

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, March 23, 2021**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Zoom**

**MINUTES**

Senators Present: F. Ahmad, D. Andersen, S. Ashida, B. Ayati, M. Bhatti, 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, A. Curtius, R. Curto, S. Elangovan, 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, L. Joseph, P. Kaboli, J. Kayle, A. Kitchen, M. Kivlighan, J. Kline, M. McDermott, K. Messingham, D. Meyerholz, T. Midtrod, N. Nisly, J. Paige, A. Panos, K. Parker, H. Parrish, G. Pierce, M. Pizzimenti, P. Polgreen, G. Russell, Y. Sato, C. Sheerin, S. Sosale, A. Strathman, J. Streit, C. Swanson, T. Treat, A. Vijh, E. Welder, P. Wesely, L. Zingman, M. Zmolek.

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

Senators Excused: A. Chauhan.

Senators Absent: J. Barker, B. Dixon, L. Erdahl, A. Gerke, A. Merryman, A. Prince, L. Song, A. Vikram, D. Wilder.

Guests: A. Breckenridge (*Daily Iowan*); E. Crawford (Management & Organizations); R. Dobyns (Governmental Relations Committee); A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council); L. Geist (Office of the Provost); K. Kregel (Provost); T. Kulper (Human Resources); S. Martin (*Daily Iowan*); P. Matthes (Vice President for External Relations); H. Mineart (Staff Council); S. Sanders (CLAS and Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee); K. Saunders (Governmental Relations); M. Scholtz (Vice President for Research); D. Supp-Montgomerie (Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee); C. Wanat (Emeritus Faculty Council); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Yockey called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
  - A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Campbell moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

## DRAFT

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (February 9, 2021) – Professor Carlson moved and Professor Campbell seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Teresa Marshall, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - *None at this time*

### III. New Business

- *Working at Iowa Survey Results (Eean Crawford, Associate Professor, Management & Organizations and Teresa Kulper, Senior UHR Lead, Organizational Effectiveness)*

Ms. Kulper thanked the Senate for providing a representative to serve on the advisory board for the Working at Iowa survey. She also thanked Professor Crawford for serving as faculty advisor for the survey. Ms. Kulper recognized Professor Jacob Oleson from the College of Public Health, as well, for running the survey reports. She then turned to a discussion of the changes made to the survey for the 2020 edition. She indicated that UI Health Care had opted to partner on their version of the survey with an outside company, Press Ganey, which conducts employee satisfaction surveys throughout the health care industry, including in academic medical centers. Press Ganey's research will allow UI Health Care to benchmark against similar institutions. The company also conducts UI Health Care's patient satisfaction surveys, so this allows for correlation between employee engagement and patient satisfaction. For longitudinal comparison, Press Ganey included ten questions from the Working at Iowa survey to their own survey.

Noting that he has served as an advisor for the survey since 2014, Professor Crawford indicated that in 2018, the survey included a measure of employee engagement for the first time. This measure was based on research he has been conducting for over a decade. The survey feedback received in 2018 questioned whether the measure of engagement applied to faculty. Also, a simplified correlation table was reported with the strength of association between every Working at Iowa survey item and the measure of engagement. Some feedback indicated confusion over whether 20 different things were being measured and wondered whether broader themes could be identified instead. The feedback also asked for clarification of the connection between those themes, if any, and the measure of engagement. Professor Crawford explained that, based on the factor analysis done across multiple groups, engagement is measured similarly for faculty as for staff. It is a valid measure of engagement for all job types at the university. As far as the 20 Working at Iowa survey statement items are concerned, the factor analysis shows that 20 unique things are not being measured. Instead, the items are grouped into five broad categories that seek to elicit perceptions of one's unit climate, of support and recognition from the university, of training and facilitation for learning how to do one's job better, of relationships with one's supervisor, and of the clarity of the goals of one's unit. Even across these themes, there is much common variance. In fact, in a Venn diagram of these broad categories, the overlapping circle in the center would probably capture 60%-80% in the overlap of all five categories. Professor Crawford emphasized that the survey measures people's general perception of what it is like to work at the University of Iowa. This perception colors one's responses to all 20 of the questions. The reason for the simplification of this year's report is to show the relationship between people's general perception of working at the university and their perceived engagement. The correlation across the university is about 0.2. In the field of organizational psychology, a correlation of 0.2 would be in the moderate range. That correlation

differs across each college and unit of the university. The survey report will show whether any particular survey statement items were rated especially high or low across people's perceptions of working at UI.

