

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, October 25, 2022**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

Senators Present: B. An, B. Ayati, A. Brian, N. Brogden, J. Carlson, M. Carvour, C. Cherwin, M. Coleman, R. Cox, R. Curto, E. Destruel, L. Durairaj, A. Farag, S. Ganesan, P. Gilbert, B. Greteman, N. Greyser, J. Halekas, N. Handoo, B. Janssen, L. Joseph, A. Kalnins, A. Kitchen, M. Landsman, D. Langbehn, A. Lesch, B. Li, D. Macfarlane, T. Mangum, J. Murry, A. Prince, Y. Shi, A. Shibli-Rahhal, A. Strathman, C. Swanson, C. Turvey, T. Wadas, E. Welder, S. Young.

Officers Present: E. Gillan, T. Marshall, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Sheerin.

Senators Excused: D. Anderson, M. Charlton, C. Grueter, E. Hill, A. Jaynes, K. Parker, M. Pizzimenti, D. Santillan.

Senators Absent: M. Abou Alaiwa, J. Achrazoglou, K. Ait-Aissa, M. Bhatti, M. Cantrell, H. Dybevik, A. Estapa, J. Gutierrez, J. Kayle, J. Kline, V. Lira, S. Martini, C. McMillan, M. McQuistan, H. Mehdi, P. Nau, A. Panos, G. Pierce, C. Pinnaro, P. Polgreen, J. Sa-Aadu, M. Santillan, Y. Sato, A. Vikram, L. Zingman, M. Zmolek.

Guests: A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); C. Reese (Office of the Ombudsperson); E. Stresow (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); J. Troester (University Human Resources); J. Urmie (Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee); T. Villhauer (Division of Student Life); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez noted that a few adjustments were made to the agenda regarding the Sparkshop items after it was sent out last week. Professor Carlson moved and Professor Strathman seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (September 13, 2022) – Professor Farag moved and Professor Cherwin seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Committee Appointments (Ed Gillan, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Farag moved and Professor Strathman seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- John Achrazoglou (Teaching & Learning) to replace Martin Kivlighan (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2022
  - Polly Ferguson (Pediatrics) to fill the unexpired term of Saket Girotra (Internal Medicine) on the Faculty Senate, 2022-24

### III. New Business

- *Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee Update (Julie Urmie, Faculty Co-chair, Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee and Joni Troester, Senior Assistant Vice President and Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer, Total Rewards, University Human Resources)*

Professor Urmie indicated that this is her first year as the faculty co-chair of the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (FRIC). She has served on the committee for about five years. Professor Urmie explained that one of FRIC's tasks each September is to review insurance costs, make expense projections for the coming year, and consider recommendations for potential premium increases. Premium rate increases for medical and dental insurance will go into effect on January 1, 2023. This is the first time in many years that a premium rate increase will occur in our dental insurance. The premium rate increase for the medical insurance is about 6%, similar to last year's increase. FRIC has also reviewed and recommended some health plan design changes recently. For the 2022 calendar year, these recommendations led to coverage for digital evaluation and management (through MyChart) and to expansion of coverage for hearing aids. For the 2023 calendar year, FRIC reviewed co-pay, co-insurance, out of pocket maximum, and deductible amounts and recommended increases in some of these amounts for the first time in many years, after months of discussion and deliberation. Without these cost-sharing increases, premium increases would have been even higher for 2023.

Senior Assistant Vice President Troester spoke briefly about benefits related to the COVID-19 response during the continuing national public health emergency. She noted that the plan member cost share for treatment is waived. New pharmaceuticals are covered as they come onto the market. Testing and vaccinations are covered at no cost. Turning to the topic of flexible spending accounts (FSA), Senior Assistant Vice President Troester indicated that a new vendor, [Health Equity](#), will begin managing the university's FSA claims as of January 1, 2023. Currently, FSA claims are managed in-house. This vendor was chosen through a competitive process. A FRIC member served on the committee that chose the vendor. Health Equity will provide 24/7 customer service, an improved customer service experience (through the use of debit cards for the health care FSA), and faster processing of claims. Moving from in-house processing to the outside vendor is cost-neutral for the university. Messaging will go out to employees in November and December regarding the new vendor. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez asked about the rationale for the change to an outside vendor. Senior Assistant Vice President Troester indicated that employees have consistently expressed concern about claims processing times. Also, the use of debit cards for FSA expenses is now standard practice among other employers. Debit cards will not be provided for dependent care expenses, however, although Health Equity will manage these claims, as well.

