

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, March 5, 2024
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: D. Anderson, R. Curto, L. Durairaj, A. Farag, C. Fox, N. Greyser, J. Gutierrez, C. Just, J. Koch, T. Mangum, M. McQuistan, M. Santillan, A. Shibli-Rahhal.

Officers Present: M. Charlton, E. Gillan, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Sheerin.

Councilors Excused: D. Shane, E. Welder.

Councilors Absent: J. Kline, J. Sa-Aadu, M. Schroeder.

Guests: A. Byrd (Office of the General Counsel), L. Geist (Office of the Provost), S. Reddy (*Daily Iowan*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Koch moved and Professor Fox seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (January 23, 2024) – Professor Shibli-Rahhal moved and Professor McQuistan seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 26, 2024) – President Gillan indicated that changes may be made to the draft agenda prior to the Senate meeting. Professor Mangum moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Caroline Sheerin, Chair, Committee on Committees) – President Gillan reminded the group that several years ago a public-private partnership with Engie, a utilities firm, was established. Proceeds from the agreement were to be placed in an endowment and directed toward the university’s strategic initiatives. A three-person board, one member of which is appointed by the Faculty Senate, was formed to manage the funds in this endowment. Professor Tom Rietz (Finance) has just finished his four-year term on the board. Professor Fox moved and Professor Just seconded that the committee appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - Erik Lie (Finance) to the [UI Strategic Initiatives Fund](#) Board of Directors, 2024-28

III. New Business

- *Faculty Dispute Procedures (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan presented Councilors with a proposed revised version of the [Faculty Dispute Procedures](#), a crucial faculty-related policy in the UI Policy Manual. The dispute procedures have been in existence for decades and constitute faculty members' last UI due process option when engaged in a dispute with university administrators. Although annually only a couple of cases advance through the entire dispute process, the existence of the procedures protects faculty rights and provides an incentive for both parties to negotiate solutions to disputes.

Although this is the first time that Councilors viewed the text of the proposed revised policy, President Gillan had updated them on the progress of the revision several times, most recently at the January 23 Council meeting, during which he displayed flow charts illustrating the policy's provisions. Directing the group to the overview of the revision process that had been distributed earlier, President Gillan reminded Councilors that the revision had been carried out over the past three years by a work group comprised of faculty members and administrators (President Gillan, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee Chair Professor Witt, former Senate president Professor Daack-Hirsch, Associate Provost for Faculty Geist, Deputy General Counsel Lukas, and Deputy Counsel Byrd).

Reviewing information that he had presented at the last Council meeting, President Gillan indicated that the current version of the dispute procedures applies to two of the university's four faculty tracks, the tenure track and the clinical track. As a result of this proposed revision, however, two streams of procedures have emerged. One stream applies only to the tenure track and remains largely similar to the original procedures. Tenure-track faculty members could initiate a grievance on various grounds, while administrators would use the dispute procedures to enforce a sanction against a faculty member, such as for [Unacceptable Performance](#). The other stream applies to the clinical, research, and instructional tracks (collectively referred to as the *specialized tracks*) and is based on procedures developed for the instructional track policy, although modifications were made to accommodate concerns raised in the report of the instructional track policy five-year review committee. One of these modifications was a new provision allowing for members of peer review committees to be drawn from the Faculty Judicial Commission in a process similar to that available to the tenure-track faculty (members of the peer review committee had been appointed by the provost in the original version of these procedures). Specialized faculty members could use the procedures to dispute an administrative decision. The Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) has been reviewing the proposed revision for several months. Most recently the committee offered edits to the draft text and approved this current version of the draft last week.

President Gillan reminded the group that at the last meeting, he had reviewed key changes to the procedures for the tenure track, along with differences between the new procedures for the specialized track vs the current instructional track procedures. That information was again provided in the group's handout today. He suggested that those two lists could help Councilors explain the key points in the proposed revision to faculty in their colleges. In response to a question, he indicated that, as a result of the revision, the dispute procedures currently inserted

into the instructional track policy will be removed, replaced with a link to the new procedures. Links will need to be corrected in various community policies, as well.

