

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, October 26, 2021**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Zoom**

**MINUTES**

Senators Present: J. Achrazoglou, F. Ahmad, D. Andersen, D. Anderson, B. Ayati, J. Barker, M. Bhatti, S. Bodine, C. Bradley, A. Brian, C. Brochu, N. Brogden, J. Buckley, C. Campbell, M. Cantrell, J. Carlson, M. Carvour, M. Charlton, C. Cherwin, M. Cunningham-Ford, A. Curtius, R. Curto, S. Datchuk, S. Dayal, L. Durairaj, S. Elangovan, A. Estapa, A. Farag, P. Gilbert, E. Gillan, S. Girotra, L. Glass, C. Grueter, J. Halekas, N. Handoo, S. Harwani, K. Hegarty, A. Hollingworth, Y. Imai, B. Janssen, L. Joseph, J. Kayle, A. Kitchen, M. Kivlighan, J. Kline, A. Merryman, D. Meyerholz, T. Midtroed, N. Nisly, K. Parker, H. Parrish, G. Pierce, M. Pizzimenti, P. Polgreen, A. Prince, L. Song, S. Sosale, A. Strathman, J. Streit, C. Swanson, A. Vijn, J. Welburn Paige, E. Welder, D. Wilder, L. Zingman, M. Zmolek.

Officers Present: M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, J. Yockey.

Senators Excused: L. Erdahl, A. Grooms, D. Jalal, A. Jaynes, J. Murry, A. Panos.

Senators Absent: A. Chauhan, B. Dixon, Y. Sato, A. Vikram.

Guests: B. Anderson (Student Disability Services); P. Damiano (Public Policy Center); A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); J. Garfinkel (Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee); L. Geist (Office of the Provost); R. Lehnertz (Vice President for Finance and Operations); B. Marcelo (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); D. McGregor-Huyer (*Daily Iowan*); K. Perez (*Daily Iowan*); E. Stresow (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); J. Troester (University Human Resources); S. Vlastos (Emeritus Faculty Council); D. Witt (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (September 14, 2021) – Professor Brochu moved and Professor Nisly seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - Susan McKernan (Preventive & Community Dentistry) to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Judicial Commission, 2021-24
  - Shawn Datchuk (Teaching & Learning) to fill the unexpired term of Mark McDermott (Teaching & Learning) on the Faculty Senate, 2021-22
 Professor Nisly moved and Professor Kline seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

- *Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee Update (Jon Garfinkel, Co-chair, Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee and Joni Troester, Senior Assistant Vice President and Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer, University Human Resources)*

Professor Garfinkel reported that over the past year, the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (FRIC) has considered a number of issues, including the annual review of insurance premiums. The committee's recommendations for insurance premiums have been accepted by President Wilson. The average rate increase across the two health plans (UI Choice and UI Select) was within national norms, between 6-7%. Professor Garfinkel commented that UI continues to offer robust plans relative to both national and peer norms. He noted that our generic prescription drug 0% co-pay and our comparatively low out-of-pocket maximum are some of the highlights of our plans. Moving on to other topics that have come before FRIC recently, Professor Garfinkel observed that the Affordable Care Act (ACA) appears to be stable at this time. Our health plans' exposure to the previously-contemplated "Cadillac tax" is essentially nil at this point. Our health plan metrics, particularly access reports that indicate whether we are meeting expectations to see patients on a timely basis, are high and stable, except for a few exceptions, for example, in neurology, where there is a national shortage of care providers.

Noting that he sits on the Retirement Fund Investment Committee (RFIC), Professor Garfinkel indicated that he is the liaison between that committee and FRIC. A key decision that was considered by RFIC and then approved by FRIC afterwards involved fee levelling. Both committees determined that fee levelling was a fairer way to average the fees of investors who participate in the university's retirement plans. Fees rise in proportion to the amount of money invested. Professor Garfinkel also noted that COVID-related benefits continue with \$0 cost for vaccinations, testing, and inpatient care. At the end of last year, there was a change to the pay structure for digital medical evaluations. These evaluations, done via MyChart, will be covered as a benefit beginning in January 2022. Professor Nisly, a member of FRIC, added that the digital medical evaluations are asynchronous. Senior Assistant Vice President Troester commented that administrators are pleased to partner with shared governance via FRIC to address the issues that Professor Garfinkel presented here today, and that UI continues to offer a robust benefits package to its employees.