Professor Urmie gave an update on topics that FRIC will focus on in the coming year. One of these topics is pharmacy benefits and the pharmacy benefit manager relationship. She explained that the university contracts with Wellmark to administer our self-funded health plan. Wellmark, in turn, contracts with CVS Caremark, a pharmacy benefits manager, to administer our prescription drug benefits. For some time now, FRIC has been discussing whether it would be more cost effective for the university to contract separately with a pharmacy benefits manager. This year, FRIC will investigate this issue more thoroughly. An outside workgroup will study the issue and bring recommendations to FRIC, which will then make its own recommendations. Additionally, FRIC will continue to monitor access and capacity for Level One (UIHC) providers. Plan design review will also now become an annual committee activity. Finally, FRIC plans to review our mental health coverage to ensure that it remains robust and to continue monitoring any new regulations that would impact our benefit programs.

- *Well-Being and Mental Health Campus Collaborative (Joni Troester, Senior Assistant Vice President and Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer, Total Rewards, University Human Resources and Tanya Villhauer, Assistant Dean for Well-Being and Basic Needs, Division of Student Life, Co-chairs)*

Senior Assistant Vice President Troester indicated that the university is now looking at well-being across campus, not just within certain sectors of the university population. She explained that last December, President Wilson had charged the Well-Being and Mental Health Collaborative with five tasks: *set yearly strategic priorities to embed well-being and mental health into all aspects of campus; lead collaboration to elevate and expand research, enhance partnerships, and identify gaps; develop and communicate a framework that supports employees' and students' success pillars; ensure well-being and mental health strategies are inclusive and culturally responsive; and develop key performance indicators and assess progress.* She added that the definition of *well-being* currently used at UI is *a process focused on life-long learning that promotes and sustains optimal health, personal connectedness, meaningful experiences, and a purposeful life.* These components also appear in the recent U.S. Surgeon General's [report on mental health and well-being in the workplace](#). Administrative sponsors for the Collaborative are the Executive Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Student Life, the Chief Human Resources Officer and Associate Vice President, and the Vice President for Research. At this time, the Collaborative's Steering Team membership includes six faculty members (some of whom hold primarily administrative appointments).

Assistant Dean Villhauer indicated that, for the first time, the UI strategic plan includes a well-being priority, [holistic well-being and success](#). The Well-Being and Mental Health Campus Collaborative has been charged with serving as the implementation team for one of this priority's objectives, *embed well-being and mental health into all aspects of campus culture to better support students, faculty, and staff.* The strategies for implementing this objective include *evaluate existing well-being programs, identify needs of diverse groups, create an inclusive framework of resources, increase access and awareness of resources, and expand curricular/co-curricular learning.* Assistant Dean Villhauer commented that, as the strategies are moved forward, the opportunity has arisen to interconnect and strengthen the current plans, programs, and initiatives that already exist, such as UI sustainability goals, shared governance priorities, DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion) goals and action plans, the Division of Student

Life strategic plan, the alcohol harm reduction plan, the anti-violence plan, and clinician well-being initiatives.

One of the resources that has helped the steering committee ground its work has been the [Okanagan Charter](#), Assistant Dean Villhauer continued. This international charter was developed specifically for post-secondary institutions. It provides a framework, a common language, a vision, principles and calls to action around embedding well-being into campus culture. It was developed by researchers, faculty, staff and students across 45 countries. Many institutions around the world have adopted the charter as a framework. The steering committee has sought to identify guiding principles that relate closely to Iowa values. Among the eight guiding principles are using *whole system approaches that embed well-being into the campus ecosystem and are focused on the whole person and ensuring a comprehensive and campus wide approach engaging with varied stakeholders from the campus community that include diverse groups of students, faculty, and staff*. In order to establish priority areas, the steering committee reviewed data from sources such as the Personal Health Assessment (for faculty and staff), the National College Health Assessment (for students), the Working at Iowa engagement survey (for faculty and staff), and the Campus Climate surveys (for faculty, staff, and students). The steering committee then established subcommittees around six areas of primary focus: food, nutrition, and movement; connections, inclusion, and purpose; substance use; built and natural environment; collaborative leadership framework; and mental health and resilience.

