: F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), C. O'Connor (*Daily Iowan*), T. Uden-Holman (Provost's Office), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Daack-Hirsch called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Foley Nicpon moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 9, 2019) – Professor Buckley moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 17, 2019) – Professor Foley Nicpon moved and Professor Sheerin seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously. Because this is the first Council meeting of the year, Councilors introduced themselves.
- D. Committee Appointments (Joe Yockey, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Cormac O'Sullivan (Nursing) to the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee, 2019-22
 - Gregory Shill (Law) to the Parking and Transportation Committee, 2019-22
 - Megan Gilster (Social Work) to the Governmental Relations Committee, 2019-22
 - David Drake (Dows Institute) to the Faculty Staff Parking Appeals Committee, 2019-22
 - Stuart Weinstein (Orthopaedics & Rehabilitation) to the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2019-24
 - Mary Trachsel (Rhetoric) to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2019-22
 - John Prineas (Physics & Astronomy) to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2019-22
 - Miodrag Iovanov (Mathematics) to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2019-22
 - Nidhi Handoo (Oral Pathology) to fill the unexpired term of Michelle McQuistan (Preventive & Community Dentistry) on the Faculty Senate, 2019-22

- Anand Vijh (Finance) to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Senate, 2019-22
 - Kay Hegarty (Accounting) to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Senate, 2019-22
- Professor Sheerin moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously. President Daack-Hirsch noted that several Senate vacancies remain on the roster in the colleges of business, liberal arts and sciences group II, and medicine. She encouraged Councilors to suggest colleagues for service on the Senate.

III. New Business

- *Proposed University Curriculum Committee (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Tanya Uden-Holman)*

Associate Provost Uden-Holman distributed a draft of a proposal for a university curriculum committee. The committee would *address both undergraduate and graduate curricular issues, including recommendation of new undergraduate and graduate course approvals and new undergraduate program approvals*. Associate Provost Uden-Holman stressed that the university curriculum committee would not add excessive time to the course approval process. The committee would work efficiently, but would still allow for colleges to have input on new course proposals. One task of the committee would be to look for any overlap with or duplication of existing courses. Another task would be to examine the potential campus-wide impact of course and degree program elimination. Acknowledging that some communication among colleges already exists regarding new courses, Associate Provost Uden-Holman noted that creation of a university-wide curriculum committee would ensure that such communication occurs regularly. Many of our peer institutions have such committees, as well. Committee members would be nominated by the colleges, Faculty Senate, and the student governance bodies for the broadest possible campus representation. The university curriculum committee would not take the place of the Graduate Council or the collegiate and departmental curriculum committees, she added.

Professor Vigmostad asked for clarification whether *all* proposed new courses would go through the university curriculum committee. Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that most would, except for those listed on her handout (study abroad courses, first-year seminars, courses for professional school students only, etc.). Noting the exception for professional school courses, Professor Sheerin asked if law school courses would be exempt from review by this committee. Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that they would be, but if the College of Law were to offer an undergraduate course, that course would not be exempt from review. Exemptions for College of Nursing courses that are offered only to nursing students might not be automatic, however, Associate Provost Uden-Holman indicated, in response to comments from President Daack-Hirsch.

Professor Lang asked how many new courses were anticipated to be reviewed each year. She commented that most of the new courses would likely come from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that about 40 new courses would probably be reviewed per semester, with the majority coming from CLAS. Professor Lang and Past President Ganim noted that, currently, the CLAS collegiate curriculum committee does not review individual courses; that task is carried out at the departmental level, by either the

departmental executive officer or by the departmental curriculum committee. If approval by the collegiate curriculum committee now becomes necessary before a new course moves to the university curriculum committee, this would add yet another step to the process. Professor Lang then asked about the vision for the university curriculum committee. Would it assess our curriculum goals annually, for example? Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that she envisioned this committee evolving over time, perhaps taking on issues such as an evaluation of the general education curriculum overall. Professor Lang suggested that this aspect of the proposed committee's work be written into the charge. Service on this committee would be more attractive to faculty members if there is a visionary component to the committee's work.

