

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, March 9, 2021**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Zoom**

**MINUTES**

- Councilors Present: D. Andersen, C. Bradley, N. Brogden, J. Buckley, M. Cunningham-Ford, L. Erdahl, L. Glass, B. Janssen, L. Joseph, M. Kivlighan, A. Merryman, N. Nisly, M. Pizzimenti, G. Russell, C. Sheerin, T. Treat.
- Officers Present: T. Marshall, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, J. Yockey.
- Councilors Excused: None.
- Councilors Absent: A. Gerke.
- Guests: J. Ankrum (Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee), J. Anthony (Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee), Biger (Sustainability Charter Committee), D. Fick (UIHC), A. Flaming (Center for Teaching), J. Garfinkel (Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee and Retirement Fund Investment Committee), M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Geist (Office of the Provost), L. Graham (Anthropology), D. Hertzler (Action Aid), E. Hildebrandt (*Daily Iowan*), E. Irish (Sustainability Charter Committee), M. Khandelwal (Anthropology), D. Kuyek (GRAIN), S. Martin (*Daily Iowan*), M. Mendonça (RedeSocial), A. Miller (DITV), P. Naylor (Farm Advocate), C. Reardon (University Human Resources), J. Ringwald (*Daily Iowan*), D. Supp-Montgomerie (Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee), J. Troester (University Human Resources), T. Uden-Holman (Office of the Provost), M. Weaver (Staff Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office), K. Zihlman (Staff Council).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Brogden moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (January 26, 2021) – Professor Janssen moved and Professor Bradley seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 23, 2021) – Professor Andersen moved and Professor Russell seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Teresa Marshall, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - *None at this time*

### III. New Business

- *Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee Update (James Ankrum and David Supp-Montgomerie, Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee)*

Professor Ankrum explained that an effort is underway, led by the Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee, to reevaluate how campus safety is conducted at the University of Iowa. Part of this effort involves gathering feedback from stakeholders through town halls and listening sessions. Displaying the committee membership, Professor Ankrum noted that the committee is comprised of diverse faculty, staff, and students from a wide variety of departments and offices across campus. The committee has been charged with responsibility *for identifying strategies and timelines for creating a campus community that supports the safety of all individuals, with particular attention to people who have traditionally experienced disproportionate harm from systems such as law enforcement.* To facilitate feedback collection, Professor Ankrum indicated that the committee has partnered with Astig Planning, a local engineering firm that specializes in community engagement.

Turning to the drivers and catalyst for this reexamination of campus public safety, Professor Ankrum noted the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis and the protests, and responses to those protests, in Iowa City that occurred last year. There is a reckoning underway now regarding who we are as a community and how we want to protect and serve members of our community. The process will focus on those who have been most marginalized and will adhere to human-centered design principles, in which people will be protected as much as possible. The committee began meeting last July. One of their first tasks was to create prototypes for different concepts of public safety. The committee then began collecting feedback from various key constituents, with the goal of presenting a formal report with recommendations to President Harreld sometime this spring. Among the many groups and individuals that the committee has sought feedback from are Cultural Center student and staff focus groups, the Diversity Councils, the University Safety and Security Charter Committee chair, and the UI police chief.

The committee created prototypes to develop ideas for what might be changed in our public safety system, Professor Ankrum explained, and used them to elicit feedback from stakeholders. A prototype is an idea for change to one piece of a system, he added. Many details would need to be ironed out before moving from separate ideas to a new, final system. The committee began with six prototypes, but has whittled that number down to three, sometimes shifting different components among the prototypes. The three prototypes are *Refocusing, Accountability, and Retraining for Campus Police; Holistic Approach to Campus Safety;* and *Community Police Oversight.* Professor Ankrum reiterated that various components of each prototype could be combined into a final plan.

