FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, March 22, 2022
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Zoom

MINUTES


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


Senators Absent: M. Charlton, A. Chauhan, B. Dixon, M. Kivlighan, J. Kline, A. Panos, L. Song.

Guests: G. Barta (Athletics); J. Bilotta (Finance and Operations); B. Ernst (*Daily Iowan*); A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); S. Fleagle (ITS); L. Geist (Office of the Provost); S. Giannakouros (Office of Sustainability and the Environment); J. Keller (Office of the Provost); B. MacKenzie (Office of Sustainability and the Environment); B. Marcelo (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); K. Perez (*Daily Iowan*); B. Rupe (Office of Sustainability and the Environment); S. Vlastos (Emeritus Faculty Council); 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 Wilder moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
B. Faculty Senate Minutes (February 8, 2022) – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Strathman seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Committee Appointments (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez, Chair, Committee on Committees)
   - None at this time

III. New Business

   • Ten-Year Facilities Master Plan (Joe Bilotta, Finance & Operations)

     Mr. Bilotta indicated that master planning for campus facilities is managed by a team that includes UI employees from UIHC, Athletics, Student Life, and academic and research programs. This team works with central administrators to prioritize and advance capital work. Until recently, Mr. Bilotta explained, campus planning has been driven by a service-oriented model. Now, however, the team would like to take a more strategic-oriented approach. They reached out to the deans and explained to them how the current space planning and analysis process works and how capital plans are developed. The team also received significant input back from the deans. A subgroup of deans then formulated several recommendations for the campus master planning process moving forward, with the intention that the colleges would take a more proactive approach to facilities planning, rather than relying on Facilities Management to take the lead. The deans envisioned a facilities planning process that was informed by data and driven by programmatic and strategic needs. The first of their recommendations was for each college to create a facilities master plan, which would include all types of the college’s space needs. The other recommendations called for the integration of collegiate plans into the university’s academic facilities master plan, consideration of the creation of a shared collaborative work center (as a result of the Future of Work efforts), development of improved space management policies, and creation of transparent funding plans.

     Collegiate facilities plans will be comprehensive and include space needs, building quality, site needs, and space management. The collegiate plans will be forwarded to the Provost’s Office, where they will be combined into one academic facilities plan. Once this plan has been formulated, the services and operations sectors of campus can then create support plans for these academic facilities. The academic facilities plan and the support plans will feed into the campus master plan, which has three capital components: a building improvement plan, a site improvement plan (parking, pathways, etc.), and a utilities improvement plan. Auxiliary unit (Athletics, Housing & Dining, Parking & Transportation) facilities plans will also feed into the campus master plan, as will the UIHC facilities plan. Mr. Bilotta noted that the colleges are just beginning to formulate their facilities plans. Although there is a pre-existing facilities plan that was recently reviewed by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, that plan could change as a result of the new planning process just described.

     Turning to a discussion of that existing plan, Mr. Bilotta explained that presentation of the plan to the Regents had been somewhat delayed while UIHC worked on its portion. UI administrators wanted to present, for the first time, one comprehensive facilities plan to the Regents. The theme of the plan was Renew. Right-size. Improve. Campus expansion was not
necessarily contemplated in this plan; the university has already been expanding for the past 50 years. While new spaces are needed, some existing spaces are no longer needed. Among the components of the plan is an upgrade of the Pentacrest, so that it can be reclaimed entirely for student use. Three of the Pentacrest buildings (MacLea, Jessup, and Macbride) will be modernized. Buildings must be emptied before they can be modernized, however. Therefore, some buildings will serve as “enablers,” so that the residents of a building targeted for modernization can be moved there before work is begun. One of these “enabler” buildings is the old Art Building, mostly unused since the 2008 flood. The Graduate College, currently housed in Gilmore Hall, will move into the old Art Building, once it is sufficiently renovated, so that central administrative offices can be moved off the Pentacrest and into Gilmore Hall, another “enabler” building. The downtown Jefferson Building will also be used over the next 8-9 years as an “enabler” building to support the Pentacrest renovation and will then be sold. Other planned projects in this area of campus include the phased modernization of the Iowa Memorial Union. Also, Halsey Hall will be razed and the Dance Department will be moved into the old Art Museum, which will be modernized specifically for the Department’s use. Mr. Bilotta noted that although Halsey Hall is an historic campus structure, the renovation costs for the building are prohibitive, leaving the university with no choice but to take it down. An expansion of the IMU parking ramp will likely be built in the empty space.

