

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, December 8, 2020
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Zoom

MINUTES

Senators Present: F. Ahmad, D. Andersen, S. Ashida, B. Ayati, J. Barker, S. Bodine, C. Bradley, A. Brian, C. Brochu, N. Brogden, J. Buckley, C. Campbell, M. Cantrell, J. Carlson, M. Charlton, C. Cherwin, M. Cunningham-Ford, R. Curto, S. Elangovan, L. Erdahl, A. Estapa, A. Farag, E. Gillan, L. Glass, A. Grooms, C. Grueter, J. Halekas, N. Handoo, S. Harwani, K. Hegarty, Y. Imai, D. Jalal, B. Janssen, A. Jaynes, M. Joseph, P. Kaboli, J. Kayle, A. Kitchen, M. Kivlighan, J. Kline, M. McDermott, A. Merryman, K. Messingham, D. Meyerholz, N. Nisly, J. Paige, A. Panos, H. Parrish, G. Pierce, A. Prince, G. Russell, Y. Sato, C. Sheerin, L. Song, S. Sosale, A. Strathman, J. Streit, C. Swanson, T. Treat, A. Vijh, P. Wesely, D. Wilder, M. Wright, L. Zingman, M. Zmolek.

Officers Present: T. Marshall, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, J. Yockey.

Senators Excused: A. Curtius, T. Midtroed, M. Pizzimenti, E. Welder.

Senators Absent: M. Bhatti, A. Chauhan, B. Dixon, A. Gerke, K. Parker, P. Polgreen, A. Vikram.

Guests: J. Anthony (Governmental Relations Task Force), D. Diekema (Internal Medicine), A. Flaming (Center for Teaching), J. Florman (Center for Teaching), L. Geist (Provost's Office), M. Harris (Student Disability Services), E. Hildebrandt (*Daily Iowan*), B. Marcelo (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion), S. Martin (*Daily Iowan*), H. Mineart (Staff Council), D. Sewell (Biostatistics), M. Venzon (Student Disability Services), C. Wanat (Emeritus Faculty Council).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Nisly moved and Professor Panos seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (October 27, 2020) – Professor Nisly moved and Professor Treat seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Teresa Marshall, Chair, Committee on Committees)

- *None at this time*
- D. Faculty Senate Elections 2021 Vacancy Tally - President Yockey explained that Senate approval of the vacancy tally is necessary before we can move ahead with our election process in the spring semester. Professor Gillan moved and Vice President Marshall seconded that the 2021 vacancy tally be approved. Professor Gillan noted that there were few Senate vacancies this year, as compared to the previous two years. Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist Laura Zaper explained that, while initially the terms of senators were likely staggered within collegiate delegations, the extensions of Senate terms for senators elected to the Council over the years have contributed to the current uneven turnover. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Recommendations from Governmental Relations Task Force (Jerry Anthony, Chair)*

President Yockey reminded the group that the Faculty Senate's Governmental Relations Committee had formed a task force over the summer to look at ways to improve the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) situation on campus, as well as to strengthen DEI-related connections within campus and between the campus and the city. Professor Anthony, who headed this task force, began reaching out to a variety of stakeholders on campus and in the city. After numerous meetings, the task force put forth 14 proposals for further consideration by Council and by Senate. The Council twice discussed the proposals and at the most recent meeting, on November 17, the Council voted unanimously to bring two of the recommendations forward for consideration by the Senate at this time, while others will be considered later, particularly those focusing on a longer-term horizon and requiring more logistical details. President Yockey referred the group to the list on the handout detailing the 14 recommendations and pointed out the two recommendations to be considered today. Recommendation a) calls for election day to be made an official UI holiday, or at least a no-class day and c) calls for establishing one DEI-focused in-teaching or theme week each Fall.

Professor Anthony thanked the Senate for inviting him to present the two recommendations today. He noted that the other twelve recommendations may come before the Senate at a later date, after first being reviewed by the Council. President Yockey added that a positive vote today would indicate that the Senate endorses these two ideas, which would eventually form part of a potential slate of proposals that would be presented to the administration as recommendations to consider. If the Senate endorses a set of proposals throughout this academic year, those proposals would then be brought to the staff and student shared governance groups for possible endorsement. Although their endorsement would not be a prerequisite to presenting the proposals to the administration, it would be the Senate's first point of collaboration to pursue.