Professor Ankrum then described the first prototype in more detail. This prototype calls for the creation of a campus community wellness division within the UI Police Department (UIPD), following a model that has had some success around the country. Wellness division staff would include mental health advocates, social workers, crisis intervention officers, etc., who are trained in de-escalation techniques. They would focus, not on enforcing law, but on supporting people in moments of crises. In this model, a dispatcher taking incoming calls determines whether police officers or staff from the wellness division are best suited to respond to a specific call. Patrol officers would still respond to calls regarding crimes in progress, still assist with security at football games, etc., but the goal would be to divert as many calls as possible to the wellness division. Another layer to this model is accountability, in the form of a citizen review board that is composed of a diverse collection of community members that would regularly meet to review outcomes of interactions with police and with the wellness division. The review board would examine these outcomes to determine if patterns emerge regarding a particular type of encounter or a particular employee and then recommend re-training or re-assignment in response to those patterns. The mission of this prototype is *to provide care, respect, and wellness resources, and to protect lives, especially the lives of those from traditionally marginalized communities.*

Professor Supp-Montgomerie then described the second prototype, based on a holistic approach to campus safety. This approach proactively supports student health and well-being by centralizing resources and utilizing alternative first responders, such as mental health professionals and trained mediators. This approach also seeks to move away from the traditional response of campus police officers and toward a community prevention and response system. It seeks to minimize the role of police officers in general by using community resources to provide safety. Instead of continuing with common types of police reform, such as decades of increased trainings, diversified police recruitment, and increased community outreach efforts, this prototype is trying to implement a robust and well-funded network of support. This support includes adequate housing, mental health care, healthy food, etc. When incidents do occur, Professor Supp-Montgomerie continued, safety will come from having a wide variety of campus and community partners to respond with resources and support, instead of relying on armed police. For example, he noted, when a mental health emergency currently occurs, police and an ambulance respond. In this model, however, a pre-existing partnership with a community crisis response team from a local mental health agency would allow for a trained mental health professional to respond to the call instead. The implementation of this model would require the creation of a campus support and safety center, a physical and virtual central space for the location of wellness and safety support services. The central space would align existing campus resources, as well as community partners, who would be involved in the response. Importantly, the service user would retain agency for how they would be served. The service user would have a say in their treatment as well as in who would respond, including an option for police. This model also calls for an accountability committee that would oversee this entire system of safety.

Turning to the third prototype, involving a campus oversight committee, Professor Supp-Montgomerie indicated that this model seeks to ensure anti-racist campus safety practices by UIPD and other entities, in order to increase the trust needed for everyone on campus to feel safe. Both past patterns of practice (use of force, types of calls received) and recommendations

for new research-based best practices would be reviewed. The oversight committee would increase trust through additional oversight and new perspectives, drawn from outside of the Department of Public Safety. The University Safety and Security Charter Committee has a wide scope, beyond a focus on the UIPD; the new oversight committee would interface with the charter committee, but remain focused solely on UIPD through reviewing patterns of police practice, providing accountability, etc. To establish the oversight committee, the UI President would appoint one cabinet member to be the administrative liaison. All oversight committee members would need to have a working knowledge of justice, equity, and inclusion. The committee could possibly be housed within the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, with the chair appointed from among Division leadership. Committee members would reflect the diversity of the community; membership would be crucial regarding how the oversight is provided and how legitimate that oversight is perceived to be. The oversight committee would be both reactive in reviewing what has been, as well as proactive in bringing up new ideas, arising both from concerns in our community and from fresh ideas from other communities. The oversight committee would have a clear mandate in three areas: to listen to and learn from the actual policing-related experiences of members of our community, especially those most impacted and least likely to feel safe; to improve and strengthen trust in campus police by providing accountability through transparency of UIPD policies and practices; and to work to ensure that decisions being made are based on current research into best practices, as well as the actual experiences of those who are most affected by campus safety.

Professor Nisly reacted favorably to all three prototypes. Regarding the first prototype, however, she expressed concern that much responsibility was placed on the dispatcher, to determine whether to send officers or wellness division staff in response to a call. The dispatcher would need a significant level of training to make those decisions, she observed. Regarding the campus support and safety center in the second prototype, she commented that getting to this physical space might be difficult for someone undergoing a crisis. As for the third prototype, she urged that many identities, especially those that are highly policed, be represented on the oversight committee. As a person born and raised in Iowa City, Professor Erdahl commented that these prototypes brought to mind the city's experience with the Citizens Review Board for the local police. She encouraged the RCSAC members to speak with members of that review board and other local experts about the barriers to actionable change when that change is recommended by oversight groups. Professor Joseph praised aspects of the prototypes, but reiterated concerns about the responsibility placed on the dispatcher, whom she hoped would receive robust training. She also suggested that the dispatcher not work alone, but have another person available with whom to consult, even if protocols exist.