Among other east campus developments, the Tippie College of Business will expand onto one of two university-owned properties on Clinton St., Mr. Bilotta continued. The Main Library, at 550,000 square feet the largest building on campus, has the largest total amount of deferred maintenance. It will be modernized in phases over the next 20 years. The university currently owns about 40% of the University Capitol Centre and has the opportunity to buy out the entire building over the next two years. Various types of student service-related offices will eventually be moved to the upper level there. Calvin Hall will be the future home of the online education programs currently housed in rented space downtown. The Mathematics and Computer Science Departments will be housed temporarily in Jessup Hall, once administrators have moved out, while their own building, MacLean Hall, is renovated.

On the west side of campus, the lower levels of Hardin Library will be modernized for the relocation of the Environmental Health and Safety Office and some health science research support programs. The cultural centers currently located on Grand Ave. Ct. will be relocated to new facilities in the western half of Hubbard Park and the old facilities will be razed. Westlawn Hall is another facility that is too expensive to renovate, Mr. Bilotta noted. It will be razed and the property will be used to support the health sciences over time (no specific facilities are planned thus far for that space). Student Health, currently housed in Westlawn, will likely be moved to the IMU. The child care center in Westlawn will be relocated, as well. Turning to Athletics facilities, Mr. Bilotta indicated that a new wrestling training facility will be built just south of Carver Hawkeye Arena. Some of the buildings located at the baseball field will be improved. New facilities for the Olympic sports are contemplated near the Hawkeye Campus west of Mormon Trek Boulevard. Some campus infrastructure support buildings may be constructed there, as well.
The university has engaged in a partnership with the cities of Iowa City and University Heights involving the construction of condominiums near the Finkbine Golf Course. The university is also exploring potential partnerships while reconsidering usage of properties located on Park Road and along the Coralville Strip. Numerous other potential areas of campus development include modernization of residence halls and the east campus research facilities and an addition to the College of Public Health Building. Concluding his presentation with projects at UIHC, Mr. Bilotta commented that a new inpatient tower, a new research facility, and possibly a new ambulatory care center were contemplated.

In response to a question in the chat, Mr. Bilotta indicated that Westlawn Hall would not be razed for several years, at least. Professor Ayati expressed strong concern that faculty in the Mathematics Department, currently housed in MacLean Hall, have not been included in conversations about renovation plans, including the Department’s temporary location(s) while MacLean Hall is modernized. He emphasized the enormous role his Department plays in undergraduate education. Mr. Bilotta responded that renovation processes have not yet begun, but that it is understood that the Mathematics Department must remain on the Pentacrest at all times. There are numerous other steps that must be taken before Mathematics can be moved, including an emptying and partial renovation of Jessup Hall, the likely temporary home of the Department. Colleges and departments have not yet been part of more detailed discussions that will follow these broadly outlined plans, he indicated, but they soon will be.

- **Office of Sustainability and the Environment (Stratis Giannakouros, Director, Office of Sustainability and the Environment)**

  Mr. Giannakouros indicated that the Office of Sustainability and the Environment serves the entire campus, but is administratively housed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. He explained that sustainability *is a philosophy that provides us a way to think about what it takes to live well today without compromising the ability of our children and grandchildren to do the same.* When we think about sustainability at UI, we usually envision the physical campus environment: the carbon emissions associated with our activities, waste production, energy consumption, and water usage. The Office, however, is more focused on the implications of sustainability from an academic and research perspective. As an institution of higher education, Mr. Giannakouros continued, it is incumbent upon us to educate our students about sustainability. He expressed the view that it is, of course, necessary to reduce our emissions and live with a smaller footprint, but that if we don’t engage our students in that process, it is a failure of the institution.