Professor Cherwin commented that some colleges require students to have a certain number of clinical hours, which sometimes may be difficult to schedule. Regarding the proposal for a no-class day for election day, she asked if it would be possible for a college to petition for permission to hold clinical teaching on that day if necessary. President Yockey responded that details such as this were the reason that the recommendation does not have more specific

language. He added that if the recommendation calls for a UI holiday, approval would be needed from the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. If the recommendation calls for a no-class day, however, similar to action taken by the NCAA which encouraged, but did not mandate, coaches to allow student athletes to take time off to vote, this could be more easily implemented by the university. Details would need to be worked out in consultation with the administration. The task force also preferred not to propose detailed plans for implementation until buy-in for the general idea was obtained from Council and Senate.

Professor Nisly commented that medical care must proceed without interruption at the hospital; however, if a university-wide plan is adopted, perhaps clinicians could be given a half-day off to vote, if they choose, so that alternating providers could make sure that patients receive care on that day. Professor Erdahl noted that early voting is already available in the hospital. She added that a “one size fits all” approach is unlikely to work at the university, so that it is not necessary to work out the details of the recommendation today. She also asked if this recommendation applied only to presidential election years, or if it was intended to be an annual event. Participation in local elections is typically quite low, she observed. Professor Anthony responded that the task force had envisioned the recommendation applying only to presidential election years. He commented that the purpose of the recommendation was not simply as a “get out the vote” effort, but more broadly as an opportunity to reflect upon the meaning of democracy and civic engagement.

Professor Carlson expressed skepticism that making election day a university holiday would lead to increased reflection, discussion, or engagement with current issues. He added that he had not seen a corresponding increase in reflection when Martin Luther King, Jr. Day became a university holiday. Professor Glass reminded the group of the many university events held throughout the week of that holiday; these events indeed foster reflection, discussion, and engagement, although the impact upon students may be difficult to measure. A similar week-long effort could be established for election day. He also stressed that the symbolism of a university holiday for election day was important for the students. Professor Cherwin concurred, commenting that it allows faculty to set a good example as leaders, demonstrating that we would like to remove as many barriers to voting as possible. Professor Erdahl pointed out that if child care is not available on election day, a significant barrier to voting would still remain.

President Yockey reminded the group that, should the Senate decide to endorse this recommendation, this would be merely the first step towards a more detailed and concrete plan, that would require meaningful and thorough discussion with students and staff, if they are interested in joining this effort, to work out the issues raised today. Professor Anthony commented that these recommendations are a vision statement. An implementation plan for follow up would then be necessary. He added that these recommendations have been shared with the Staff Council and student governance leadership groups. All three leadership groups were enthusiastic about the recommendations and eager to become involved and to make a unified statement with Faculty Senate. Professor Nisly spoke in favor of an overall vision that is eventually supported with concrete plans applicable to individual components of the university. Via the chat function, Professor Wesely reiterated Professor Anthony’s point that this university holiday would represent more than just an increased opportunity to vote, but also a time for

civic reflection. President Yockey added that presenting the proposed holiday to administrators as primarily an opportunity to reflect on the role of democracy is the most viable way forward.

President Yockey indicated that, because of the numerous non-senators on the Zoom call, voting at today's meeting would take place after the meeting, likely via a Qualtrics survey, which would allow for anonymous and secure voting. It would also allow senators more time to review the distributed materials. He requested that senators be on the lookout for an email message in the next few days with instructions regarding how to vote. [The results of the vote are appended to these minutes.]

- *Proposed Endorsement of Recommendation Letter from Search Committee for Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Joe Yockey)*

President Yockey explained that this letter, which had been unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Council at its last meeting, had been written by the members of the most recent search committee for the Associate Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. He reminded the group that this search had been ended prior to the recommendation of potential candidates. Following the search, some of the members of the committee had written a letter to various campus constituencies with a series of recommendations for how the next search might proceed. President Yockey indicated that the letter is a forward-looking document, not reflective of any specific problems that happened in the last search, but using the experience of the last search to consider this type of search from a broader perspective and to determine how to make the next search better and more meaningful.