Professor Sheerin asked for clarification regarding what current problem the curriculum committee would be solving, other than the fact that many of our peers have such a committee while we do not. Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that there has been some duplication of courses lately, which is particularly problematic given our current environment of constrained resources. Professor Sheerin suggested that, before instituting another layer of approval for new courses, efforts be made to better educate faculty members regarding what courses already exist. Associate Provost Uden-Holman commented that the university curriculum committee could do both tasks. Serving on this committee would allow faculty members from across campus to learn about what is being done in other colleges and to share this information with their collegiate colleagues.

Professor Erdahl, who serves on the Medical Education Council for the Carver College of Medicine (CCOM), observed that the Medical Education Council does not report to the Graduate Council. Associate Provost Uden-Holman explained that proposals for new degrees do not go to the Graduate Council for approval; rather, Dean John Keller, as dean for graduate and professional education, would approve these proposals. President Daack-Hirsch brought up several issues that the Senate officers had previously discussed with Associate Provost Uden-Holman regarding this proposed committee. She noted that the committee would provide a setting in which colleges could offer ongoing input on the general education curriculum. Also, information about potential course eliminations would become available through the committee long before students attempt to register for those courses, thereby giving colleges the opportunity to make alternative plans in a timely manner. And, the additional layer of approval that the committee would provide would ensure that new course proposals are beneficial to the university as a whole, not just to a particular college or department.

Past President Ganim observed that it might be useful for the proposed committee to post criteria for new course approval. Professor Lang expressed concern that a CLAS new course proposal might receive departmental and collegiate approval, but not receive approval from the university curriculum committee, which might include only a few representatives from CLAS. Associate Provost Uden-Holman commented that she envisioned a process in which departments contemplating the creation of a new course would research possible existing similar courses and would initiate communication with the colleges and departments that offer those courses prior to submitting a new course proposal to the university curriculum committee, so that possible duplication could be addressed early in the process. This would remove a sense of uncertainty from the final stages of the course approval process. Professor Rodriguez-

Rodriguez raised the issue of university curriculum committee members not having the expertise to evaluate the relevance of a proposed new course outside their disciplines. Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that departments will have the opportunity to explain the curricular relevance of a proposed new course to the committee. Committee members would also be encouraged to reach out to departments for additional details. Professor Gerke asked how the committee would be alerted to the possibility of course duplication. Associate Provost Uden-Holman indicated that one source of this information would be the Registrar's Office, which might raise questions about a course proposal if key word searches turn up similar existing courses. Registrar's Office staff could then triage the course requests, separating out course requests that require minimal review from those that should be looked at more closely for potential duplication. Associate Provost Uden-Holman indicated that details of the review process would be worked out in the future.

Professor Foley Nicpon asked for clarification whether formation of the committee was already in the implementation stage or was still under consideration. Associate Provost Uden-Holman confirmed that the committee was still only under consideration at this time. Professor Foley Nicpon followed up by asking what steps would be required for implementation. Associate Provost Uden-Holman responded that she planned to seek input from the Faculty Senate, the associate deans for faculty, and the Council of Deans before any action would be taken to establish the committee. Professor Vigmostad commented that, while she appreciated the goals of the proposed committee, in her experience, it can be challenging to have a new course approved even at the departmental level by colleagues with expertise in the relevant area. Although it could be useful to have a central location for all course syllabi to be available, she questioned whether the proposed committee could function effectively. Professor Gerke asked how many duplicate courses are detected each year. Associate Provost Uden-Holman answered that she would need to see the data before responding. She reminded the group, however, that the university has recently adopted a new de-centralized budget model that rewards colleges for credit hours offered, thereby creating a new incentive structure. A university curriculum committee could serve to mitigate any unintended consequences of this new structure. Several councilors raised the issue of the new budget model undermining cross-disciplinary teaching efforts, because colleges will want to retain as much tuition revenue as possible from the courses they offer. Associate Provost Uden-Holman commented that we must ensure that colleges that provide the resources for cross-listed courses receive the revenue from those courses.