Ms. Kulper indicated that the university report is now on the Working at Iowa website, <https://hr.uiowa.edu/administrative-services/working-iowa>. All of the organizational and departmental reports have been released, as well. She explained that there was a 68% participation rate for the survey, an increase from previous years. The participation rate for faculty was 61%. Themes similar to those of previous years emerged from the 2020 survey. Our strengths tend to be consistent, reflected in high agreement with these survey statements: *I understand my work expectations*, *my supervisor treats me with respect*, and *my unit focuses on excellent service*. Our opportunities (survey items with lower agreement) included statements related to fair workload distribution, recognition of accomplishments, and opportunity for promotion. For UI Health Care, the top strengths related to unit support of diversity, the ability to share concerns with one's supervisor, and a unit focus on excellent service. Fifteen of the survey items showed improvement in 2020, while five items remained the same, Ms. Kulper explained. Some of the items that showed improvement were those at the lower end of agreement, including recognition of accomplishments of faculty and staff, constructive management of work conflicts, fair workload distribution, and promotion opportunities. Some items with higher levels of agreement that also improved included knowing job expectations and understanding how one's job fit into the overall mission of the university.

Turning to the next steps for the survey, Ms. Kulper indicated that the survey results are being shared with leadership and shared governance groups. The organizational and departmental level results have been distributed to the senior HR leaders, who are sharing them with unit leaders. Unit dialog and action planning are encouraged. Because the Working at Iowa and the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Campus Climate surveys both came out in the fall, there has been some training around how to incorporate the results of both surveys into unit action planning. (In the future, the DEI survey will likely move to the spring semester.)

- *Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee Update (CLAS Dean Sara Sanders and David Supp-Montgomerie, RCSAC)*

President Yockey explained that this committee was created by President Harreld and is chaired by Vice President for Student Life Sarah Hansen. The committee is charged with developing a new approach to public safety for the campus meant to be consistent with the university's goals in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Professor Supp-Montgomerie commented that this is one of the committee's last opportunities to gather campus feedback before it presents its report to President Harreld. The committee itself, he explained, is comprised of a large, diverse group of faculty, staff, and students from across campus, who have been working hard since July to come up with human-centered designs for new ideas for campus safety. These new ideas center the voices and concerns of members of our community who are least likely to report feeling safe. To gather feedback, the committee has met with numerous stakeholders across campus, including 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 has also held town halls and conducted a survey.

As a central component of their work, the committee created prototypes to develop ideas for what might be changed in our public safety system. Dean Sanders described the first prototype, which called for a reimagining of what public safety would look like. It creates a structure that identifies the difference between criminal acts or imminent threats to safety and incidents in which a caring and wellness approach would be more beneficial, such as crisis incidents that are related to mental health, substance abuse, or other non-criminal concerns. This prototype calls for the creation of a campus community wellness division, staffed by wellness advocates such as mental health advocates, social workers, crisis intervention officers, etc. These staff members would respond to non-criminal, non-violent calls for service. The wellness advocates' role would involve thinking about overall cultural competencies and trauma-informed approaches that could be applied at scenes, following up with individuals after incidents occur, partnering with the patrol division out in the field, and assisting trained police officers in a collaborative approach. Within this new structure, the patrol division would continue to respond to crimes in progress. The division's focus would be on protecting life and safety, but officers could accompany wellness advocates when requested; patrol officers could likewise request that wellness advocates accompany them. Dean Sanders observed that this model calls for trained dispatchers to discern when patrol officers or wellness advocates would be needed to respond to a call. Another component to this model is a citizen review board that would look at policies and complaints by members of the community. The board would also ensure that all community voices are heard in terms of shaping future service provision. Important issues to consider include attracting a diverse applicant pool into the wellness division and providing robust training. Currently, she noted, all new police officers attend a law enforcement academy to complete basic training, after which they return to the force for four months of field training. They also complete de-escalation and crisis intervention training. This prototype contemplates a comprehensive, career-long, top-down plan to re-focus training efforts for officers. Enhanced training would include a focus on creating inclusive communities and community-focused policing strategies. The resulting change in perspective would begin with leadership and trickle down to the rest of the police force.