Professor Nisly commended the writers of the letter for suggesting that the new AVP report directly to the University President, be a member of the president's cabinet, and hold the title of vice president. She expressed the view that, when that central role was lost in the previous search, it likely discouraged many candidates who may not have felt that the position had enough authority or a direct link to the University President, which in turn would appear to indicate that the university did not fully support diversity, equity, and inclusion. Professor Nisly did not advocate, however, removing the position's reporting line to the Provost's Office, because this position plays an important role for the faculty and for the students, and that role is best carried out through coordination with the Provost's Office. She reminded the group that a survey conducted some years ago indicated support for a dual reporting line for this position, to the University President and to the Provost. She had served in this role on an interim basis and found the dual reporting structure to be ideal. President Yockey commented that the Senate could certainly submit additional recommendations, separate from those already listed in the letter. Professor Treat, who served as the Faculty Senate representative on the search committee and signed the letter, commented that the letter does not indicate that the person in this role should not report to the Provost; rather, the letter emphasizes that the person should report to the University President.

Professor Wright asked how many people of color had served on the search committee. He noted that he is one of the few Black faculty on campus, but was never engaged in this search process. He also took issue with the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Action Plan (referenced in the letter), which he felt was out of touch with campus DEI conditions. He commented that he

felt that no one had ever reached out to UI faculty of color and asked them about their vision for DEI; his lived experience as a faculty member of color appears not to be valued on campus. Professor Paige concurred with Professor Wright. She commented that in her view, the university has underestimated how bad its problems with faculty of color really are. The reputation of the university among people of color around the country has plummeted, particularly with the departures of the most recent AVP for DEI and of prominent faculty members of color. There is a lack of initiative in engaging people of color on issues of DEI, she added, especially on recruitment and retention, which will suffer as a result. Returning to the DEI Action Plan, Professor Wright expressed disbelief and frustration regarding how the plan could even be implemented. In his view, the plan is overly idealistic, a fantasy even, with a top-down rather than bottom-up structure. He added that people hire those similar to those with whom they interact; if they are not interacting with people of color, then they will likely not hire people of color. He asked for people of color to be invited to the table to participate in campus discussions of DEI. Professor Wright also voiced skepticism about the value of diversity- and bias-related classes, and instead advocated for lived interaction between people of different racial and ethnic groups to overcome and correct bias. However, if people of color are not part of the power structure, by serving on committees and participating in decision-making to affect the course of the university, then little progress will be made. He emphasized that for black and brown people, DEI is a constant lived experience, not a box to be checked or a career to be pursued. He urged that people of color be brought into the DEI conversation in a bottom-up way.

Professor Paige expressed the view that the university's DEI response has been an unmitigated disaster. She felt that the situation had been much better when she arrived here in 2014, but that in the intervening years, the voids created by faculty and administrators of color who have left have yet to be filled. The university does not seem to have a vision for getting back to its 2014 conditions and has not really engaged its faculty of color recently. She did not feel that the university had a strong interest in retaining her. She added that she would not advise other faculty of color to come to UI, because of the administrative turnover and the lack of interest in engaging faculty of color. The UI is not on par with peer institutions when it comes to DEI, she declared. President Yockey thanked Professor Wright and Professor Paige for their candid and compelling comments. He indicated that the Senate has a strong interest in finding ways to improve the DEI situation on campus. He invited both senators to meet with the Senate officers to address their concerns. In concluding this agenda topic, President Yockey noted that information regarding voting on the endorsement of the letter would be emailed to senators after the meeting.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Short Presentation: Accommodation Requests (Mark Harris, Director, Student Disability Services and Michael Venzon, Associate Director, Student Disability Services)*