Professor Ahmad asked if there was a breakdown available of how many employees had chosen each of the two health plans. Senior Assistant Vice President Troester responded that, for calendar year 2021, about 13-14% of employees chose UI Select (the newer plan), while the remainder chose UI Choice. Open enrollment for 2022 begins next week. Plan enrollment statistics will become available to FRIC in February.

- *Campus Project Update (Rod Lehnertz, Senior Vice President for Finance & Operations)*

Senior Vice President Lehnertz began his presentation by providing the group with some campus basic facts. The campus is 1,992 acres with 32 miles of roads and 4 miles of tunnels. Out of the campus' 21.2 million gross square feet, 8.8 million are associated with the general education fund (GEF). The remainder is associated with the hospital, athletics, residential life, etc. The campus contains approximately 250 buildings with an average age of 46 years. Although this is not unusual, it is a reminder that we must continue to care for and modernize our facilities. There are more than a dozen buildings that are older than 100 years. Currently, the university has a deferred maintenance back-log of \$396 million. Senior Vice President Lehnertz commented that once mechanical systems reach their intended replacement date, they become deferred maintenance if that replacement does not take place. However, consistent upkeep and maintenance can extend the lives of these systems.

Senior Vice President Lehnertz indicated that the university contracts with a company called Sightlines that does conditions assessment and planning at universities throughout the country. He displayed a chart showing the largest increase in building construction at UI occurred following World War II, as it did on many university campuses. He noted that buildings typically have a 30-40 year cycle of renewal; this does not refer to deferred maintenance, but to buildings becoming antiquated and no longer optimal spaces for modern teaching and research. Because so many buildings became antiquated at the same time, decades after the post-WWII building boom, UI and other universities face significant financial challenges addressing their facilities' needs. Currently, the university spends \$12.6 million annually on deferred maintenance and renewal efforts. In 2016, the university's deferred maintenance/building renewal budget was cut by 33%, significantly impacting the institution's ability to keep up with this work. As a result, the growing backlog of maintenance presents an increasing risk to the university in terms of rapidly escalating future repair costs, along with potential widespread business interruptions and the negative impact on faculty and student recruitment. Because of the reduction in funding for deferred maintenance and building renewal, administrators must, of necessity, prioritize spending on facilities, Senior Vice President Lehnertz explained. Funds are directed, therefore, at projects that reflect the institution's top priorities, that have the highest operational cost risks, and that have the greatest impacts on students.

Last year, the public private partnership (P3) with global energy firm [Engie](#) was implemented. Thus far, Engie's operations on our campus have gone well, Senior Vice President Lehnertz commented. There have been some refinements to the partnership between UI and Engie over the past year, as minor disputes have been ironed out. Sustainability continues to be a high priority at UI. Prior to the P3 agreement, UI had planned to be coal-free by 2025. With Engie as our partner, work continues toward that goal, which may now be reached as early as 2023. Transition planning and testing in the power plant's boiler system have already begun. UI

has been aggressive, relative to other universities, in our biofuel efforts. Over 15 years ago, the university began testing oat hulls, a byproduct of cereal production at the Cedar Rapids Quaker Oats factory. Now, 10-15% of steam produced on campus is generated from oat hulls. The university has also begun burning energy pellets made from miscanthus, a bamboo-like weed that grows up to 12 feet tall. Miscanthus is very weather- and insect-resistant and it doesn't require chemical applications. One acre of miscanthus is the equivalent of about 4 tons of coal. The university is currently using about 1,200 acres of miscanthus and plans to expand usage to 2,500 acres. Regarding deliverables to the university from the P3 initiative, an annual sum of \$15 million is generated for student performance improvements and research growth.

Turning to campus master planning, Senior Vice President Lehnertz explained that the planning process has been developed and refined over the past 5 years. Administrators are moving to a data-based analysis of space usage needs and facilities' conditions. They are collecting information from collegiate and other unit (Parking, Student Life, Athletics) master plans in order to formulate an overall campus master planning process that will guide facility investments over the next 5-20 years. The composition of the campus planning teams has also been refined. The master planning team includes stakeholders from units across campus. The space planning team looks closely at research needs throughout the university. Representatives from the administration, stakeholders, and shared governance are embedded within planning teams in order to bring the widest possible perspective to immediate, medium, and long-term decision-making. Campus master planning is based on the UI strategic plan and the university's missions and priorities. It is also necessary to maximize efficiencies in the ongoing facility cost-of-ownership and to right-size the campus.