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 strives to implement a robust and well-funded network of support. 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. To be able to utilize alternative

response options, this approach envisions creating a new structure, a central campus support and safety center. Students, faculty, and staff should feel safe and comfortable using this central space for all things related to their wellness and safety. It represents both a physical and a virtual location. Service users can report a concern via phone call, text, chat, or physical walk-in. This approach envisions that the central space would align existing campus resources, as well as community partners, who would be involved in responses to calls. 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 and critique this entire system of campus safety. Overall, this prototype aims for a more holistic way to address safety concerns on campus through proactively making efforts to provide a variety of responses for university community members to utilize through one central space.

Turning to the third prototype, Professor Supp-Montgomerie indicated that this prototype involves the creation of a campus oversight committee. This oversight committee is designed to ensure anti-racist campus safety practices by UIPD and other entities, so that they are fully accountable to our university community. The oversight committee would increase the trust required 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 improve trust by providing additional oversight and new perspectives from members of our community best suited to consider matters of equity and inclusion. The University Safety and Security Charter Committee has a wide scope, beyond a focus on the UIPD, Professor Supp-Montgomerie noted. The new oversight committee would interface with the charter committee, but remain focused solely on UIPD through reviewing patterns of police practice. 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.

Dean Sanders indicated that the committee is open to considering hybrid versions of these prototypes, that would combine pieces of each into a new model. Professor Russell commented that the three prototypes do not appear to be mutually exclusive. For example, the first and third prototypes could be combined. Dean Sanders noted that the second prototype, more so than the first and the third, involves a reallocation of resources. Professor Supp-Montgomerie added

that, in its report to President Harreld, the committee will be recommending pieces of all three prototypes, rather than just one specific prototype, that seem to resonate most with the community. Professor Carlson asked how the prototypes relate to the issues that gave rise to this effort, that is, dissatisfaction with the police response to the protests held last summer. He also observed that some of the proposals appeared costly. He asked how cost factored in to the recommendations that the committee would make. Professor Supp-Montgomerie responded that, regarding funding, the committee has sought to come up with new ideas that resonate with members of the community and will recommend that the administration fund the ideas that would likely be most successful. He acknowledged that most of the proposed ideas require financial commitment. As for the concerns that arose during the summer about the police response to the protests, Professor Supp-Montgomerie commented that this is a complicated issue, but that the oversight and policy reviews proposed by the prototypes would be useful. Dean Sanders added that the committee had struggled with the issue of the police response to the protests from the beginning. They realized that no solution would be perfect, but that the prototypes represented progression in the journey to improvement.

Professor Campbell asked for clarification about the aspect of the second prototype that calls for the service user to request the type of service needed. Professor Supp-Montgomerie responded that the service user might be presented with options to choose from, but he acknowledged that this might be overwhelming for a person in immediate need. Professor Campbell expressed concern that a delay might occur in providing the person in crisis with immediate and appropriate care, especially health care. Dean Sanders observed that the second prototype centers the service user's voice, but that there may be a point at which that focus might not work in practice. Professor Jaynes noted that the first prototype called for a distinction to be made between criminal activity and non-violent or mental health issues. She thought that there may be situations in which the cases would overlap, for example in cases involving substance abuse, which is still considered criminal activity. Dean Sanders responded that, in these situations, while both a police officer and a wellness advocate might respond to a call, only one would take the lead in the response, while the other would play a background, supportive role. Also regarding the first prototype, Professor Pizzimenti commented that it appears that the dispatcher makes the initial decision how to classify a call. He wondered if perhaps a police officer and a wellness professional could both be sent to respond to a call, and then they can determine the focus of the encounter. Dean Sanders responded that dispatchers would be highly trained in determining who should be sent to respond to a call. However, there could be a model in which both are sent and then one takes the lead depending on the nature of the situation. In conclusion, Professor Supp-Montgomerie noted that the committee would soon be finalizing their data and their report and would submit the report to President Harreld in April.