Bria Marcelo, Director of Diversity Resources and Strategic Initiatives within the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, introduced the presentation, explaining that the purpose of these twenty-minute “teaser” programs was to create an opportunity for participants to increase awareness and knowledge while acquiring a meaningful skill. She indicated that the objective of today's program was to *raise knowledge of the accommodation structure and boost confidence*

for engaging with a classroom request. Dr. Harris explained that he would provide some data about the Student Disability Services Office and then describe steps involved in addressing academic accommodations. He indicated that 1298 students are registered with Student Disability Services. His office works with students in all colleges except for Dentistry, Law, and Medicine, which have their own processes. About 300 new students have sought services since May 2020, to prepare themselves for the transition to campus. Dr. Harris listed the top four accommodation requests: extended time on quizzes/midterms/finals; reduced distraction testing environment; class notes/audio recording of classes; and disability-related absences and deadline modification (DRADM). Requests for this last accommodation have seen the greatest increase lately.

Dr. Harris then explained that there are three steps to take to introduce accommodations into the classroom. The first step involves introducing the topic in a way that sets a positive and welcoming tone; students have identified this first step as a critical juncture in their classroom experience. On a slide, Dr. Harris displayed possible comments an instructor could make to set this positive tone, such as stating a commitment to being sure that everyone has access to the course materials and acknowledging that not everyone learns in the same way, in addition to indicating an intention to work with students until their needs for accommodations have been successfully met. The second step involves normalizing the interaction between students and instructors regarding accommodations. While some students may have experience with these interactions, other students will find these conversations new and possibly intimidating. Dr. Harris noted that over 96% of students requiring accommodations have invisible disabilities, so it may not be apparent to instructors who in their classrooms require accommodations. Instructors indicating that they have had conversations in the past with students about academic accommodations and that this has been a great way to learn more about their students can help normalize these interactions. The third step involves instructing students on what to do next. This can occur in the syllabus, with specific steps listed, as well as during class. For example, the instructor can request that students who email about the accommodation should include their student ID and course title in their messages. Dr. Harris added that his office does coach students on how to interact on email and in person with faculty members regarding their accommodations.

Mr. Venzon then introduced a small group activity for senators, during which they demonstrated potential approaches to the topic of accommodations during a first day of class and provided feedback to each other. Following the breakout sessions, senators shared insights and tips. In concluding the presentation, Mr. Venzon suggested some “take home activities,” such as making today’s topic the subject of a faculty meeting (Student Disability Services could facilitate this) and senators individually revisiting what they have done in the past in light of what they have learned today. Ms. Marcelo informed senators of a workshop entitled *Inclusive and Equitable Course Design and Instruction in the Contemporary Classroom*, jointly created by her office and the Center for Teaching, that is available to faculty members. Professor Gillan asked if there were any anticipated changes to SDS services for the upcoming spring semester, particularly for large-enrollment freshman classes. Mr. Venzon responded that spring services would likely be similar to those of the fall. The SDS staff will be encouraging students to seek out accommodations for spring classes as early as possible, so that there is plenty of time for

preparation. He added that the shift in modalities from in-person to online learning had presented challenges to the students and the staff.

- *COVID-19 Update: Surveillance Testing (Daniel Diekema, Clinical Professor, Internal Medicine and Director, Division of Infectious Diseases and Daniel Sewell, Assistant Professor, Biostatistics, College of Public Health)*

Professor Diekema began his presentation by noting that a campus group of medical and public health experts are putting together a plan to expand surveillance testing for SARS-CoV-2, the agent of COVID-19, in the spring semester. He then described the broad categories of SARS-CoV-2 testing available. The first category of tests is the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test. PCR tests detect the viral RNA. These are the tests performed in most hospital laboratories. They have the highest analytic sensitivity; however, these tests can show a positive result long after recovery from infection, when one can still, perhaps even months later, shed fragments of RNA. This can sometimes make the tests difficult to interpret, especially if an asymptomatic population is being tested.