Vice President Yockey suggested that the proposed committee serve as a notification, not a review, body to prevent course duplication. Each new course proposal would be sent to the group, which could then review it for similarities to other university courses. If duplication is discovered, the college proposing the new course would be notified. President Daack-Hirsch added that the committee could develop a relatively narrow focus on looking for duplication, ensuring new courses benefit the university as a whole, and determining the impact of discontinued courses on students throughout the university. Questions of meeting accreditation standards and other programmatic-related issues would be reserved for the colleges and departments to handle. Associate Provost Uden-Holman concurred that this would be her vision for the committee, as well. Professor Erdahl asked if anyone was monitoring the university's course library, with a focus on potential course duplication. If not, perhaps this is where we

could begin regarding monitoring for duplication. President Daack-Hirsch and Associate Provost Uden-Holman noted that some degree of duplication can be useful, because of the variety of different views across disciplines. Professor Lang suggested that the proposal for the new committee include a statement about the motivation for the committee's formation. The potential challenges created by the new budget model should be openly stated, as well as any wider goals such as fostering interdisciplinary teaching. Several councilors noted that framing the new committee this way would likely lead to the committee being more readily accepted by faculty members than if the committee was described merely as an additional approval body. Faculty members would probably be more interested in serving on the committee, as well. Past President Ganim commented upon the work of the Graduate Council, which invites faculty members to present new program proposals in person. Associate Provost Uden-Holman noted that the proposed committee would not disrupt the current process of Board of Regent approval for all new academic programs. She thanked councilors for their feedback and commented that she looked forward to discussing future topics with them.

- *Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations Review Report (Joe Yockey, Chair, Review Committee)*

President Daack-Hirsch explained that it is the duty of the Faculty Senate periodically to review the central administrative offices. For some time, the Senate had been behind in its review schedule, but is now back on track. The Office of the Vice President for External Relations was reviewed during Spring 2018. The review of the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations was begun in Fall 2018, but because of the size and complexity of the Office, that review extended through Spring 2019. The review of the Office of the General Counsel got underway in Spring 2019 and is expected to be concluded soon. The central administrative reviews have two parts, a review of the Office and a review of the top official. The review report of the former becomes a public document, housed on the Faculty Senate website, while the review report of the latter remains a confidential personnel document provided to President Harreld only.

Vice President Yockey, who chaired the review committee for the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Operations, listed the members of the committee, all faculty members: Ramji Balakrishnan (Business), Barbara Eckstein (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Megan Foley Nicpon (Education), Alicia Gerke (Medicine), and Lia Plakans (Education). The external reviewer was Brian Burnett, Senior Vice President for Finance and Operations, the Chief Financial Officer, and Treasurer for the University of Minnesota. Vice President Yockey indicated that the review process was lengthy, because Finance and Operations is a huge enterprise that touches every corner of the campus. The review committee began its work by analyzing the self-study produced by the Office and determining which issues it would focus on in the report. The committee conducted 14 interviews with senior Finance and Operations leaders and distributed two surveys, one to staff and administrators (associate deans, collegiate budget officers) who regularly interact with Finance and Operations and one to all faculty with appointments of 50% or greater. The committee then discussed their findings and had some follow-up conversations with Finance and Operations staff before drafting their report. The report will be posted on the Faculty Senate website after the September 17 Senate meeting.

Turning to some of the recommendations developed by the review committee, Vice President Yockey noted that a breakdown in the relationship between Finance and Operations and the Campus Planning Committee had occurred over the years, leading to the marginalization of what had once been an active and engaged charter committee, the membership of which includes faculty, staff and students. Fortunately, however, as a result of the review, that relationship has been revived over the past few months. Some other issues highlighted in the report include the high turnover rate among officers in the Department of Public Safety due to lower compensation compared to other area law enforcement agencies and the need to remain vigilant and transparent as the new budget model is implemented, so that “turf wars” do not arise among colleges, for example, and so that the campus community can clearly evaluate the effectiveness of the budget model.

President Daack-Hirsch commented that the central administrative review committees generally focus on issues that have the most impact on the faculty, particularly on their teaching and research activities. She added that the review process allows for opportunities for faculty to understand how complex central administration is and to advocate for beneficial changes. Past President Ganim noted, in reference to the recommendation related to the Campus Planning Committee, that the recent creation of the Campus Development Team by Finance and Operations has contributed to wider campus engagement, including from the Campus Planning Committee, on university facilities issues. Professor Foley Nicpon, a member of the review committee, praised Vice President Yockey’s skillful shepherding of the review process and the extensive work he put into creating the review report.