Turning to next steps, Assistant Dean Villhauer indicated that the steering committee is working on implementing its Year 1 critical tactics for the UI Strategic Plan related to holistic well-being. The components of the Strategic Plan are highly interconnected, so the group is seeking to collaborate with other implementation teams. Building on their efforts to document existing services, programs, etc. in their primary focus areas, the steering committee is striving to increase awareness of and access to well-being-related services. The group is in discussion with strategic communication staff to establish a well-being communication framework and web portal that would span the entire university community. Among accomplishments to date, the steering committee has formed a partnership with UI Staff Council and has expanded the online Kognito: At Risk training to focus on faculty and staff. Regarding this training, Senior Assistant Vice President Troester commented that we all have a role to play in providing support to each other and to our students, while emphasizing that faculty and staff are not expected to become mental health counselors. The At Risk training simply teaches how to recognize and inquire about student and staff distress. The program also teaches knowing and referring to campus resources and knowing one's limits and boundaries. The program is avatar-based and takes about 30 minutes to complete. By the end of September, 627 faculty and staff members had taken the program. After completing the program, participants indicated that they felt more confident about managing difficult conversations around distress and they also felt more competent directing distressed individuals to resources. She urged senators to take the training and to encourage their colleagues to do so, also.

Professor Mangum commented that there might be some overlap between the university's well-being initiatives and those being pursued in the local community, especially by the [Better Together 2030](#) initiative, which is led by the Iowa City Area Business Partnership, the Iowa City

Area Development Group, Think Iowa City, and the Iowa City Downtown District. Professor Carlson expressed disappointment that there appeared to be no alignment of the well-being goals with the university's core missions of teaching and research. He speculated that much student angst is precipitated by academic endeavors, such as not being able to graduate in four years, while faculty members may be distressed by the university's falling rankings or drops in the number of tenure-track faculty. Senior Assistant Vice President Troester responded that the well-being implementation group is working with other committees involved with faculty, staff, and student success because of the recognized impact on well-being of the university's core missions of teaching and research.

Professor Greyser expressed concern about increasing expectations placed on faculty. While well-being goals are laudable, there are still only so many hours in a day to get things done. Senior Assistant Vice President Troester commented that she hoped the well-being initiative did not sound like just one more service in which faculty members were requested to participate. She indicated that she would take this feedback to the steering committee. A senator added that heavy workloads generate additional stress for faculty members; perhaps this issue could be addressed in some way as part of well-being initiatives. Assistant Dean Villhauer commented that the steering committee would be looking at policy and structure modifications and other ways to remove barriers that cause stress. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded the group that we are still emerging from the COVID-19 crisis. We have just gone through two very tough years and faculty nationwide are feeling burned out. It will take some time for us to recover.

- *Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report (Chanelle Reese, University Ombudsperson)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez introduced new full-time University Ombudsperson, Chanelle Reese, who started her position on June 21. Ms. Reese began her presentation by reminding the group that the Office of the Ombudsperson *provides problem solving and conflict resolution services and serves all faculty, staff, and students*. The services of the Office are *confidential* (except in situations in which Office visitors report a crime or express the intention to harm themselves or others), *impartial, informal, and independent*. She indicated that among the actions in which the Office can engage are helping visitors to identify options, mediating conflicts, and making referrals to other campus resources.

Turning to visit data from last year, Ms. Reese indicated that there were 661 visitors to the Office during 2021-22. The largest percentage of visitors were staff, at 46% (40% of visitors were professional and scientific staff members). She expressed the view that the visitor profile should be more reflective of the campus community, however. With increased outreach to students from the beginning of their stay here, the number of student visitors to the Office should rise. The Office tracks the types of concerns that visitors bring; 55% of visitor concerns in 2021-22 related to *evaluative relationship issues*. This is consistent with other higher education institutions, Ms. Reese noted, adding that a visitor case can have up to four types of concerns associated with it. Among the evaluative relationship concerns, the issues that visitors most frequently mentioned were *communication, respect/treatment, departmental climate, and supervisory effectiveness*. Disrespectful behavior was experienced by 32% of visitors, Ms. Reese continued. Forms of disrespectful behavior include respect/treatment, bullying, and abrasive behavior. Turning to top concerns by visitor category, she indicated that the top concerns for

faculty were *communication-evaluative, respect/treatment – evaluative, departmental climate, consultation, and supervisory effectiveness*. Going forward, Ms. Reese indicated, consultations (in which, for example, a DEO reaches out to the Office for advice in dealing with conflicting faculty members within a department) will not be counted separately from Office visits. Most visitor cases carry some type of perceived risk to campus if not addressed; the category with the highest percentage (36%) of perceived risk was *loss of productivity* due to ongoing conflict.