In concluding the presentation, Professor Supp-Montgomerie provided councilors with a link to a quantitative survey, through which faculty could provide additional feedback on the prototypes presented here today.

- *COVID/Fall Planning Update (Dan Fick, Campus Health Officer; Lois Geist, Associate Provost for Faculty; Joni Troester, Senior Assistant Vice President & Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer; and Tanya Uden-Holman, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of the University College)*

Associate Provost Uden-Holman began the presentation, commenting that students are eager to be back on our residential campus, to form and maintain connections. Because some high school students may have fallen behind because of COVID impacts, the university is developing bridge programming for the summer months, particularly in the areas of science, math, and writing. Those charged with running the *On Iowa!* orientation programming are planning not only the welcome for our new students this fall, but also are considering potential activities for our returning students who have not had a significant on-campus experience thus far. Additionally, Associate Provost Uden-Holman noted that the deadline to drop a class or withdraw registration is May 7 this year, the last day of classes. Students need grade information to make decisions regarding dropping or withdrawing. She commented that some students have expressed concern that grade information is not being provided to them in a timely fashion, so she urged councilors to spread the word that faculty, if they have not already done so, should make grades available to students as soon as possible.

Dr. Fick then gave an update on COVID at the university. He commented that COVID infection numbers have gone down both in the state and in Johnson County in recent weeks, mirroring the decline on campus. Testing is now widely available and the cost of testing supplies has dropped. Regarding vaccines, Dr. Fick noted that Governor Reynolds has modified the tiers of individuals eligible to receive a vaccine. Health professionals have been working through tier 1A, which includes health care providers, and tier 1B, which includes first responders. Several groups (those living and working in some congregate settings, meat packing plant employees, and individuals below age 64 with certain health conditions) that were initially planned to be included in tier 1C have now been moved into tier 1B. At the state level, he explained, vaccines are supplied to the counties. Each county then determines how fast vaccines are distributed to the different eligible population groups. Johnson County is still working on tiers 1A and 1B. UIHC has developed a COVID risk scoring system and is currently prioritizing people aged 60-64 and people with high COVID risk scores. UIHC is giving about 1,000 doses per week. This week, the state received about 60,000 doses of the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines combined. This equates to about 2% of Iowa's population and is for the first shot of the two-shot sequence. Thus far, about 600,000 Iowans have received shots (some of these individuals have received both doses). At the current rate, vaccination of the total population will take considerable time. Just because more people have now become eligible, that does not mean we will be receiving more doses anytime soon, Dr. Fick pointed out. Vaccines are not being distributed to counties based on population. Therefore, many rural counties are receiving more vaccine per capita than Johnson County. For March and much of April, UIHC will be contacting eligible patients via MyChart to receive the vaccine. An increase in availability of the vaccine is anticipated for May and June, but the logistics of its distribution remain to be seen.

Ms. Troester indicated that the Vaccine Distribution Group, a subset of the Critical Incident Management Team, is meeting twice weekly. This group reviews vaccine eligibility and requests. The employee-based requests are administered through the employee health clinic, while

Student Health vaccinates those students in health care roles that have vaccine priority. The group has moved through most of the requests relative to the 1B tier and must continue to adhere to the guidance provided by the Iowa Department of Public Health relative to the tiers. Should that guidance be updated, the group would look at eligibility for other population groups.

Dr. Nisly noted that she and some of her health care provider colleagues have been contacted by UIHC patients who live outside of Johnson County and who have indicated interest in the vaccine through MyChart, but have not yet been contacted to receive a dose. She suggested that it be made more clear that non-Johnson County residents are not eligible for UIHC vaccines. Dr. Fick indicated that this is a decision that was made by the county; UIHC *employees* who live outside of Johnson County can be vaccinated, but not *patients*, given the complexities surrounding vaccine distribution. He noted that he would pass this concern for wider publicity on to those in UIHC who could address it. Via the chat function, Professor Buckley asked for the public-health based rationale for the continued exclusion of non-UIHC teaching faculty from the tiers, given that, in many other states, college and university faculty are receiving first and second doses already. Dr. Fick responded that this determination was made by the state, through the Iowa Department of Public Health.