Senior Vice President Lehnertz then highlighted some recent projects. He noted that 200,000 square feet of antiquated buildings have recently been razed, in an effort to right-size the campus and to reduce deferred maintenance costs. In the place of one of those obsolete structures, the new Psychological & Brain Sciences building arose. Another new structure is the Pharmacy Building, which will allow for modernized teaching and will also advance economic development through the college's FDA-approved pharmaceutical operations. The Pharmacy Building's dedicated state appropriation was also the largest request for a capital project in the university's history. The Kinnick Stadium North End Zone was a notable addition to the football stadium and was a gift-funded project, as all Athletics projects are. The Stanley Museum of Art is currently under construction and will open in Fall 2022. Most of the work will be completed by the end of 2021, but modifications will continue to be made to accommodate the specific needs of the artwork before it can be re-located. Over half of the building's costs came from private gifts. The construction of the new art museum is the final post-2008 flood project.

The university is currently pursuing state funding for renovation projects on the Pentacrest. A request to modernize MacLean Hall (built in 1912) was originally approved in 2007, but the initial funds allocated were redirected towards flood recovery and reconstruction. Now, the university is requesting \$28 million for this deferred project, which will include the modernization of the systems, layouts, and exterior of this 110-year-old building. The renovated structure will be anchored by the fast-growing computer science major. Graduates from this program are in-demand in Iowa, an incentive for the state to authorize funding for the

renovation. The next two planned renovations are Jessup Hall (built in 1924) and Macbride Hall (built in 1908); the university will pursue state funding for these projects, as well.

Facilities improvements are planned for the arts campus, Senior Vice President Lehnertz continued. The former Museum of Art (built in 1969) is currently being used on an interim basis by museum staff as they await the opening of the new museum. Once that occurs, the building will be repurposed for the Department of Dance, the needs of which correspond well to the structure of the former museum. The original Art Building, a historic structure built in 1936 and currently standing empty, will also be renewed and reoccupied. The University Capitol Center will likely see continued growth in Student Services offices located there. A “co-work commons” is opening soon on the second floor. This space will provide on-campus meeting rooms and other resources to employees working in a hybrid or remote format. The university currently has 62% ownership of the mall. In two years, the university will have the right to buy the entire mall. The mall’s central location makes it a prime space for student and university services. It also keeps retail outlets close to campus. Among other projects underway or planned for the near future are a new facility (100% gifted) for the Nonfiction Writing Program, continued major renewal and modernization of our residence halls, several donor-funded Athletics projects, and perimeter land use, including a 55+ development where the University Club used to be and possible development of the Park Road former band practice field. This last project would be in accordance with Regents expectations that campus-adjacent, university-owned land be used for our core missions. Renovation and deferred maintenance will be addressed for the Iowa Memorial Union. Regarding UIHC, a North Liberty hospital project is anticipated to be completed by 2025. Top priorities for the main hospital campus are expansion of bed capacity, along with facility and research modernization.

Via the chat, Professor Wilder asked if anyone had compared the energy needed to harvest 1 acre of miscanthus vs the energy needed to extract 4 tons of coal? Senior Vice President Lehnertz commented that there are costs associated with biofuels. Currently, the harvested miscanthus is taken by truck to a plant in Wisconsin for pelletizing. This is still cost-comparative to coal. It is possible that a similar plant may be built in eastern Iowa. Costs would then be reduced even more. Many of our peer institutions have moved directly from coal to natural gas, the current price spike of which is hurting them financially. By diversifying our energy sources, we protect the institution. Senior Vice President Lehnertz, having finished his presentation, then responded to several additional questions in the chat. He noted that the Department of Mathematics will likely move to Macbride Hall, that the eventual removal of Halsey Hall (once Dance has moved to the old art museum) will allow for the replacement of the IMU parking ramp, and that the move of university administration offices to the old art building is being explored, following the renovation of Jessup Hall and the consolidation of the social science departments there. Also, departments residing in the antiquated Field House may be relocated to more functional spaces as UIHC needs further impact that area of campus.