  In addition to working with academic units to ensure that students are educated about sustainability, the Office engages in a variety of other endeavors, such as hosting events and lectures, supporting student organizations, and encouraging faculty and undergraduate research around sustainability. The Office also promotes the campus as a living laboratory, so that students do not have to travel in order to have sustainability learning experiences. Living laboratories on campus provide our students with the opportunity to learn about ecosystems. For example, the [Ashton Prairie Living Laboratory](#) contains about 11 acres of reborn prairie. Deep water sensing and stations for cloud monitoring allow students to measure biodiversity impacts, track water flows, and study restoration and conservation. The Iowa River is also now
starting to be used as a living laboratory, to give students the opportunity to study water quality issues.

Moving to a broader overview of sustainability, Mr. Giannakouros noted that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has just released its Sixth Assessment Report. The IPCC is a body of thousands of scientists from around the world who contribute to reports discussing the scientific status of our understanding of climate change. The recently released assessment was dire. There has been a long-standing assumption that we must keep global warming below 1.5C, in order not to precipitate the worst consequences of climate change. Based upon our failure over the last several decades to keep our emissions under control, even the most optimistic scientists no longer believe that we will be able to reach that goal. The question now is whether warming will increase 2C or 3C. Mr. Giannakouros then cited some examples of the consequences of this projected increased warming rate. Most likely, about 18-29% of all terrestrial and freshwater species will face a very high risk of extinction. By 2100, up to 75% of the global population could experience “life-threatening climatic conditions” because of heat and humidity. This will cause huge movements of populations away from affected areas. Food security will also be undermined by the pressure put on food production and access. Mr. Giannakouros noted that the IPCC report was released amidst the crisis in Ukraine and therefore received little attention; however, the consequences of climate change that the report outlines will far overshadow all of our current crises. He emphasized that the impacts of climate change are already being experienced now and he expressed the view that our political and social systems are too fragile to absorb these climate shocks; in 2015, he noted, when one million Syrian refugees crossed into Europe, it completely destabilized European politics. Mr. Giannakouros explained that he has described the content of this report in order to make the case for the Office’s position that teaching our students about sustainability should be part of the core mission of the university. Every future job that we train our students for will be impacted by the challenge of climate change in the coming decades.

Turning to the UI 2030 Campus Sustainability Goals process, Mr. Giannakouros explained that a shared governance process developed goals for 2010 and 2020. Using the same process, students, faculty, and staff drafted updated goals for 2030. The process was slowed by the pandemic and the transition in presidential leadership, but President Wilson has now approved the goals. The goals will be incorporated into the university’s strategic plan, which will be presented to the Regents this summer and announced in September. The UI 2030 climate goal is reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 50 percent. This target is achievable and is 5% better than what the IPCC recommends. The goal to keep the planet below a 1.5C increase requires net zero emissions worldwide by 2050. In order to achieve this, greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced by 45-50% by 2030. How we construct and renovate our campus buildings will be the deciding factor in reaching that goal. We must develop a set of environmental standards for building construction and renovation on campus. The UI 2030 education goal is one hundred percent of undergraduate students will complete a sustainability-focused course before graduating. It is not enough to modify our campus to reach our goals, if our students are not educated about climate change and sustainability. The Office is working with colleges to implement this requirement with flexible standards.
The UI 2030 Waste Goal is become a Zero Waste campus by achieving PLAN Atlas Bronze Zero Waste certification. The focus of this goal is not so much on recycling, but on being smarter about what we consume. The UI 2030 Water Goal is improve water quality in the Iowa River by creating best practices for stormwater management and conservation. Linking our impact on the Iowa River to a goal allows us to teach students, faculty, and staff about the importance of our water sources. We take 100% of our drinking water as surface water from the Iowa River. Recently the university has had to put in a reverse osmosis system because of the explosion of nitrates and other contaminants in the water. The UI 2030 Campus Goal is embed sustainability into every college and auxiliary unit’s strategic plan and report on progress annually. In the previous sets of goals, UIHC was excluded, although 50% of our energy consumption and 50% of our waste comes from the hospital. The hospital complicates our efforts and makes our waste goals harder to achieve because biohazard waste cannot be recycled. Industry standards of care must also be observed. Under this goal, UIHC and other auxiliary units are invited to consider their contributions to the university’s sustainability effort.