- *TIAA Farmland Investments: Employer Perspective (Joni Troester, Senior Assistant Vice President & Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer)*

President Yockey reminded the group that the Council had begun discussing this issue last fall, after the Sustainability Charter Committee submitted a resolution for consideration by the Council. A revised and updated version of the resolution was included in today's meeting packet. Ms. Troester then presented the employer perspective on the TIAA farmland investment issue. She was joined by Professor Jon Garfinkel, faculty co-chair of the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (FRIC). Professor Garfinkel also sits on the Retirement Fund Investment Committee.

Turning to an overview of the UI retirement plan options, Ms. Troester explained that the university sponsors three retirement plan options for our active employees. At the time of hire, each employee can choose to enroll in the university's 403(b) plan or in the state-sponsored IPERS plan. For the university's 403(b) mandatory plan, the employer contribution is 10% and the employee contribution is 5%. The university is the plan sponsor, meaning that it must ensure that the plan meets all requirements relative to compliance, has sound investment strategies, and has a wide range of options for employees. TIAA is the sole recordkeeping vendor. The university also offers a voluntary 403(b) plan, in which employees can make contributions up to IRS limits. The university is the plan sponsor and TIAA is one of six vendors. In 2020, an additional voluntary deferred compensation 457(b) plan was made available. Employee contributions are allowed up to IRS limits. The university is the sponsor of this plan and TIAA is the sole recordkeeping vendor. About 42,000 university faculty, staff, and retirees participate in the mandatory 403(b) plan. Within the voluntary 403(b) plan, there are about 3200 participants who contribute on a regular basis. In the voluntary deferred compensation 457(b) plan, there are about 600-700 regular participants.

In 2018, the Retirement Fund Investment Committee was formed as a prudent UI response to ongoing investment complexities and increased obligations relative to fiduciary responsibility as a plan sponsor. Ms. Troester provided a link, <https://her.uiowa.edu/benefits/retirement/ui-rfic>, to a website describing this committee. The committee's purpose is to respond as fiduciaries for the plan, by having responsibility for the plan relative to investments, fees, and fund line-up in terms of fund performance over time. Eight individuals comprise the membership of the committee, including two faculty members. Professor Garfinkel represents FRIC. Professor Zaharis has extensive investment expertise. Other members include Terry Johnson, the university's chief financial officer; Susan Klatt, director of treasury operations; Carroll Reasoner, the general counsel; Cheryl Reardon, chief human resources officer; Rebecca Olson, senior director of benefits; and Ms. Troester. The committee monitors compliance, selects investment options, oversees fee fairness and fund performance, and ensures choice over risk return for the menu of options.

Ms. Troester went on to explain that there are 59 funds available to UI employees through TIAA. These options fall into five different categories: multi-asset (5 funds); fixed income (15 funds); U.S. equities (26 funds); global, international, and emerging market equities (11 funds), and sector funds (2 funds). A few funds are no longer available for new contributions because of performance issues relative to peer benchmarking. The purpose of these many funds is to offer participants a line-up of choices that expand across the risk return spectrum and allow individuals to diversify based on their own needs and desires and to allow them to invest to best meet those needs. She noted that there are two social choice options among these funds, the CREF social choice account, an annuity-type option in the multi-asset category and the TIAA-CREF social choice equity fund institutional account, in the U.S. equities category.