- *IowaRISE Program (Pete Damiano, Director, Public Policy Center)*

Professor Damiano explained that the IowaRISE initiative has grown out of the strategic planning process and the [Path Forward](#) development process, particularly the Path Forward Engagement Work Group, during the last five years. He noted that the P3 agreement, mentioned

earlier by Senior Vice President Lehnertz, had provided some of the funding for the initiative. Professor Damiano indicated that he has co-chaired the Path Forward Engagement Work Group with, at various times, Professor Sherry Watt from the College of Education, Professor Teresa Mangum from the Obermann Center, and Professor Kajsa Dalrymple from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication. The work group defines *engagement* as engaged education and research, not just as outreach. Over 200 participants across campus are involved in the initiative, along with some community partners. The work group determined that engagement could have a positive impact on some of the challenges that the university is facing. Many of our students have difficulty finding the right path for themselves at the university, leading to a retention rate, especially for our most vulnerable students, that is lower for UI than for most of our peers. We lose about 14-16% of our students after the first year and about 7% every year after that. There is also an approaching “demographic cliff” in Iowa that will make retention even more important in the coming years.

RISE stands for **R**esearch, **I**nternships and **M**entoring, **S**ervice Learning, and **C**ivic Engagement, Professor Damiano explained. The work group has been considering how to scale research opportunities for students a little more broadly, get students involved in internships and mentoring more consistently, and provide service learning classes for students to explore their future career interests, all in a more guided, intentional way. The focus is on students who tend to fall through the cracks. This might include first-generation students, under-represented minority students, and student veterans, but could also include any students who simply haven’t figured out their purpose at the university.

Pilot funding for the initiative was received several years ago and the first cohort has begun work. The initiative is overseen by the IowaRISE Advisory Committee, which has over 40 members and four subcommittees. The initiative strives to involve academic support units, such as the Pomerantz Career Center and the Division of Student Life, with the colleges and departments, so that they can work more collaboratively. Professor Damiano further explained that RISE functions as an umbrella over a series of activities. It is a way to provide more visibility to students, faculty, and staff about opportunities that currently exist on campus. The initiative could potentially be implemented campus-wide, under the broad categories of CreativeRISE (with a focus on the arts and humanities), Health SciencesRISE, Physical SciencesRISE, and PolicyRISE.

Although the main goals of the initiative are student recruitment and retention, there are several other objectives. One of these is alumni engagement. Alumni could be recruited to serve as mentors to students. The initiative also seeks to provide support to faculty and staff who have wanted to engage in similar efforts but who lacked institutional support. For students, the overarching purpose of the initiative is career and life discernment, with the added benefits of cohort-building, leadership opportunities, and a reflection component. While a student could enter into the initiative at any point, several classes are or soon will be available to students to orient them to the RISE program. These classes include *Life Design I* and *II*, taught by Professor David Gould, and *Explore Iowa*, taught by Professor Carrie Schuettelpelz.

Professor Damiano then briefly described some aspects of the RISE components. Within the Research component of RISE, students can earn digital badges online to prepare them for conducting research on a faculty-led team. As part of the Internships & Mentoring component, models are being developed for classes to provide mentoring to students, but also for the alumni approach previously mentioned. Students would be matched with an instructor or alumni mentor, who would set up several experiences for the student throughout the semester, concluding with a reflection component and future planning by the student. Badging modules have also been developed for the service learning and civic engagement components, to better prepare students for these experiences, with a particular focus on a spring break service learning trip.

In conclusion, Professor Damiano indicated that the IowaRISE program has submitted a request through the P3 process for two more years of funding. He invited questions from the group either now or following the meeting.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Sparkshop (Bailey Anderson, Access Consultant, Student Disability Services; Anna Flaming, Director, Center for Teaching; Brianna Marcelo, Director, Diversity Resources, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Erin Stresow, Assistant Director, Diversity Resources, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)*

Ms. Marcelo commented that, following up on the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) presentation at the September 14 Senate meeting, she wanted to highlight two primary items this month, support from campus leadership and accessibility tips and skills. Regarding the former, she noted that one topic that leadership has elevated in recent conversations is navigation of the tension around free speech and inclusion in the classroom setting. In the next few weeks, the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will present some recommendations to senior administrators about what to include in a skills workshop to manage this type of difficult classroom conversation. In order to obtain additional feedback from senators regarding the content of the proposed workshop, Ms. Marcelo then requested that they respond to the following prompt: *When thinking about Free Speech and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the classroom, we must include \_\_\_\_\_*. Via the chat, senators submitted their responses all at the same time (the “chatterfall” strategy).