The second category of tests is the antigen test. Professor Diekema indicated that these tests detect viral proteins. They have lower analytic sensitivity than the PCR tests, but their positive results primarily occur when viral shedding and replication are taking place. Most rapid tests (i.e., results are obtained in 30 minutes or so) are antigen tests. The third category of tests is the serology test. These tests detect the antibody response to the virus. They are negative during the early phase of the illness; the antibody response is detectable about 1-3 weeks into the illness. Moving to an explanation of *sensitivity* in relation to testing types, Professor Diekema commented that analytic sensitivity refers to how much viral nucleic acid or viral antigen has to be present in a sample for a test to be positive. This is independent of the point in time when an individual is tested. Analytic sensitivity can also be expressed as a “limit of detection.” Clinical sensitivity, on the other hand, refers to how likely a test is to be positive if an individual’s symptoms are due to COVID-19. The issue with clinical sensitivity is that it is variable not only by the test type and the sampling site, but also by the duration of time that an individual has been infected. One of the issues with testing an asymptomatic population is that it is even more difficult than to consider clinical sensitivity, because none of the available tests have been validated for use in populations that have no symptoms. Their FDA approvals were based on characteristics in individuals who had symptoms of COVID-19 or confirmed illness.

Professor Diekema explained that from the time of initial infection with SARS-CoV-2, the mean time to the onset of symptoms is about five days. It varies about 2-10 days from the exposure to the onset of symptoms. The highest level of viral shedding in the upper airway is either just before the onset of symptoms or right around the onset of symptoms. At this time, both the PCR and the antigen tests are going to be positive. Over the first week, the amount of virus in the upper airways declines rapidly. The PCR test may remain positive, or it may move back and forth from positive to negative over a long period of time. The antigen test will become negative within 5-6 days. Further out from the onset of symptoms, antibodies (which are detected by the serology test) develop.

Moving on to the concept of using testing for public health surveillance, Professor Diekema commented that there are very strong proponents of using the antigen tests, which have lower analytic sensitivity, in a repetitive manner in asymptomatic populations, not necessarily to diagnose COVID-19, but to diagnose infectiousness (i.e., to detect individuals at the time that they may be shedding the virus). One of the rationales for this approach, as Professor Diekema had mentioned earlier, is that there is a high level of viral shedding prior to the onset of symptoms. Also, 20-40% of individuals, depending on the population, may not have any symptoms at all during the course of their infection. These individuals, however, play a role in transmission, so we should try to detect them through frequent testing. We will find them during the window when they are most infectious. The PCR tests, on the other hand, may produce positive results when there is no significant chance of transmission.

Professor Diekema indicated that the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) has weighed in on the testing of asymptomatic individuals to reduce the “silent spread” of the virus. The CDC has prioritized universities for expanded testing. Rapid testing turnaround is critical so that prompt intervention, such as isolation of an infected person and contact tracing, can occur. Rapid (results within 30 minutes) antigen testing is the preferred testing type for surveillance testing, and it is the testing type proposed for use at UI next semester. The CDC has emphasized that a positive antigen test in an asymptomatic person has to be confirmed with a PCR test, because of the rate of false positives in antigen tests. A number of institutions around the country have implemented a surveillance testing program for asymptomatic students, Professor Diekema commented. Duke University, for example, tested their population twice weekly using pool testing, meaning that samples from several individuals were pooled and then tested. If the pool turned up a positive result, then those individuals were all tested separately. This method preserves testing resources. More infections came to light through pooled testing and contact tracing than through self-reported symptom monitoring. Some transmission chains were likely interrupted through this process. Over half of the cases that were detected did not have symptoms at the time of testing. Concluding his presentation, Professor Diekema noted that asymptomatic testing cannot be pursued in isolation. Other interventions must simultaneously be made to contain the virus; Duke also implemented daily symptom monitoring, single occupancy dorm rooms, modified classrooms, mandatory masking, etc. He referred to the “Swiss cheese” model for preventing the spread of COVID-19, indicating that each intervention has holes, or imperfections, and that multiple layers of interventions improve success.