Questions have arisen surrounding specific funds, Ms. Troester noted. The TIAA-CREF Lifecycle Index Fund is the mandatory plan's default fund. New employees do not necessarily make a choice regarding what funds into which they want their retirement contributions placed. There needs to be a choice, however. Per IRS guidelines, the university can identify a default fund. As a lifecycle fund, the fund recalibrates investments over various age bands as the individual grows older. Investments are managed based on age appropriateness. Ms. Troester stressed that there are no farmland investments, but rather equity and fixed income, in the Lifecycle Index Fund. There are approximately 20,000 participants in the Lifecycle Index Fund. The TIAA Traditional Annuity is another fund around which concerns have arisen. It is an annuity that is underwritten by the TIAA General Account. Within the General Account, there is a small percentage of investments in natural resources and land, some of which is farmland investments. Farmland investments make up 1.2% of the investments in the TIAA General Account. There are approximately 19,200 participants, active employees and retirees, in the TIAA Traditional Annuity. There are other annuity funds available, however, so individuals have other options for an annuity-type product. The two real estate funds located in the sector fund category also do not include farmland investments. To sum up, Ms. Troester reiterated that of the 59 funds available, only one includes farmland investments; therefore, individuals have a wide variety of choice and are not required to invest in funds that include farmland investments.

Turning to issues that have arisen regarding farmland investments, Ms. Troester commented that there have been some concerns raised regarding transparency of information.

She noted that she has shared public reports on farmland investment by Westchester/Nuveen with the group. These reports are also available through the TIAA/Nuveen website. They include an annual report, an annual sustainability report, and a global sustainability report. Also shared has been an online farmland mapping tool that allows for individuals to see where farmland investments are located. The university is in talks with TIAA about making this information available through the TIAA UI website. Land acquisition has been another issue of concern. Ms. Troester commented that there are checks and balances in place for TIAA/Nuveen/Westchester in terms of policy for land acquisition relative to farmland. She noted that there is pending litigation related to farmland in Brazil. The Retirement Fund Investment Committee is monitoring this situation and will review any legal findings, in order to determine what, if any, action should be taken by the university. Conflicting views have emerged over deforestation and aerial photos of deforested lands. In general, though, Ms. Troester added, the deforestation policy of TIAA/Nuveen/Westchester dictates a 25-year look-back period relative to the use of satellite imagery. If a location has been determined to have undergone deforestation in the past 25 years, then the purchase is not pursued. There are a substantial number of key performance indicators in place regarding sustainability metrics, along with detailed reports describing progress.

In closing, Ms. Troester commented that what the university, as the plan sponsor, hopes to offer in these three opportunities for retirement savings is choice across the fund line-up menu. The university will continue discussions with TIAA and monitoring of the farmland investments. University representatives meet quarterly with TIAA and farmland investments are on the agenda at these meetings. They have also engaged with TIAA to facilitate ease of information availability on the UI TIAA microsite so that plan participants can easily access that information.

- *TIAA Farmland Investments: Sustainability Charter Committee Perspective (Matthieu Biger, Staff Co-chair, Sustainability Charter Committee and Erin Irish, Faculty Co-chair, Sustainability Charter Committee)*

Professor Irish and Mr. Biger ceded the floor to representatives of several non-governmental organizations. The first to speak was Maria Luisa Mendonça, founder and executive director of Network for Social Justice and Human Rights (RedeSocial) and currently a Visiting Scholar in the Center for Place, Culture and Politics at the CUNY Graduate Center. Dr. Mendonça explained that for the past 20 years her organization has been conducting research about policies that affect human rights and the environment in the Brazilian countryside. She commented that since 2010, her organization has identified a new trend of financial corporations targeting farmland as a financial asset, especially after the collapse of the housing market in the U.S. TIAA is a major player in this process, promoting the expansion of monocrop implantations of soy and sugar cane, causing deforestation, pollution of soil and water sources, destruction of local food production, and displacement of indigenous communities and small farmers. She asserted that TIAA sustainability reports have no independent assessment. No independent body and no independent methodology can prove what TIAA claims in its sustainability reports. The maps of farmland that TIAA presents do not allow for the identification of the exact location of their farms. RedeSocial works closely with communities that are organizing to defend land rights against land grabbing by TIAA and other financial

corporations. This is a critical moment for TIAA. As a result of an ongoing investigation by the Brazilian public prosecutor's office, the national land reform institute (INCRA) concluded that TIAA violated a Brazilian law that limits foreign ownership of farmland. Also, according to INCRA, TIAA was not able to present documentation of legal transfer of public land it acquired to confirm how this land was put on the market. TIAA clients face financial risks because several large land titles can be canceled.