Via the chat, Professor Gillan asked if the campus sustainability goals included the power plant or if the public-private partnership (P3) had removed the plant from the university’s sustainability efforts. Blake Rupe, Sustainability Program Manager in the Office, responded via the chat that the Office is working with the P3 partners (the UI Energy Collaborative) and Facilities Management staff on the goals, particularly the climate goal and the water goal. Professor Ahmad noted that the education goal focuses only on undergraduate students. He asked if there were any plans to develop education requirements for graduate and professional students. Mr. Giannakouros responded that, because of the focused nature of graduate education, instituting a requirement is more complicated. At this time, the goal will cover only undergraduates. Mr. Giannakouros added that collaboration with the hospital and other units, such as Athletics, is essential for the success of the university’s sustainability goals. Sustainability cannot be a centralized effort, but requires wide buy-in from across campus. Professor Campbell encouraged Mr. Giannakouros to make presentations to UIHC units, where he might find a willingness to collaborate on sustainability efforts or to incorporate sustainability topics into graduate education. Mr. Giannakouros commented that he has been working with faculty from across campus, including from the Carver College of Medicine, on a climate challenge for undergraduate students. He added that he is certainly willing to present to units at UIHC.

- **Athletic Director Gary Barta**

  Before Mr. Barta began his remarks, President Marshall led Senators in a round of applause for the UI men’s and women’s basketball teams’ Big Ten Tournament championships. Following up on President Marshall’s praise, Mr. Barta noted that in the last two years, UI teams have won eleven Big Ten championships, which is a record in UI history. Mr. Barta then reiterated that athletics is not the most important thing that happens on this campus, but it is one of the most visible – a remark that he has often made to the Faculty Senate over the 16 years of his tenure here.

  Mr. Barta commented that it is important to him that Athletics is well-integrated into the campus community. For example, he serves on the UI President’s Cabinet. Liz Tovar, the Senior
Associate Athletic Director for Student-Athlete Academic Services, also serves as the UI Executive Officer and Associate Vice President of the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Most of the senior staff, he noted, have additional reporting lines to other offices outside of Athletics. Kevin Zihlman, Assistant Athletics Director for Compliance, has served as Staff Council president this year, as well.

Turning to finances, Mr. Barta observed that, since 2007, Athletics has been a self-sustaining entity, not receiving any student fees or general education fund support. As a result of the pandemic, Athletics sustained a $43 million deficit. Six million dollars of that deficit was spent in daily testing of student athletes and coaches so that they could safely compete. Athletics has taken out a loan to pay back the $43 million with interest over the next 10-15 years. On the national scene, regarding student athlete financial aid, Mr. Barta noted that until recently, it was customary to cover tuition, room and board, and books. Then, cost of attendance was added, followed by supplemental educational benefit money. Now, name, image, and likeness (NIL) gives student athletes the opportunity to earn money through corporate sponsorships and social media promotions. At UI, NIL is working as intended thus far. There have been some problems reported at other institutions, however. Although the UI cannot set up NIL opportunities for student athletes, the university can provide education on how to manage these opportunities.

Mr. Barta noted that a new staff member has been hired in Athletics to focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts. The student athletes themselves have created four affinity groups for women student athletes, Black student athletes, LGBTQ student athletes, and international student athletes. Athletics has formed a strong relationship with the Black Alumni Association. There is a DEI Accountability group that works with Athletics on its DEI action plan, which is embedded in the Athletics strategic plan. Mr. Barta cited a recent administrative report indicating that 15% of the Athletics executive management team are members of a racial or ethnic minority, compared to 14% at the university overall. Among the professional and scientific staff, 14% are members of a racial or ethnic minority compared to 11% at the university overall. Among the total staff, 13% are members of a racial or ethnic minority, similar to the university overall. The last topic that Mr. Barta addressed was mental health. He commented that he had created the first sport psychologist position (1 FTE) in Athletics 11 years ago. There are now 5 FTE’s working in the area of student athlete mental health. In Mr. Barta’s view, social media has played a role in the increasing mental health crisis we observe among students.