- *Shared Governance Participation in Academic Leadership Appointments (Joe Yockey)*

President Yockey reminded the group that the officers had circulated via email to the Senate a proposed resolution regarding joint faculty participation in decisions to appoint academic leaders. He explained that there have been an escalating number of questions and concerns that faculty members have raised with the Senate officers regarding the three most recent senior level administrative appointments and the fact that they were made without a formal search

process. The appointments at issue are the provost, the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the Executive Officer for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. President Yockey stressed that the concerns that the officers have been hearing are solely concerned with the *process* of the appointments, not with the *qualifications* of the individuals appointed to these positions. However, because of the clear shared governance implications, as well as of the volume of the feedback received, the officers wanted to solicit the Senate's input. President Yockey commented that his sense from talking to President Harreld and Provost Kregel is that they believe these three hires are isolated events driven by the unique, exigent circumstances surrounding sudden departures in the midst of the pandemic. They have told the officers that there are no plans to make this process the new normal, and later this week it is anticipated that an announcement will be made about the formation of a search committee for an internal search to identify the next dean of the Graduate College. Also, a national search firm has already been retained to conduct the search for the next dean of the College of Dentistry. All of this spring's appointments, moreover, went through the formal waiver process with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

Professor Joseph commented that the resolution was useful, considering the ways in which the administration appeared to be drifting away from engagement with shared governance in the situations described. This is an opportunity to increase awareness of what has been happening. The resolution could lead to a reconsideration of this drift.

Professor Carlson moved and Professor Panos seconded that the Resolution Expressing the Faculty Senate's Expectation for Joint Faculty Participation in Decisions to Appoint Academic Leaders be approved.

Professor Glass thanked the officers for their work on the resolution and agreed that it would be a worthwhile reminder to the current leadership. He also encouraged senators to inject this concern into the current presidential search, adding that we need to make clear that we want future leaders who support shared governance, as outlined in the resolution. President Yockey, who serves on the presidential search committee, indicated that he would bring up this topic with the search committee. Professor Nisly commented that while we affirm the importance of shared governance, we should not diminish the appointments of the three administrators who were chosen in this way. She reminded the group that we are currently facing unprecedented circumstances, in the form of the pandemic, that have impacted normal processes.

Professor Wesely offered a friendly amendment to remove a passage referring to previous UI presidents because it was unclear how this passage advanced the overall argument of the resolution.

Professor Carlson commented that in his view, there has been a cultural shift in Jessup Hall (where many central administrative offices are located). Shared governance processes in many situations have been disregarded or marginalized. For example, when changes were made to employee benefits some time ago, an ad hoc committee was appointed, seemingly bypassing the shared governance charter committee charged with dealing with those specific issues. It is possible that the same situation is materializing again regarding faculty-related policy changes that we may soon see. Professor Carlson emphasized that shared governance does not mean that

administrators come to faculty leaders after they have already decided what they want to do, in order to ask about concerns. Rather, shared governance means that faculty should be involved from the beginning of discussions, in the middle of discussions when options are being considered, and at the end of discussions when final decisions are being made. This is not because faculty are entitled, but because decisions are better when that kind of input is received. No administrator, no matter how brilliant, can know the impact of everything they do on researchers and instructors in every part of the university. The faculty as a collectivity can know those things; they can bring to the table wide knowledge about the needs and the interests of faculty and the impact of decisions on faculty, and therefore on the university's teaching and research missions. Professor Carlson reiterated that university decisions will be better if Jessup Hall engages faculty in a meaningful way. He expressed the view that administrators have not been doing this in many cases for several years. Working in Jessup Hall during the flood of 2008, he observed administrators working very hard to help the university recover from the flood, but administrators then also engaged faculty right from the beginning of the crisis and in every subsequent decision that was made. This engagement with faculty made the flood response and recovery much better, in Professor Carlson's opinion. He felt that the resolution sent an important message and he hoped that the Senate would pass it.