Even if we don't consider these legal issues, Dr. Mendonça continued, TIAA promotes a destructive agribusiness system, based on massive use of chemical inputs that destroy soil, water sources, and biodiversity. This type of agricultural system based on fossil fuels is a main cause of climate change, including large sugar cane plantations to produce ethanol. Several scientific studies have confirmed that Brazilian ethanol cannot be considered green energy. Moreover, environmental destruction decreases agricultural productivity over time. Consequently, agribusiness corporations expand their plantations to exploit more natural resources. This is what we have seen recently with increasing fires and deforestation in the Brazilian *Cerrado*, the most biodiverse savanna in the world and an important source of underground water and river springs. Farmland is a vital resource for humanity and cannot be a target for financial speculation.

Next to speak was Patti Naylor, an Iowa farmer and a focal point for the North American civil society at the UN Committee on World Food Security. Ms. Naylor indicated that she farms with her husband in Greene County, which is located in west central Iowa, and that she has recently transitioned her entire farm to organic. Ms. Naylor went on to comment that Iowa is the perfect place to be discussing serious issues surrounding agriculture, food production, and land access. As we see here in Iowa, she continued, intensive production of two crops that use harmful chemical pesticides, while raising millions of animals in confinements, which is the agribusiness agenda, is easy to manage, but at the same time is very destructive. The results we see here in Iowa are polluted rivers, soil erosion, far fewer families on farms, and hollowed out rural communities. Ms. Naylor posed the question, whether here in Iowa, or on TIAA-managed farmland, what tweaks to this system could possibly be enough to be considered sustainable? In Iowa, most of the corn and soybeans we produce are used to feed livestock in feedlots and confinements, or to make biofuels. Portions of these two crops are used as ingredients in highly-processed foods, contributing to diet-related diseases. The meat, milk, and eggs from Iowa are not going to low-income people who are food-insecure. Thus, this is not the model needed to "feed the world." Furthermore, the financialization of farmland for investment goals creates obstacles for young and aspiring farmers to access land. In some cases, it also takes farmland away from farmers already in the community. In fact, this model is at odds with the laws of Iowa, which limit the corporate ownership of farmland, precisely because it is harmful to farmers and to rural communities. In contrast, an extensive system with diversity in crops and animals on family-scale farms is a far better way to produce food.

Ms. Naylor expressed the view that we need to take a different direction in agriculture. Research shows the environmental, social, and economic benefits of diverse, community-based, family-scale farming. She added that the University of Iowa contributes to and depends on a healthy and thriving state population and economy. As an Iowa farmer, speaking to fellow Iowans, Ms. Naylor commented that she worries that in supporting TIAA's status quo, the

University of Iowa faculty are essentially undermining the institution's future. She appealed to the group to vote in favor of the resolution.

The final speaker was Doug Hertzler, a Senior Policy Analyst at Action Aid USA and a PhD graduate in Anthropology from the UI. Dr. Hertzler explained that Action Aid is a human rights-based anti-poverty, anti-hunger organization working in 45 countries. He noted that TIAA also manages his organization's staff retirement plans. Dr. Hertzler continued, commenting that TIAA had been avoiding any serious engagement with communities affected by its massive farmland investments well before Action Aid wrote an initial letter to TIAA in 2015 expressing concern. TIAA has a long history of avoiding serious civil society engagement, he asserted, noting that in today's meeting packet is a letter signed by 29 organizations objecting to TIAA's misleading depiction of its willingness to engage on these issues. Action Aid has become alarmed at the type of agriculture in which TIAA is investing through its global accumulation of farmland, including in Brazil's *Cerrado* forests. Dr. Hertzler indicated that TIAA claims that this land acquisition addresses United Nations goals related to global hunger, but he described this claim as false and commented that the land acquisition creates further inequality and imbalance in food systems. In numerous communities it threatens the human right to food and nutrition. TIAA is also engaged in greenwashing, Dr. Hertzler added, as evidenced in its misleading response to Chain Reaction's report on deforestation, as explained by two letters included in the meeting packet. Also, TIAA's 25-year look-back on deforestation, referenced earlier, has not applied to the land TIAA has purchased so far. The meeting packet also contains a letter from Action Aid discussing the damaging effects of TIAA's farming practices on communities, water, and soil in Illinois. TIAA is helping to make farming inaccessible to young farmers and farmers of color there by driving up prices, at least temporarily, and by concentrating land in fewer hands, which is most likely to be a permanent phenomenon.