Professor Sewell began his presentation by reiterating that surveillance testing should be only one of many approaches to infection control. He indicated that surveillance testing has three major goals, describing the current disease burden in the population of interest, monitoring trends over time and identifying outbreaks. Surveillance stands in contrast to screening, which aims to control infection. He explained that there are two types of surveillance, passive and active. The former involves simply receiving information, as in the context of self-reported cases. Active surveillance implies proactive measures to find, or at least estimate, every infection that is occurring within a population. Professor Sewell advocated for the testing of both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. Citing several studies, he commented that among young adults, asymptomatic rates are very high, so testing only symptomatic individuals will not lead to identifying every case among young adults. Asymptomatic rates decline among older

adults. At least one study has indicated that over half of all transmission may be due to silent transmission (through pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals). Professor Sewell continued, noting that several studies have shown that symptom-based screening along with isolation is insufficient to control an outbreak. Referring to the Duke University study mentioned by Professor Diekema, he indicated that 73% of infections there would not have been detected if surveilling was only done for symptoms. Turning to infection control, Professor Sewell commented that isolation after detection was important to stop the spread of the virus, but he emphasized that even if every symptomatic case was detected, this would not be enough to stop the spread of disease, so both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals must be tested. He added that testing frequency and turnaround time is more important than test sensitivity. In an ideal world, he continued, everyone is being tested; once a case has been detected, an “army” of contact tracers identifies everyone the infected person has been in contact with and ample facilities exist for the isolation and quarantining of those contacts. This is not realistic, however. In fact, contact tracing is extremely difficult and requires massive resources to implement effectively. An alternative is app-based automated contact tracing. One study has shown this alternative to be less effective in reducing transmission than manual contact tracing; however, it is far easier and certainly better than doing no contact tracing.

Turning to the topic of sampling for limited screening, Professor Sewell commented that the pool testing mentioned earlier by Professor Diekema is certainly cost-effective. Limited or targeted screening is also an option, by leveraging the contact’s network. Some methods of targeted screening do not require knowledge of the infected individual’s network. Professor Sewell then described various examples of contact tracing that did not require testing every single contact in an infected person’s network. In conclusion, he reiterated that surveillance testing is just one aspect of controlling the spread of the virus. Personal protective equipment and social distancing are still needed, along with all the other layers of protection described in the “Swiss cheese” model of virus control.

Professor Barker noted that numerous colleges and universities have carried out surveillance testing. He asked if UI has been in touch with any of those institutions regarding the success of those efforts. Professor Sewell responded that he and Professor Diekema have been working with Grinnell College, which has implemented a screening program with weekly testing. Grinnell has had an extremely low number of infections. Professor Diekema added that a campus group headed by Dr. Dan Fick, the campus medical officer, has been in touch with our Big Ten peers, some of which are also conducting surveillance testing of their students. Professor Zmolek asked if any efforts were being made to reduce students’ disincentives to self-report. For example, a student may not self-report out of fear of losing a job and then experiencing financial hardship. Professor Diekema responded that he did not know of any efforts of this type, and added that this is more generally a societal problem that we have not addressed well. In conclusion, he reiterated that a draft plan for UI surveillance testing has been put together. The surveillance testing will be carried out with the use of a rapid antigen test. President Yockey thanked Professor Diekema and Professor Sewell for this informative and helpful presentation.

- *Open Dialogue – Issues Going Forward (All Senators)*

President Yockey explained that since this is the last meeting of the semester, he wanted to give senators a chance to express any concerns that have emerged in light of the experiences of the last several months. He noted that the issues raised earlier in the meeting about diversity, equity, and inclusion would be a strong focus of the Senate going forward. Professor Kayle commented that she was deeply affected by Professor Wright's and Professor Paige's comments today and by their impressions that the university is not welcoming, not equitable, and not a livable place. She urged that the Senate do whatever was in its power to do to address this situation. For example, we could strive, not just to include our BIPOC colleagues in the university's diversity, equity, and inclusion work, but to center them in defining the anti-racist, anti-oppression work that should be done and inviting them to direct those efforts. In addition, if we invite and expect our BIPOC colleagues to share their creativity, their labor, and their brain power to do this work, can they have other responsibilities removed to account for this service and this contribution, so that this work can be reflected in their overall load and their responsibilities? Professor Erdahl commented that the comments shared here today by Professor Wright and Professor Paige need to be lifted up. She added that if we are going to endorse the letter from the DEI search committee, then we should also request that there be more involvement from BIPOC individuals in formulating the DEI Action Plan. She agreed with Professor Kayle that faculty members involved in this work should be recognized and rewarded for their service. President Yockey invited additional recommendations to be made with an endorsement of the search committee's letter or separately. He commented that DEI concerns will be featured on an upcoming Senate agenda.