While senators were responding to the prompt, Professor Nisly described a recent incident in which a student in her college voiced a complaint about an instance of free speech that felt hateful and offensive to that student and to others. No action was taken on the complaint because of the free speech rights of the faculty member who had made the hateful statement. The student had then questioned the university’s professed commitment to DEI, when there was no support offered to those harmed by the hateful speech. Professor Nisly suggested that the proposed workshop address action that *can* be taken in these frustrating situations, so that those harmed know that they are supported.

Mx. Anderson and Dr. Stresow then began today’s Sparkshop on visual descriptions and alternative (ALT) text. Dr. Stresow indicated that the purpose of the session was to *grow skills and awareness in inclusive and accessible introductions and alternative text descriptions*. Objectives for today’s session were to *consider why inclusive and accessible introductions and*

*alternative text descriptions are important to all, practice using inclusive and accessible introductions while navigating potential situations, and develop systems to include alternative text descriptions in e-content.* Mx. Anderson explained that visual descriptions are part of an inclusive introduction and are a description of the visual context of a location, a person, or a space. They may be provided in real time, but can also refer more generally to a verbal description. Alternative (ALT) text is a brief textual explanation of an image used in the coding of a digital graphic online or in digital files. Visual descriptions and alternative text overlap in many spaces, including in digital spaces such as Zoom, and they can feed into one another in how we introduce ourselves and share information about ourselves.

Using the *what-so what-now what* framework, Mx. Anderson explained that the *what* of today's Sparkshop is that *visual descriptions are not included or done well. ALT text is not included in images.* Images are thus made invisible to those using screen readers or to those who are having technical difficulties. As for the *so what, if they are not included, people can be misgendered, misidentified, and not included in valuable content and connection.* We gather a lot by the visual, Mx. Anderson noted, so if we are not saying what we see and describing ourselves, we are leaving out some content from a large group of people, which can include those with visual differences, those who may happen to be driving while listening, those who may be having trouble with their screen, etc. Turning to the *now what*, Mx. Anderson indicated that the group would learn some *best practices of collecting ALT text and visual descriptions for future use.*

Dr. Stresow then explained that visual descriptions are *spoken aloud (describing your presence on Zoom or in-person), are part of an introduction with pronouns, support those unable to see you, and include what is important to you to share with others.* As an example, she then gave a visual description of a photo of herself that she uses on Zoom. She further explained that ALT text, which could be a caption or embedded in the e-content, is *shared with others to allow them to describe you accurately and with respect, ideally written by the person in the image, and can be included in any media packet with bios and photos.* If an image is not displaying, the ALT text will describe the image for the user. Senators were then dispersed into breakout rooms to practice giving brief visual descriptions of themselves.

Returning from the breakout rooms, Mx. Anderson then presented several *now what* suggestions for practicing ALT text. Mx indicated that, internal to the university, senators could find their biography and photograph on the UI website, write up an ALT text to describe the photograph, and then send that text to the website administrator to update. Mx noted that, depending on the platform, text could be automatically generated or it could be personally customized. Internal and external to the university, senators could include ALT text with the biography and photograph submitted with materials to conferences and collaborators. They could also provide visual descriptions for virtual and in-person meetings.

In the chat, a senator asked where ALT text should be placed and whether the university would be adding space for this on faculty websites. Mx. Anderson responded that it depends on the website platform. Platforms can function differently on the back end. Mx suggested asking the local website administrator if they could incorporate ALT text into the website. The text



could also be added as a caption. Mx added that the Student Disability Services office has a shared document for internal use that includes photographs, biographies, ALT text, and pronouns for all office employees. Also in the chat, a senator asked if the concepts introduced today were developed in collaboration with those who might have visual or hearing impairments. Mx. Anderson responded that the concepts are standard practices in spaces in which individuals who are blind or who have visual impairments operate. Mx had first learned of these practices at a conference of the American Council for the Blind for audio description training. The practices are now starting to emerge as part of inclusive introductions. Mx. Anderson noted that these practices originated to serve individuals with disabilities and that mx likes to be proactive and assume that there is someone present who could benefit, before that person needs to divulge personal information or ask for an accommodation. Dr. Stresow invited the group to learn more about this topic at a BUILD (Building University of Iowa Leadership for Diversity) class, *Responsible Action – Disability Accommodations on Campus*, to be held on Tuesday, April 12, 9 am – 12 pm, via Zoom.