Dr. Hertzler thanked Ms. Troester for her presentation detailing the types of funds available for investment through TIAA, but he also stressed that TIAA is the global leader in farmland acquisition. TIAA is bringing in money through a variety of sources, such as foreign pension funds and state pension funds, but universities remain its major clients. TIAA has put hundreds of millions of dollars of retiree money at risk by trying to create its own loophole in Brazilian laws on foreign land ownership. It is now in danger of losing some of its farmland titles there. Dr. Hertzler commented that the resolution before the Council today is not radical, it is well-documented, and it does not call for divestment from particular funds. Voting to approve the resolution will put more pressure on TIAA to improve transparency, including by supplying more informative and accurate maps of its land holdings. It will also draw attention to agricultural-related problems on a broader scale and will contribute to the development of solutions that go beyond TIAA. The resolution builds on the efforts of tens of thousands of TIAA clients who have already signed resolutions, written letters, made phone calls, and held meetings to encourage the company to improve its policies so that it does not invest in deforestation and in human rights violations and so that it protects its clients. An approved resolution could also be helpful to the university in its dealings with TIAA. Dr. Hertzler encouraged councilors to join with Action Aid as fellow TIAA participants in raising the profile of these issues by passing this resolution.

Professor Janssen commented that the UI Retirement Fund Investment Committee appears to be interested in TIAA's transparency practices. The resolution could potentially support that interest. Ms. Troester responded that the committee has had an initial conversation with TIAA about transparency and that the University of Iowa through TIAA microsite now contains all of the company's public reports referenced earlier. The committee is working towards having the reports more prominently displayed so that UI employees can easily access the information.

Professor Nisly moved and Professor Janssen seconded that the Resolution of the University of Iowa Faculty Senate urging FRIC and RFIC to ask TIAA to Address Transparency and Sustainability Issues Related to Rural Land Grabs be approved. Via a Zoom poll, the motion was approved with 13 voting in favor and 4 voting against.

President Yockey indicated that the Senate officers would review upcoming Senate agenda items and determine when the resolution would come before the Senate.

- *President's Report (Joe Yockey)*

President Yockey turned first to an update on the status of the ongoing UI presidential search. He indicated that there was not much new information to share at this time, but that the search committee met last Friday and discussed the anticipated timeline for the search process going forward. Several key *tentative* dates in the process have emerged. Between April 12 and April 23, we would be welcoming candidates to campus in some type of hybrid format. The deadline to provide feedback on the finalists to the search committee would be April 27. The search committee would then meet on April 28 in preparation for meeting with the Board of Regents, State of Iowa on April 29, possibly extending into April 30. The Board of Regents would meet on April 30 to decide who the next UI president would be. Additional information can be found on the UI presidential search website, <https://presidentalsearch.uiowa.edu/>.

Moving on to an update on the 2021 Iowa legislative session, President Yockey reminded the group that the first funnel date for bills was last Friday, March 5. He explained that if a bill fails to move out of committee in its originating chamber by the funnel date, then it is finished for this term. Bills of interest to higher education that failed to advance for this term include a Senate anti-tenure bill (a House version of this bill remains alive); a bill to ban the use of the *1619 Project* in curriculum; a bill to require in-person commencement; a bill to require the public posting of course syllabi; a bill requiring the university to hire a public policy event coordinator; a bill to ban universities from enforcing off-campus mask requirements; a bill to enable the legislature to appropriate all sources of university funding, including external funds; and a bill to survey faculty political affiliations. Higher education-related bills that advanced included House and Senate versions of free speech legislation. The Senate's version was passed yesterday. This legislation contains a version of former President Trump's executive order on diversity training. The House has split its free speech bill and its diversity training bill into two separate pieces of legislation. Additional updates on these bills will be provided at the March 23 Faculty Senate meeting.