Each year, the report identifies themes and trends of concern to the Office. For 2021-22, one of those trends was *bullying concerns involving residents, fellows, post-docs, graduate students, international scholars, and grant-funded staff*. The perceived bullying was carried out by supervising faculty members, physicians, and/or principal investigators in research labs. The Office has proposed addressing this issue through proactive coaching of principal investigators and faculty members on funding agencies' guidelines and sanctions on hostile work environments, as well as on the UI strategic plan's commitment to student success. Another trend related to *advisor-advisee relationships involving graduate students and their academic mentors*, specifically graduate students' fear of losing the financial or professional support of a mentor. The Office urged departmental Directors of Graduate Study to monitor the well-being of graduate students. The last trend was *interpersonal conflict in the health sciences and health care areas*. The Office speculated that pandemic pressures are likely contributing to this conflict. The annual report found that risks associated with these trends included lack of productivity, loss of personnel, loss of federal funding, and the potential for serious policy violations that could lead to grievances and legal action. The Office advocated for administrative proactive measures and widely-available mental health services. Ms. Reese indicated her intention to review the Office's data on a quarterly basis, so that emerging trends can be addressed more swiftly.

Ms. Reese concluded her presentation by citing more recent data on faculty concerns this year. Among non-tenure-track faculty members, concerns have arisen regarding assignments and schedules, especially regarding volume and appropriateness of work assigned. For tenured faculty, the top issues were consultations and the impact of administrative decisions that are not disciplinary in nature. Some other concerns have been scientific conduct, such as authorship and handling of data, and discrimination and bias.

A senator commented that, over the years, he has had several encounters with the Office of the Ombudsperson and has found the staff to be very helpful in resolving difficult situations. Professor Shibli-Rahhal asked if the bullying described among last year's trends was directed toward those with marginalized identities. Ms. Reese responded that the data collected did not indicate this. A senator asked how outreach to students to increase their usage of the Office would be conducted. Ms. Reese indicated that the Office would strive to undertake a public relations campaign to reach students, although resources for such a campaign are currently very limited. At this time, most students find the Office via a supervisor or faculty member. Dr. Stresow, who was in the audience, suggested integrating the Office into all types of orientations held on campus. A senator asked how the need of a particular population for the Office's services was ascertained. For example, perhaps students don't visit the Office very often because they

find resources they need elsewhere. Ms. Reese responded that graduate students and post-docs certainly tend to have more complex needs that the Office is well-equipped to handle. Undergraduate students, however, may have interpersonal conflicts, such as with roommates, with which the Office can still assist. Also, the Office can support undergraduates who are navigating the official resolution of a situation that has come through the sanction process in the Office of the Dean of Students. Professor Macfarland offered praise for the responsiveness and professionalism of Office staff, based upon his peripheral involvement in several cases. He requested clarification regarding how many cases last year involved a negative animus based on race or sex. Ms. Reese responded that the percentage last year was very low, but that may be because individuals experiencing such animus turn first to the [Office of Institutional Equity](#) for assistance.

- *Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee Report – Discussion of Recommendations (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded the group that at the last meeting, the Senate had voted to accept the [report](#) of the Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee and to allow the Senate officers to pursue next steps for possible implementation of the report recommendations. The Senate officers have been discussing these next steps among themselves and also with the Faculty Council at their October 11 meeting. The report recommendations fell into the categories of *dispute resolution procedures; composition of Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, and University committees; titles and ranks; length of term; roles; review and promotion; and morale*. Potential revision of dispute resolution procedures for all tracks is being pursued separately through discussions between faculty members, including Vice President Gillan, and administrators.

The Council focused on discussing the second set of recommendations, regarding the composition of the Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, and University committees, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez explained. Currently there are caps on the percentages of clinical-track (20%), research-track (10%), and instructional-track (10%) faculty who can serve on the Senate from each collegiate delegation. Councilors considered the pros and cons of increasing, eliminating, or maintaining these caps. Some felt that it made sense for the percentages of faculty tracks in each delegation to mirror the percentages of faculty tracks in the colleges. Or, perhaps the caps could be adjusted every few years as the ratios change. Faculty on one track may have difficulty understanding the needs of faculty on other tracks, so strong representation from all tracks would be helpful. Others noted, however, that instructional-track faculty may be concerned about expressing their opinions freely out of fear of retaliation (such as contract non-renewal), so the use of caps may still be justified. It is possible that improvements to the dispute procedures for instructional-track faculty may allay these concerns.