- *President’s Report (Sandy Daack-Hirsch)*

President Daack-Hirsch thanked those who attended the annual Faculty Council/Administrative retreat on August 20. She reminded the group that the morning sessions of the retreat had focused on shared governance committee structure, including the long-established charter committees and the new committees that have emerged from the Path Forward initiative and the budget review process. Some overlap has arisen among all of these committees. The shared governance groups are charged with periodically reviewing the charter committees and a new review is about to get underway. One focus of the review will be on this overlap. President Daack-Hirsch noted that Past President Ganim gave a very helpful overview presentation at the retreat on shared governance committee structure, which he may give to the Senate later this year. Professor Merryman added that the presentation was very informative for her as a new councilor. Professor Lang, who has served on one of the Path Forward committees, expressed surprise that the charter committees were never mentioned at the meetings of that committee. She commented that better connections should be formed between the Path Forward and the charter committees.

President Daack-Hirsch indicated that the afternoon sessions of the retreat focused on diversity, equity and inclusion as it relates to faculty recruitment and retention. The sessions included presentations from representatives of the Department of Mathematics and the Department of Internal Medicine’s Cardiovascular Division about recruitment and retention of diverse faculty, graduate students and post-docs in those units. The Senate officers took notes during the small group discussions of this topic and they plan to create a document based on the

ideas generated during these discussions to circulate among the councilors. President Daack-Hirsch commented that there is much faculty can do at the departmental level to advance the goals of diversity, equity and inclusion and therefore to change departmental culture in a grass-roots, faculty-led effort.

Turning to an update on the proposed second health insurance plan that was the subject of considerable interest and concern to senators during the spring, President Daack-Hirsch indicated that the administration will move ahead with implementing the second plan in time for the annual benefits enrollment in the fall. At the October Senate meeting, representatives from Human Resources and from the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (FRIC) will provide an update on communication efforts to university employees regarding choosing a plan. President Daack-Hirsch commented that there are still many unknowns regarding the new two-plan structure of our health benefits, such as migration rates between the plans and future premium increases. The Senate officers will continue to monitor developments and to advocate for faculty, including by attending the monthly FRIC meetings. Past President Ganim reminded the group that the Faculty Senate sent a letter, composed by Vice President Yockey, to administrators over the summer detailing the Senate's concerns about the second health plan. These concerns included the lack of sufficient data to fully evaluate a proposed second plan and the speed of the process used to create the second plan. The letter had requested a year's delay in implementation so that proper consideration could occur. Unfortunately, this request was not granted.

Professor Erdahl asked if the Senate had any recourse in this situation. President Daack-Hirsch responded that the process, however accelerated it seemed, did follow the required steps, but simply ended in a decision with which the Senate did not agree. Senate input was not dismissed, she added, because the concerns the Senate raised will be monitored as the plan is implemented. Past President Ganim added that we must watch the roll-out of the new plan and the education process, which must be transparent and thorough. An initial communication has gone out regarding a comparison of the plans. President Daack-Hirsch commented that health plans may be a more important tool for retention than for recruitment, because junior faculty are likely more interested in salary than in benefits at this stage of their careers. Professor Lehan Mackin indicated that she would like to see updated cost projections for the two plans, information that was not available to the senators in the spring. Vice President Yockey stressed that faculty must remain vigilant and engaged as implementation unfolds.

President Daack-Hirsch reminded the group that over the summer the Faculty Senate had formed a task force to address gaps in the university's current Catastrophic Leave Donation policy. She explained that an employee may be diagnosed with a catastrophic illness but then not have enough vacation and sick leave accrued to cover the 90-day waiting period until disability leave begins. Therefore, the employee would lose salary during the time that is not covered under any type of paid leave. The Catastrophic Leave Donation policy currently allows for vacation-accruing employees to donate accrued vacation time to other vacation-accruing employees in this situation. However, employees, including faculty on nine-month contracts, who do not accrue vacation are not eligible to receive donations. The Senate officers have been in communication with central administration about this issue for some time. At the April

Board of Regents meeting, concerned faculty members brought up this topic during the public comment portion of the meeting. After subsequent communication with administrators, the Senate formed the task force which includes President Daack-Hirsch, Past President Ganim, Professor Glass, Professor Elena Carter from Rhetoric, and Professor Meaghan Harding from English as a Second Language. HR staff member Nathan Stucky served as the HR liaison and content expert.