President Yockey continued, noting that the Board of Regents has adopted a series of free speech policy recommendations. It is the Senate officers' understanding that the university is developing an implementation approach to those recommendations by April 1, so that they can

be in place well before the summer and fall semesters. The officers have asked the Senate's Committee on Academic Values, chaired by Professor Richard Fumerton, to begin taking a look at two recommendations in particular, that focus on a syllabus statement and a training program. Several constitutional law experts among the faculty will also assist in the committee's efforts.

We are in the last few days of the committee recruitment season, President Yockey reminded the group, and urged those interested in charter, university, or Faculty Senate committee service to apply for committee membership by Friday, March 12.

The last item that President Yockey addressed in his report was an update on the recent work of the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC). He noted that in March 2016, the Senate passed the instructional-track faculty policy. This policy contemplates a review of the policy's implementation five years after its enactment. The policy was fully implemented in Fall 2017, so the officers are beginning to prepare for the review. The committee will be formed by the Senate officers in consultation with the Provost's Office. President Yockey requested that any councilors interested in serving on this committee contact the officers.

President Yockey then reminded the group of the letter he had shared with them earlier today; this letter that he had received from FPCC discussed concerns the committee identified regarding faculty shared governance involvement in the Provost's Office efforts to reform the Faculty Dispute Procedures. After receiving this letter from FPCC, President Yockey had sent it to Provost Kevin Kregel and Associate Provost for Faculty Lois Geist. He commented that in the recent past, efforts to create or revise policy (such as the instructional-track faculty policy, the minors on campus policy, and the intellectual property policy) had been from the beginning collaborative endeavors among the Senate officers, FPCC, the Provost's Office, and the General Counsel's Office. Traditionally, the group would identify problems, research options, and put together policy drafts collectively. These drafts would then come before Council and Senate for a vote. When the officers first heard about the efforts to review the Faculty Dispute Procedures (FDP), they recommended this collaborative approach. The Provost's Office has elected to take what appears to be a slightly different approach, President Yockey commented. As he understood it, the Provost's Office would provide the officers with outlines and drafts of the policy revision and then the officers would act as liaisons with FPCC for the purposes of soliciting feedback and ideas, rather than having the officers and FPCC involved in discussions of issues and in development of policy in that collaborative way that had been our norm. FPCC is beginning to do this policy work on its own, by looking at our peers' practices related to FDP. The officers have also asked the Provost's Office for a written rationale for the proposed changes to the FDP policy, as well as a timeline for the revision.

As a separate issue, President Yockey asked the group if the Council and Senate should take a more active role in this process. From his perspective, and the perspective of FPCC, the current process of developing policy reform for FDP looks out of step with our traditional shared governance norms. President Yockey's understanding of the rationale for the changes is that the Provost's Office feels that the current regulations are overly complex and take too long to implement. At this time, the officers are considering inviting administrators to a Senate or

Council meeting to further explain the rationale for the changes, as well as to discuss the process for making revisions. The Council and Senate may wish to consider a formal resolution, as well. The officers remain in conversation with the Provost's Office about these topics. He added that the officers certainly agree that faculty members who behave inappropriately should be held to account in a timely and efficient manner and prevented from causing additional harm, but we must also uphold due process. Any changes to the FDP should align with faculty's best interests and result from a joint effort with faculty shared governance.

Professor Joseph observed that administrators appear to be drifting from the traditional shared governance model. She commented that we must consider how to regain alignment and fix this problem. She added that leadership transitions offer opportunities to emphasize successful collaborative processes. Professor Treat wondered why this drift had occurred in the first place; this may help us determine our strategy moving forward. President Yockey commented that additional communication with administrators might shed light on this issue. Professor Russell asked if the FDP revision process was an isolated incident or part of a pattern. President Yockey responded that a difference of opinion had also emerged regarding the approval process for the revision of the central academic review policy that had recently come before the Council and the Senate. Professor Bradley asked about the Provost's Office response to the FPCC letter. President Yockey indicated that a response had not yet been received, but in conversation with administrators the officers have tried to reiterate points made in the letter.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 23, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, via Zoom.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 13, 3:30-5:15 pm, via Zoom.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Treat moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Yockey adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.