- *President's Report (Joe Yockey)*

President Yockey indicated that the search for the next UI President is now underway. The search committee held its first meeting on December 4. A recording of that meeting is available on the presidential search website, <https://presidentalsearch.uiowa.edu/>. A series of listening sessions, divided by constituency group, will be held in the next few weeks. A schedule can be found on the website, along with a proposed timeline of the search, a list of the search committee members, and other information.

President Yockey noted that he had additional items to report, but in the interest of time, he would send an email message to senators rather than discuss them now. [The full text of the distributed report is appended to these minutes.]

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, January 26, 3:30-5:15 pm, via Zoom.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 9, 3:30-5:15 pm, via Zoom.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Erdahl moved and Professor Zmolek seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Yockey adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.

Appendix I – Results of vote on Governmental Relations Committee Task Force Items (distributed electronically to senators on December 15, 2020)

Dear Senators,

I'm writing to let you know that both of the GRC task force items that went up for a vote by the Senate last week were approved.

The vote breakdown for item a) – “Election Day” – was as follows:

- Yes – 41
- No – 14
- Abstain – 3

The breakdown for item b) – “DEI theme week” – was as follows:

- Yes – 44
- No – 5
- Abstain – 8

Please let me know if you have any questions.

In the meantime, wishing you all a good break and happy holidays,

Joe

Appendix II – Additional items from President’s Report (distributed electronically to senators on December 9, 2020)

Dear Senators,

I'm writing with additional follow-up information from the President’s Report I planned to present during last night’s meeting before we ran out of time.

- First, information about the upcoming UI Presidential Search listening sessions is available on the following sites: <https://now.uiowa.edu/2020/12/campus-invited-provide-input-next-president> and <https://presidentalsearch.uiowa.edu/>

The specific sessions dedicated to faculty will occur on Friday, Dec. 11 (Noon—1:00pm); Monday, Dec. 14 (7:30—8:30am); and Monday, Dec. 21 (Noon—1:00pm). There will also be an all-campus session on Monday, Dec. 21 (5:00-6:00pm).

Details about how to access each session via Zoom are set forth in the links above. As a reminder, the purpose of these initial listening sessions is to gather feedback on the content of the Presidential job description and the required qualifications for the position.

- Second, in the spirit of partnership with our student shared governance counterparts, I've attached two documents prepared by the UI Undergraduate Student Government (USG) on the subject of alternative grading. As you may know, USG recently surveyed all undergraduate students to seek their input on adding a Pass/No-Pass grading option for the current semester. The response rate of 29%, representing approximately 6,500 undergraduate students, is impressive. The results of the survey are described in the two reports I'm passing along today.

I share these reports not to discuss or take a position on the merits of alternative grading. Indeed, the Provost's office has already determined that there will be no alternative grading this semester. However, the Senate officers were highly impressed by the professionalism of USG's efforts, and we want to be supportive of their dedication to this issue. Also, we thought you might appreciate reading the narrative comments collected in the reports that describe some of the challenges students faced this semester.

As an aside, one of the most rewarding parts of shared governance service this year has been the close working relationship we've formed with the two student government groups and with Staff Council. The leaders of these three groups are outstanding partners, and I can't imagine trying to navigate the difficulties of this year without their advice, wisdom, and perspective.

Finally, and unrelated to the President's Report, I've attached the slides that Dr. Diekema used during his presentation on Covid-19 surveillance testing. We'll also be back in touch soon with information about how to vote on the items that the Senate decided to advance for formal consideration.

In the meantime, please let me know if there are any questions or concerns I can help you with.

With best wishes,

Joe