- *Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee Update (Doris Witt, Chair, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee)*

Professor Witt began her presentation by explaining that the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) *reviews and makes recommendations on all proposed University policies and procedures affecting faculty not otherwise under the jurisdiction of another Senate or charter committee. The Senate President may refer any such proposed policies or procedures to another committee.* She also displayed the [current FPCC membership list](#). Professor Witt indicated that her goal for today was to provide a preliminary update on important changes being proposed to two Operations Manual policies, [III.10 Faculty](#) (including faculty tracks) and [III.29 Faculty Dispute Procedures](#). Both of these policies directly impact faculty. She emphasized that the FPCC's review of the proposed revisions is an evolving effort, but that she would present today what the committee currently believes are the revision's key elements.

Professor Witt further explained that policy III.10 defines the various faculty tracks (tenure track, clinical track, research track, and instructional track, along with fixed-term appointments) and also governs their implementation, such as promotion procedures, determination of ranks, post-tenure review procedures, etc. Policy III.29 establishes the dispute procedures for the tenure, clinical, and research tracks. Disputes can be initiated by either a faculty member or by the university. Turning to the origins of the proposed revisions, Professor Witt indicated that, prior to the 2020-21 academic year, there were conversations in the Provost's Office about the desirability of making changes to these two policies. This intention was preliminarily conveyed to the Senate officers and to FPCC. The Provost's Office, working with the Office of the General Counsel, then started drafting revisions to the two policies. During 2020-21, FPCC members expressed concern about the process undertaken for the policy revision; established shared governance norms appeared to be disregarded by not involving faculty from the beginning of the revision process of these foundational faculty policies.

Last spring, Professor Witt indicated, FPCC members, in anticipation of learning more about the impending revision, began researching faculty dispute procedures and track definitions at

peer institutions for the sake of comparison. In May, the committee received new drafts of the proposed revisions, which were overwhelmingly extensive. Committee members considered the accompanying rationale document insufficient for the scope of the revisions. This fall, three FPCC subcommittees undertook in-depth examinations of the proposed revisions. Committee members also sought communication with the co-chairs (Professors Anne Stapleton and Caroline Sheerin) of the Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee, currently carrying out the mandatory five-year review of this new track.

Turning to a discussion of what changes were likely needed in policy III.10, Professor Witt noted that the policy was composed piecemeal over several decades, ranging from highly-detailed language on the tenure track to more streamlined language on the instructional track. Overall, the policy does not respond to the university's current situation, in which tenure-track lines are decreasing while clinical-track and instructional-track lines are increasing. The new policy for the instructional track also includes a separate dispute procedure section specific to that track; this section should more logically be placed within policy III.29. It is quite possible that many faculty members would prefer revisions to III.10, both to reflect and to improve current practices, but FPCC has not yet had the opportunity to gather feedback.

As for III.29, this policy was originally developed for the tenure track. As additional tracks emerged, they were incorporated into the policy, with the exception of the instructional track, which, as previously mentioned, has its own dispute procedures. Those procedures should likely be transferred into this policy. There is also some disagreement between the Provost's Office and FPCC regarding whether the research track has access to the dispute procedures in III.29. As with III.10, faculty may desire changes to III.29, but FPCC has not had the opportunity to gather feedback on this matter, either.

Returning to III.10, Professor Witt then broadly described the proposed changes to this policy. The revision would create a two-tiered, hierarchical structure for the faculty tracks. The tenure track would occupy the upper tier, with the "contract tracks" (clinical, research, instructional) occupying the lower tier. The current instructional-track language would serve as a model for language applicable to all the contract tracks. The entire policy has been streamlined to less than half of its current length. Some of the removed language would be shifted to various other websites, primarily Provost's Office and collegiate websites. Focusing on changes proposed for the tenure track, Professor Witt indicated that important language on the history and purpose of tenure, along with the university's commitment to it, would be moved to the Provost's Office website. A requirement has been added for the evaluation of *professionalism* throughout all aspects of all reviews that tenure-track faculty undergo. FPCC members found this new insertion problematic because it is not associated with any other university policy, such as the policy on professional ethics. It appears that a requirement that faculty members seeking tenure first be found qualified as teachers before research and service can be considered has been removed. Adjustments have also been proposed for post-tenure reviews: annual reviews are as consequential as five-year reviews; deans or the provost can require an altered post-tenure effort allocation portfolio; and faculty members would not be able to file grievances about altered portfolios.