The Council indicated general support for making changes regarding track representation in the Senate, although a clear consensus on the specific type of change did not emerge, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez continued. Further discussion about these and other recommendations will continue to take place at next month's Council meeting. The Senate will eventually be invited to engage in discussion of the report recommendations, as well, prior to taking any votes

on the recommendations. To assist the Council and the Senate in their deliberations, the Faculty Senate's Committee on Rules and Bylaws will likely soon be asked to examine the issue of representation in the Senate constitution for all of the tracks. The Senate constitution requires that changing the percentage of clinical-track representation in each collegiate delegation needs a three-fifths, rather than a majority, affirmative vote. As an aside, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that one Councilor expressed concern that shared governance appears to be becoming less relevant at the university. At this Councilor's suggestion, the Senate officers may organize a forum on the value of shared governance next semester.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Sparkshop: Faculty Senate Survey Results (Anna Flaming, Director, Center for Teaching)*

Dr. Flaming reminded the group that at the last meeting, she and Bria Marcelo, Director of Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives in the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, had described how their two offices have been partnering to present a series of diversity, equity, and inclusion sparkshops to the Senate. At the last meeting, they had surveyed senators to see which topics would be of most interest for presentations this year. The top responses to the survey were *managing controversial topics, equitable assessment, identifying individuals in distress, and identifying and addressing microaggressions in the classroom*. Dr. Flaming and Ms. Marcelo are currently working on creating these sparkshops, which will be presented during the next four Senate meetings. In the meantime, however, they had received a request to present a program on the topic of *pronouns*, so a sparkshop on that topic would be presented today.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Sparkshop: Pronouns (Erin Stresow, Assistant Director, Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)*

Dr. Stresow explained that diversity, equity, and inclusion sparkshops focus on only one concept and provide for practice of one specific skill. The topic of today's sparkshop would be pronouns. The sparkshops use a *what/so what/now what* framework. For this sparkshop on pronouns, the *what* is *misgendering students and colleagues*. The *so what* could include *a lack of a sense of belonging, a negative learning environment, and isolation* for the individual impacted, and *a misrepresentation of values* for the speaker. On a personal level, the *now what* stage could include the "MAKE it better" framework: match language, apologize, keeep focus, and evaluate. Dr. Stresow posed the question of why pronoun usage was so important. After senators offered suggestions, she added that using the correct pronouns helps us identify others and create connections with them. Commenting on the frequency with which others use our name or pronouns in a single day, she emphasized how difficult it would be for an individual for whom the incorrect pronouns are constantly used. Using the correct pronouns is a sign of basic respect and helps create an inclusive environment on campus. Pronouns are not just words, she continued; they are attached to our identities, our experiences, and our sense of belonging.

Noting that language is constantly evolving, Dr. Stresow displayed a chart of pronouns, some of which were familiar and others with which senators may not have interacted before. Senators then took turns practicing unfamiliar pronouns in an exercise. Responding to a comment about the difficulty of even knowing names, not just pronouns, in large classes, Dr. Stresow advised simply using a person's name until you come to know their pronouns. Once a relationship has been built, it will be easier to remember a person's pronouns. In conversation with senators, Dr.



Stresow acknowledged that the variety of pronouns can be overwhelming. She also indicated that the new pronouns introduced today are gender neutral, but that a particular pronoun set may have a more specific meaning to the person or groups who choose to use them. In case you use an incorrect pronoun, she noted, it is acceptable simply to correct yourself. It is understood that people make mistakes. Our students and colleagues appreciate the efforts that we make to use their correct pronouns. Dr. Stresow went on to observe that some languages, such as Spanish, may be highly gendered while others may not even use gendered pronouns. She added that there is an ongoing debate between respecting pronouns and prescriptive linguistics. The latter refers to established rules for language, rather than actual usage of the language. Language evolves over time, Dr. Stresow reiterated. For example, the phrase “preferred pronouns” is no longer used, because one’s pronouns are not “preferred.” They simply *are* one’s pronouns. Also, the pronoun “they” has long been used informally to refer to a single individual. “They” can be a substitute until a person’s pronouns are known.

Turning to how to address misgendering, Dr. Stresow expanded on the framework (“MAKE it better”) she had introduced earlier. In order to match language, listen for the pronouns others use for themselves and then use the correct pronouns yourself. If you make a mistake, acknowledge it and apologize for it. Keep the focus on the person impacted by your error, not on yourself. Finally, evaluate and reflect on your actions, to determine if this was a one-time mistake or if there is a pattern developing. Dr. Stresow then presented a case scenario for senators to think about. She also provided suggestions for more practice with pronouns. There are various apps and websites that provide opportunities to practice different sets of pronouns. Also, you can “update your mental space” by thinking about a person using their pronouns. Use “they/them” for unknown persons. And, take the initiative by adding pronouns to your email signature and introducing your pronouns when you meet new people. Dr. Stresow concluded her presentation by alerting senators to her Office’s additional educational opportunities regarding pronouns.

- *President’s Report (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez observed that the campus community is still in various stages of recovery from the pandemic crisis. She reminded senators that they can always contact the Senate officers with any comments, concerns, or ideas. She also urged senators to share what they have learned at Senate meetings with their collegiate colleagues.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 15, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 6, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Farag moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.