Commenting on other aspects of shared governance, Professor Gillan put a link to an AAUP article in the chat. Composed by the members of the UI AAUP Sanction removal committee, this article, <https://www.aaup.org/article/rebuilding-%E2%80%9Ciowa-nice%E2%80%9D-shared-governance-sanction-collaboration#.YIQIX2dKiUL>, described the circumstances leading to the sanction and the committee's efforts to have that sanction removed. He expressed hope that the administration is not using the pandemic as an opportunity to put into place dramatic and long-lasting changes. Referring to recent high-profile searches prior to the spring appointments, he acknowledged the frustration and concern felt by the university community when expensive external searches yield appointees who stay only a year or a month. Professor Gillan commented that communication needs to be improved. He wondered if administrators are afraid that if they communicate some intent to the faculty before it is accomplished, then faculty will immediately protest the proposed action, leading to its demise. However, faculty are willing to work with administrators to confront challenges. He emphasized that faculty want to make a positive impact through their service to the university.

Professor Carlson accepted the friendly amendment and Professor Panos reaffirmed his second of the motion that the Resolution Expressing the Faculty Senate's Expectation for Joint Faculty Participation in Decisions to Appoint Academic Leaders be approved. Via a Zoom poll, the motion was approved with 50 voting in favor, 0 voting against and 6 abstaining.

President Yockey indicated that he would convey the resolution to university leadership and have the resolution posted on the Faculty Senate website.

At this time, via the chat, Professor Nisly proposed a resolution in support of our Asian, Asian-American and Pacific Islander community. She commented that this community is suffering violence and microaggressions, and also may be living in fear. The resolution would indicate that the Faculty Senate stands with the Asian-identified community. President Yockey



indicated that the Senate would take up the resolution in the From the Floor portion of the meeting.

- *President's Report (Joe Yockey)*

President Yockey began his report with an update on the presidential search. He noted that the deadline (March 15) for best consideration of candidate materials has passed. The applicants' files have all been shared with the search committee, which will meet this Friday to determine the slate of semi-finalists. The semi-finalists will likely be interviewed by the search committee April 1-3. Plans then call for hybrid, on-campus interviews for 3-4 finalists in mid-April. There will be opportunities for faculty shared governance to interact with the candidates, but the format and opportunities for those interactions are still being worked out. A process will be put into place for the campus to provide feedback. The deadline to provide that feedback is tentatively set for April 27. The Board of Regents, State of Iowa is expected to announce the new UI president on April 30. Professor Joseph asked how many applicants applied for the position. President Yockey was unable to provide a specific number, but added that the search firm indicated its satisfaction with the volume of applications received and also indicated that the number was in line with comparable searches.

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.]

- *Strategic Planning 2022-2027 (Provost Kevin Kregel and Vice President for Research Marty Scholtz)*

Vice President Scholtz thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak today. He indicated that he and Provost Kregel are the co-chairs of the strategic planning committee. The plan will run from 2022 to 2027. He noted that this is a change in the scheduling that had been outlined prior to the pandemic, when a 2021-2026 plan had been envisioned. Vice President Scholtz indicated that the new strategic plan will celebrate the UI as a "destination university." Being a "destination university," however, means different things to different groups of people (students, Iowans, researchers and scholars, etc.), he acknowledged. Our strategic plan should be able to incorporate all of those different concepts of "destination university." Vice President Scholtz continued, noting that the committee wants not only to focus on the development of a new plan, but also consider its implementation and evaluation. For previous versions of the plan, one committee developed the plan and then passed it on to another entity to implement it. This time, data and assessment will be built into the plan from the beginning. The plan will also consider how to incorporate the UI Center for Advancement, the budget planning process, and the P3 funding into its end goal of improved outcomes, leading to the UI becoming a destination university.

A Strategy Team (ST) will be charged by President Harreld to develop, implement, and evaluate the new strategic plan, Vice President Scholtz indicated, and will be able to adjust the strategy and initiatives as needed. Among the tasks of this team are developing the overall scope of the planning process with a keen eye toward implementation and evaluation; setting plan goals, strategies, and measurable outcomes; identifying some areas of distinction that will

contribute to the creation of a “destination university;” serving as the institutional manager of the P3 program; and collecting institutional data. All of these tasks will be carried out with the purpose of determining if we are making progress and moving the institution forward. Vice President Scholtz then displayed a list of the current ST membership. Many of the members are administrators with staff who can assist in the implementation of the plan’s components. These administrators will be held accountable for implementing the plan.