- **IT Security (Steve Fleagle, Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer)**

  Vice President Rodriguez-Rodriguez indicated that Associate Vice President Fleagle would address general issues of current information technology security. She added that concerns about privacy, use of information, and data retention have been raised among faculty regarding link-tracking within the Dispatch mass email system used by the university and that Associate Vice President Fleagle would discuss this issue, as well.

  Associate Vice President Fleagle explained that Dispatch is a communications campaign system, similar in functionality to commercial products such as Constant Contact. These products allow for users to select a population and then deliver a communications campaign, often using a template. Dispatch has the ability to assess engagement with email messages. For
example, users, if they choose, can assess whether an email message was opened and whether any links in the message were clicked. Before being allowed to initiate a campaign, users must go through a training on privacy, including on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Data is not anonymized in Dispatch. The purpose of a product like Dispatch is to conduct a communications campaign, with a series of messages, including reminders; anonymizing data would not allow for determining who has read a message or who needs a reminder. Regarding opting out of Dispatch, Associate Vice President Fleagle indicated that it is possible to opt out of individual campaigns, if the campaign has been set up to allow for this. A global opt-out is not available, however, because the university uses Dispatch for some email messages that are required to be sent, for legal or compliance reasons. Only those users managing a particular communications campaign, or other authorized users in their department, can access the data from that campaign, Associate Vice President Fleagle explained. As a default, data is kept for two years, so that users can look at year-over-year statistics and trends.

Turning to cybersecurity, Associate Vice President Fleagle commented that this is a rapidly changing landscape. Millions of cyberattacks, in a wide range of methods, occur on the university IT system every day. Many of these methods are not new, so the university can set up our IT systems to respond to and block these attacks. Still, several hundred of these daily attacks require an IT professional to respond. Outdated software systems and phishing attacks are the biggest threats to IT security. He encouraged Senators to keep their software systems up-to-date and to be careful about clicking on links. The targets for attacks are data or systems, with data becoming increasingly targeted in recent years. Data that attackers are interested in include intellectual property and personally identifiable information, especially healthcare information. There are two types of attackers, Associate Vice President Fleagle explained, financially-motivated attackers looking to sell data and government-sponsored attackers with a range of motivations. Most attacks do not originate with a lone individual. Instead, attacks are conducted by organized crime syndicates or state-sponsored government actors. These highly sophisticated organizations have org charts, specialists, even customer-service representatives and salespeople. In order to block attackers, the university must get it right every time, he pointed out, but attackers only need to get it right one time. Technology, although it has benefitted our lives in many ways, also creates a very complex environment, which makes it easier to find a way in and to hide. Our attack surface gets bigger as we deploy more technology. In the last 4-5 years, there has been an increase in state-sponsored attackers, primarily from China and Russia, but from other countries, as well.

Associate Vice President Fleagle noted one additional concern – ransomware. Attackers hold data hostage until they are paid a ransom. If the ransom is not paid, attackers will publish the data or sell it on the black market. Ransomware attacks have increased 350% since 2018. In the same timeframe, the ransom paid has increased from about $8 billion to over $45 billion. He commented that he has been in communication with several academic medical centers that have experienced ransomware attacks. In one case, the center paid $1.7 million in ransom, but spent at least $30 million in clean-up costs. In another case, the center paid $2.5 million in ransom, but spent over $60 million in clean-up costs. Referring to current geopolitical activity, Associate Vice President Fleagle observed that Russia has extensive cyberattack capabilities, probably the
strongest in the world. Thus far, Russia has not unleashed that capability, except in very targeted activity in Ukraine. Around the world, however, cybersecurity professionals are on high alert, waiting for a Russian cyberattack to be launched. Yesterday, the White House issued a statement of warning about a possible upcoming cyberattack. It is unlikely that such a warning would be issued unless a serious attack is being considered. Right now, our IT staff are working overtime to monitor our systems.