Moving on to changes proposed for the “contract tracks” in III.10, each of the three tracks is understood as focusing on one component of the traditional tenure track – teaching (instructional track), research (research track), and service (clinical track). FPCC members perceive here a denial of the current reality that tenure lines are often replaced by clinical or instructional lines and that faculty serving in the clinical or instructional track are often qualified for and, indeed, are actually doing the work of faculty on the tenure track, but without the rewards and protections of the tenure track. Almost no job security would be granted to the contract tracks during the first six years of full-time employment and faculty may be terminated with no more than three months’ notice for reasons not related to performance. With colleges also acquiring greater control over the structure of the contract tracks, disparities among colleges will almost certainly arise.

Turning to proposed revisions for III.29, Professor Witt commented that a two-tiered structure would be instituted for dispute procedures, as well. The tenure track would continue to have access to robust procedures that would include peer review, while the contract tracks would have lesser procedures, in which administrative review would play a substantial role. Overall, the policy has been considerably streamlined, with many details of the revision still yet to be analyzed by the FPCC. Among revisions proposed for the tenure track dispute process are changes in aspects of time frames for filing and responding to claims, along with allocation of the burden of proof. The impact of the changes appears to be a decrease in faculty protections and an increase in administrative power. There is a new requirement that grievances arise only from matters that substantially impact employment conditions. FPCC members are especially concerned that the possibility of filing a grievance on the grounds of discriminatory treatment in a denial of promotion or tenure may have been eliminated. For the contract tracks, although clinical-track and research-track faculty would no longer have access to the tenure-track procedures, an exception has been carved out for clinical-track faculty in the College of Law, the accreditation requirements of which mandate that clinical-track and tenure-track faculty be treated similarly. As with the tenure track, small changes accumulate with the effect of taking power from faculty members and giving it to administrators. FPCC members feel that the overall impact of the revisions for the contract tracks risks undermining the university’s commitment to DEI-related goals, because many of the people on the contract tracks are women and minorities. There could be insufficient protections for academic freedom, as well.

In summary, Professor Witt indicated that FPCC members do not consider that the appropriate shared governance model was followed for the policy revision process. Instead of this administrator-driven approach, they believe a more collaborative process should have been pursued, beginning with discussions between faculty representatives and administrators regarding perceived policy shortfalls. Faculty representatives should then have been involved in gathering needed information and they should have been full partners in redrafting the policies. The committee also finds that the revisions serve to enhance power for administrators and to decrease rights for faculty. Given the insufficient rationale presented for proposed changes related to tenure-track faculty, FPCC members would like more time to engage with tenure-track faculty across campus to gather feedback on the revision. While instructional-track faculty now have the opportunity to provide input on their track via the current review process, clinical-track, research-track, and fixed-term faculty should also be able to weigh in on proposed

modifications to their tracks before any changes go into effect. And, the committee wants greater recognition of the invaluable contributions made by all faculty on the contract tracks. This recognition could be expressed through greater uniformity across the colleges regarding track definitions, expectations, and processes, along with more employment stability and academic freedom protections.

President Marshall commented that proposed changes to the Faculty Dispute Procedures were expected, but that changes to the faculty tracks were not. She added that the Senate officers and FPCC members are still in negotiations with administrators regarding the proposed revisions. Weekly meetings of the Senate officers and the FPCC chair with administrators have been set up in an attempt to resolve differences. Of particular concern is the timing of the review of the instructional track, which is scheduled to conclude at the end of the spring semester, while the Operations Manual changes are projected to be completed by early in the spring semester. Professor Witt's presentation today is an effort to keep the Senate informed of proposed revisions to several policies that deeply affect faculty, President Marshall indicated. She noted that additional faculty committees may be needed for several related tasks, such as composing a definition of *professionalism*.

- *President's Report (Teresa Marshall)*

Regarding COVID, President Marshall reminded the group of President Biden's [recent executive order](#) requiring federal contractors to mandate COVID vaccination for their employees. University administrators, together with the Board of Regents and our sister Regents institutions, continue to study the order and its impact on the university, which is a federal contractor and has a large amount of money at risk.

President Marshall also noted that Staff Council leadership is exploring a proposal for a tuition reimbursement program for faculty and staff and their dependents. If the proposal moves forward, the Senate officers plan to support it.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 16, 3:30-5:15 pm, Zoom.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, Zoom.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Campbell moved and Professor Joseph seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Marshall adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.