A key aspect of the plan is to take the vast array of institutional data and the assessment expertise we already have and utilize these resources from the beginning of the strategic planning process. A data and assessment team has been formed to ensure that the institution has access to or is acquiring the right kinds of data needed to establish metrics and to provide outcome analytics. Vice President Scholtz explained that the basic framework used to start the new planning process has been pulled from the last strategic planning process. The new planning efforts will have three core focus themes: student, faculty, and staff success; research and discovery; and diversity, equity, and inclusion. Engagement will be embedded in the strategies of each area, because it touches all of them in various ways, community-engaged research being one example. One of the next steps after the collegiate and unit strategic plans are developed is the population of Strategic Planning Development Teams, which are based on the themed areas of student success; faculty and staff success; diversity, equity, and inclusion; and research and discovery. The Senate officers have assisted in identifying faculty members to serve on these teams. Membership is sought not only from shared governance but from the offices charged with implementing the strategic plan. These teams will take the collegiate and unit plans and start to coalesce them into the university’s new strategic plan.

The Strategic Planning Development Teams, along with the Strategy Team, will work closely with campus partners, such as shared governance, President’s Cabinet, Council of Deans, and stakeholder groups (the UI Center for Advancement, for example). In coming months, a series of listening sessions and town hall meetings will be scheduled in order to obtain feedback from the campus community. These events will begin this spring and continue into next fall and spring. The new strategic plan is due to the Board of Regents in summer 2022. In conclusion, Vice President Scholtz referred the group to a website still under construction for future ongoing updates on strategic planning, <https://strategicplan.sites.uiowa.edu>.

Having served on several past strategic planning committees, Professor Nisly commented that the campus community sometimes regards these efforts with skepticism because people believe that their voices will not be heard and that the plans will simply end up in a drawer somewhere. She suggested that previous strategic plans be consulted for feedback obtained from the campus community at that time. Perhaps some forgotten ideas will be found there and can finally be implemented. Professor Nisly also urged that wider outreach efforts, such as to the Diversity Councils, be made to gather feedback. Different media, such as Twitter, could also be useful in gathering feedback from a broader range of campus community members. She added that the outcomes of previous plans should be made available to the campus community. In response to Professor Nisly’s first point, Vice President Scholtz indicated that, over the course of his career, he has also seen strategic plans that seem to be forgotten after they are produced. He added that this is why both implementation and assessment components are being incorporated

into the overall strategic planning process from the very beginning. He noted that the core themes of the new plan are basically the same as in the previous plan. Vice President Scholtz also expressed appreciation for the issues raised in Professor Nisly's second point and commented that efforts will be made to gather input through a variety of methods.

Professor Ahmad asked what benchmarks are being considered for faculty, staff, and student success, aside from the major benchmark of research productivity for faculty and graduate students. Vice President Scholtz responded that for students, benchmarks might include graduation rates or time to graduation. For graduate and professional students, the benchmarks might include placement of students after they leave UI. Our metrics must be broad enough to encompass the many different views of our constituents and our audiences. Professor Carlson commented that the university's relationship with the people of Iowa and with the legislature often fluctuates. Noting that the strategic plan seeks to address the university's relationship with Iowans, Professor Carlson questioned the assumption made in the presentation slides that Iowans want the same things for the university that the faculty do. Vice President Scholtz responded that the point of that slide was to emphasize that different constituencies view the university differently. We must balance those various viewpoints and create unified messaging. Some standards, such as UI's membership in circles of prestigious universities, may find common agreement among all of our constituencies. Part of our task may need to be educating people on why this is important for UI.

IV. Executive Session: Governmental Relations Update (Pete Matthes, Senior Advisor to the President and Vice President for External Relations and Keith Saunders, Director of State Relations, Office of Governmental Relations)

Professor Campbell moved and Professor Russell seconded that the Senate move into executive session, inviting Mr. Matthes, Mr. Saunders, and Professor Dobyms (chair of the Governmental Relations Committee) to remain. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Matthes and Mr. Saunders provided an update on governmental relations and answered questions from senators.