President Daack-Hirsch indicated that the Senate proposes to address revisions to the Catastrophic Leave Donation policy in stages, with the first stage involving the number of employees on campus who can accept donations of vacation time. This would involve a minor change to the state's administrative code. President Daack-Hirsch explained that the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) must first review and approve the proposed revisions to the policy, so today she was just asking for comments and feedback from councilors. Once FPCC has approved the revised policy, the Council will hold an electronic vote in time for the revised policy to be considered by the Senate at its September 17 meeting. Staff Council would also need to approve the revised policy, as well as the central administration. Then, the policy revision could appear on the Regents' agenda for their November meeting. President Daack-Hirsch commented that eventually, the Senate could pursue expanding the policy further to allow for the donation of sick leave, as well. Nine-month faculty could then be donors, not just recipients, of leave. This policy change would be a bigger endeavor, requiring financial projections and study.

Professor Merryman commented that, in her experience as a physician treating many university employees, there is an underlying problem with a lack of adequate parental leave, that employees are using the catastrophic leave donation policy to deal with. President Daack-Hirsch acknowledged this issue, but noted that, even if a more satisfactory parental leave policy was implemented, there would still be a need for the Catastrophic Leave Donation policy to cover other types of health situations. She added that the current process of donating leave is awkward and inefficient, as well as lacking in confidentiality. Fixes to the process would require IT solutions. Professor Glass stressed that nine-month faculty currently do not have access even to this imperfect process, because they do not accrue vacation. Professor Erdahl commented that the title of the leave may discourage employees from using the policy for parental leave. In response to a question, President Daack-Hirsch commented that recent efforts to expand parental leave have not been successful because of conflicts with state administrative code.

Regarding the proposed public-private partnership, President Daack-Hirsch noted that two public forums are scheduled for next week. The process is in the "request for proposals" (RFP) stage. Professor Glass noted that the *Chronicle of Higher Education* had recently published a special report on public-private partnerships. President Daack-Hirsch concluded her report by informing the group that the Faculty Senate Twitter account is now live, @IowaFacSen. Vice President Yockey indicated that the Senate officers plan to use the account for announcing upcoming events, as well as for publicizing the accomplishments of faculty, especially of those serving on the Senate.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Glass commented that his colleagues have expressed concern about the new non-projectile stun gun policy. He asked if the Senate has a way to voice these concerns. Professor Lehan Mackin asked for clarification whether stun guns can be brought into classrooms. President Daack-Hirsch said that it was her understanding that they could be brought into classrooms. She added that, originally, the bill apparently did not have exceptions for locations such as the hospital and the football stadium, but those exceptions were eventually added. President Daack-Hirsch offered to invite a representative from Campus Safety to an upcoming meeting to answer councilors’ questions about this policy. Professor Erdahl asked about the Senate’s interactions with legislators in general. Past President Ganim indicated that the Senate hosts a reception for local legislators each year, while the Senate’s Governmental Relations Committee meets with the legislators prior to the start of each session.

Professor Gerke asked if there would be a new search for an Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, following Dr. TaJuan Wilson’s resignation from the position after only a few months on the job. President Daack-Hirsch responded that the university is currently considering its options. Meanwhile, staff-led work in the important areas of diversity, equity and inclusion is moving ahead.

Professor Buckley reminded the group of a story in the *Daily Iowan* last week regarding the use of student identification cards as valid identification for voting. The story indicated that ISU had changed their cards so that students could use them for voting, while UI will not be changing their cards. UI students would be eligible, however, to apply for state-issued ID cards that would be valid for voting. Professor Buckley asked if the Senate would be involved in a wider effort to inform students of this situation. President Daack-Hirsch commented that the student governance bodies have been deeply engaged in this issue. She added that the best course of action for the Senate would likely be to learn the students’ position on the issue and then support their position, perhaps with a public statement.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 17, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 15, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2520D UCC.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Glass moved and Professor Erdahl seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Daack-Hirsch adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.