Speaking generally about our security measures, Associate Vice President Fleagle noted that two-factor authentication has been widely employed throughout university systems, reducing the number of compromised accounts by a factor of 10. Extensive external and internal technology protections have been put into place, such as firewalls and segmented networks. The university also employs a third party to test our technical protections. They attack our systems on a regular basis; if they find vulnerabilities, the university fixes them. Information is widely shared with our Big Ten peers and with the federal government. We also conduct regular drills. Internal auditors review whether our IT policies are being followed. The UI’s cybersecurity team supports the entire university, including the hospital, and has done a great job adapting to the rapidly changing cybersecurity landscape.

In response to a question raised in the chat, Associate Vice President Fleagle commented that he did not think that UIHC would lift its block on access to Google Docs because of specific healthcare-related issues, but that he would look into it. Regarding a chat question about how to keep home computers safe, Associate Vice President Fleagle indicated that users should regularly update their operating systems and their applications. Local IT staff can be helpful to a limited extent. Also, users should be careful of links that they click on.

• Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Sparkshop: Mentoring (Bria Marcelo, Director, Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)

Ms. Marcelo began the presentation by noting that mentoring, especially across social identities or group lines, had been one of the topics suggested by senators for a Sparkshop session. While most Senators likely have had some experience with mentoring, today’s presentation would discuss how to reduce some common barriers while mentoring across group lines. Ms. Marcelo displayed a quote from the article Barriers to the Successful Mentoring of Faculty of Color, “Mentors can provide the mentee with social, professional, and institutional connections; provide access to resources; and increase feelings of belonging and engagement that are key to success.” She then requested that, via the chat, Senators share a benefit experienced by being mentored or being a mentor.

Following the previously-established format for the Sparkshops, Ms. Marcelo indicated that the what? of today’s session was mentors who differ from their mentee’s marginalized identities may be less equipped to support their unique challenges. The so what? was minimize or ignore impact of social identities on success and/or harm; amplify stigmatization or barriers; deny access. The now what? was recommendations and resources for mentorship and mentoring across group lines.
Drawing from the article mentioned above, Ms. Marcelo described four common challenges faced when mentoring across group lines. Negative mentoring takes place when specific incidents occur that limit the mentor’s ability to effectively provide guidance to the mentee. Negative mentoring can lead to adverse outcomes, such as lower levels of support, lower job satisfaction, higher turnover, and psychological distress. Negative mentoring was found to be worse in some cases than having no mentoring at all. Five underlying drivers of negative mentoring were identified: distancing, lack of expertise, manipulative behaviors, dysfunctionality, and mismatch within the dyad. Commenting on this last item, Ms. Marcelo noted that researchers focused on differences in approaches and in identity (race, gender, nationality, etc.). The differences may lead to challenges to effective mentoring relationships.

Turning to the other three challenges, Ms. Marcelo indicated that difficulty finding mentors is an issue that has been of concern at the university, especially since mentees may want mentors who share their identities. Insufficient institutional support exists when there is no formal mentoring program at an institution. When structure and support for mentoring is lacking, a disproportionate mentoring burden falls on those who have been successful mentors. Lack of post-tenure mentoring often occurs because the pool of available mentors, especially from underrepresented minorities, becomes even more limited the farther one moves up in a career.