Professor Treat moved and Professor Panos seconded that the Senate move out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

V. From the Floor – Noting that there was no longer time to consider Professor Nisly's resolution, President Yockey indicated that he would be in touch regarding next steps.

VI. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 13, 3:30-5:15 pm, via Zoom.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 27, 3:30-5:15 pm, via Zoom.

VII. Adjournment – Professor Panos moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Yockey adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.

DRAFT

***Appendix I – Items from President’s Report (distributed electronically to senators on March 24, 2021)***

Dear Senators,

Thank you for participating in yesterday’s meeting. I apologize for running out of time to present my full President’s report. The items below represent what I meant to share. Also, if anyone would like to speak directly with me and Teresa about these topics or other matters, we will be holding “office hours” tomorrow and Monday. For tomorrow, you are welcome to drop by our open *Zoom* room between **3:00—4:00pm**. On Monday, we’ll be available from **9:00—10:00am**.

The link to join us will be the same for both days: <https://uiowa.zoom.us/j/9313392839>. Again, feel free to stop by if your schedule permits. We’ll simply be hanging out and ready to talk about anything on your mind.

Also, we are grateful to everyone who sent us comments on the resolution introduced at the end of yesterday’s meeting relating to support for the Asian, Asian American, and Pacific Islander community. We will continue to process your feedback and then provide an update in a separate message.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Potential Revisions to the Faculty Dispute Procedures ([Ops Manual III.29](#)):**

As we shared with the Faculty Council two weeks ago, the Provost’s Office has begun a process of making revisions to the Faculty Dispute Procedures. Yesterday, the Provost sent the officers a preliminary draft of the proposed changes. We haven’t had time to fully digest the changes yet, but we sent the draft to the Faculty Senate’s Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) for its full review and comment. The FPCC co-chairs are Professors Ed Gillan and Doris Witt. It is our understanding from the Provost that the reform effort is still in the early stages and will continue into the next academic year. There will be additional opportunities for faculty to provide feedback, likely coordinated through Faculty Senate, and it is also possible that there will be discussions of this topic within individual colleges. We expect to provide a more comprehensive update at the April 27 Senate meeting.

**Instructional Faculty Policy Review ([Ops Manual III.10.11](#)):**

In March 2016, the Faculty Senate approved the Instructional Faculty Policy (codified in the Operations Manual at III.10.11). That policy requires a review not later than five years following its implementation by a committee of the Faculty Senate appointed by the Faculty Senate

DRAFT

president. Because implementation was largely finished by Fall 2017, we will be conducting this five-year review in the next academic year (21-22). This is another topic we hope to discuss more fully at the next Senate meeting. In the meantime, as we prepare for the review, please let me know if you are interested and willing to serve on the review committee. Please also feel free to nominate others to serve. Faculty from all tracks are invited to serve, but the policy requires that there be representation from the instructional track.

**Faculty Ombudsperson Opening:**

The University is currently seeking a new Faculty Ombudsperson via an internal search. For best consideration, application materials should be submitted through [jobs@uiowa](mailto:jobs@uiowa) by April 15, 2021. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me or former Faculty Senate President Tom Vaughn. Tom is our primary contact on the search committee and can be reached at [tom-vaughn@uiowa.edu](mailto:tom-vaughn@uiowa.edu).

**UI Presidential Search:**

Below are the key upcoming dates for the UI Presidential Search process:

**March 26:** the search committee meets to identify semifinalists.

**April 1-3:** the search committee interviews semifinalists (by Zoom).

**April 12-23:** Hybrid, on-campus interviews for up to four finalists, including virtual open forums with the campus community. The tentative dates are:

- Finalist 1: April 12—13 (this date will be eliminated if only three finalists are selected)
- Finalist 2: April 15—16
- Finalist 3: April 19—20
- Finalist 4: April 22—23

The campus community will have until April 27 to provide feedback via a Qualtrics survey, and the search committee members will reconvene on April 28 to prepare their comments about the finalists to present to the Board of Regents. The search committee will meet with the BOR on April 29 or April 30. The Regents will interview each finalist and make its selection of the next University of Iowa president on April 30.

Thank you—and as always, let me, Teresa, or Ana know if you have any questions or concerns.

Take care,  
Joe