Several recommendations for mentoring across group lines have been put forward by researchers at the Center for Faculty Excellence at UNC Chapel Hill. The first was for institutions to create formal mentoring programs. Programs would be developed based on the need to create feelings of connection. Formal programs would also establish larger networks of mentors. Another recommendation was to promote peer mentoring or facilitated peer mentoring. Developing social capital through networking with others can lead to access to resources, emotional support, and collegial relationships. Structures that allow for peer mentoring emphasize values such as encouragement, collaboration, and collective success. Various peer mentoring models have been shown to improve research, writing, career satisfaction, and confidence. The third recommendation was to provide professional development and networking opportunities. This is important for mentees and mentors. Training can focus on how to be an effective mentor, as well as on how to decrease structural barriers for positive mentoring and how to incorporate best practices (negotiation tactics, work-life balance, institutional priorities) into mentoring. A recommendation specific to group lines is to mindfully call out the elephant in the room. Mentors can be open about their positionality and acknowledge that they may not have the same struggles as their mentees. Other recommendations listed were meet the challenges of intersectionality, don’t avoid difficult topics, ask for feedback, and encourage multiple mentors.

Ms. Marcelo displayed a chart entitled Your Mentoring Network that was created by the National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity. The UI has an institutional membership in this organization, which offers tools and resources on mentorship. The chart can help visualize the many mentoring needs, from a variety of people, that an individual might have. The chart can also help mentors set boundaries for themselves. Ms. Marcelo indicated that this Sparkshop would not have a group activity. Instead, she requested that Senators think about a mentee that they have and consider where they would place themselves on the chart as part of this mentoring relationship. She also requested that Senators think about any identity-related barriers that may
need to be considered in the mentoring relationship. She referred the group to the Mentoring@Iowa webpage for additional resources. Ms. Marcelo concluded her presentation by showing a quote from a publication of the Center for Faculty Excellence at UNC Chapel Hill. The quote emphasized that organizational climate makes a difference on the impact of mentoring. Mentoring cannot be relied on as an institution’s primary strategy for improving retention, promotion, and development.

• Proposed Changes to University Libraries Charter Committee Charge (Loren Glass, Chair, University Libraries Charter Committee)

Professor Glass explained that the University Libraries Charter Committee has been working on reforming its charge for several years. He referred the group to the charge document, with tracked changes and comments, that he had provided. Updates to the list of duties in which the committee engages have been proposed to reflect current practices, resources, and spaces. More consequential, however, is a potential shift in constituent representation. Seats are now given to four students, two undergraduates and two graduates. The committee proposes to reduce that number to two students (one from each category) and then fill the two extra seats with faculty members, bringing the faculty membership total to seven. Inconsistent student attendance, particularly by undergraduate students, is one factor for the proposed change, but the committee members also felt that faculty are more invested in issues related to the libraries. Among the faculty members, it also seemed appropriate to more widely distribute disciplinary and collegiate affiliations. The current version of the charge seems to heavily favor the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, calling for one each of the five faculty members to come from the biological sciences, the humanities, the physical sciences, and the social sciences and one at-large. The committee has proposed that, among the suggested seven faculty members, three come from CLAS (one each from the arts and humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences) and two come from the health sciences. The remaining two faculty seats would rotate among colleges other than CLAS.

President Marshall explained that the process of charter committee charge revision involves seeking the approval of all four of the shared governance groups that contribute members to the committee. Two weeks ago, the Faculty Council approved the proposed changes to the charge, which has now come before the Senate. Professor Gillan requested clarification about the provided document, noting that revisions to the committee membership were contained in comments rather than within the tracked changes. President Marshall responded that the Council had voted to approve the revised committee membership concept, rather than specific wording. Professor Gillan requested that a final document be shown to the Senate once all approvals have been obtained.

Professor Harwani moved and Professor Janssen seconded that the tracked and conceptual proposed revisions to the University Libraries Charter Committee charge be approved, with the understanding that a final version would eventually be shared with the Faculty Senate. The motion carried unanimously.
President’s Report (Teresa Marshall)

President Marshall indicated that two central administrative searches are underway, for the Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel and for the Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine. The Faculty Senate’s Committee on the Selection and Review of Central Academic Officials has collaborated with the Faculty Senate officers to identify Senate representatives to nominate for the two search committees.

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

V. Announcements
   - The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 12, 3:30-5:15 pm, Zoom.
   - The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 26, 3:30-5:15 pm, Zoom.

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