Professor Just expressed appreciation for President Gillan's efforts across multiple meetings to prepare Councilors for a decision on whether to approve the proposed revised policy. He commented, however, that Senators might feel less prepared than Councilors to cast their votes at the next Senate meeting. He wondered how the Senate could be provided with more information. President Gillan noted that Senators would receive all the background documents that Councilors have received, but acknowledged that Senators would have to rely, to some extent, on trust that the work group and the FPCC had done extensive work to shape a revision of this complicated policy that was acceptable to faculty. He added that the proposed revised policy was intended to be a "living document," to be amended when necessary. A five-year review of the procedure stream for the specialized faculty is already mandated in the proposed revision.

Professor Mangum commented that it is important to explain to Senators what problem was solved through revising this policy. President Gillan observed that administrators had sought more standardized dispute procedures, thus leading to the proposed consolidation of the procedures into two streams. Also, both faculty members and administrators would benefit from streamlining and clarifying the dispute processes. And, it was necessary to make updates to this long-standing policy to conform to current practices (email message vs. certified letter, for example, as the method for notification of university decisions). Professor Just found the revision timeline to be reassuring evidence of a robust and thorough process, but agreed with Professor Mangum that an explanation of the problems this revision solved would be most relevant to Senators. Councilors suggested that this explanation take the form of a bulleted list. The Senate officers indicated that they would work on creating a list for the Senate meeting.

President Gillan observed that faculty members had engaged in a long process of negotiation and compromise with administrators in order to create this proposed revision. Vice President Sheerin added that instructional-track faculty members, through the review of the instructional track policy, had advocated for improvements to their dispute procedures, while administrator concerns had precipitated changes to the dispute procedures for the other tracks. She emphasized that the revision effort was a shared governance process, involving both faculty members and administrators. Professor Curto suggested that a Senate officer make a presentation to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly regarding the proposed revision, especially considering the large number of instructional-track faculty in that college.

Professor Curto moved and Professor Just seconded that the proposed revised faculty dispute procedure policy be moved forward for the Faculty Senate's consideration. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan indicated that the first review of the Office of the President since 2003 has begun. Faculty Senate is responsible for coordinating periodic reviews of central administrative offices and administrators, he explained. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez is chairing the review committee. Review committee members include two members of the Faculty Senate's Committee on the Selection and Review of Central Academic Officials, Craig Just (Civil & Environmental Engineering) and Michael Sauder (Sociology & Criminology), along with Dawn Anderson (Law), David Hensley (Management & Entrepreneurship), and Michelle McQuistan (Preventive & Community Dentistry). The external reviewer is Jon Steadland, Chief of Staff, Office of the President, University of Minnesota. The review of the Office of the Vice President for Research, meanwhile, is nearing completion. President Gillan noted that Vice President for Research Scholtz had recently announced that he was stepping down from that position. Thus, a search will likely soon be launched for his replacement.

The [UI 24/7 Support and Crisis Line](#), in partnership with CommUnity Crisis Services, has now been expanded to all faculty, staff, and postdocs. This service has been available to students since Fall 2021. President Gillan indicated that he would forward a flyer to Councilors to distribute and post.

President Gillan concluded his report by noting that the DEI Task Force, of which he is a member, is continuing its review of UI DEI programs; a new university faculty/staff awards ceremony will take place at Hancher on April 30, following the last Faculty Senate meeting; and, as they do every spring, the Senate officers continue to monitor relevant legislative activities.

- *Councilor Roundtable Discussion (All Councilors)*

President Gillan reminded the group that he had recently sent them questions to consider for discussion during the roundtable. Many of the questions had concerned communication with faculty constituents, especially to transmit information acquired at Council and Senate meetings. Relatedly, President Gillan had asked about Councilor/Senator interactions with collegiate shared governance bodies. It is important to demonstrate to faculty the value of shared governance at both the collegiate and the university levels, he had emphasized.

Professor Just commented that he had recently reported on Senate activity at an Engineering Faculty Council meeting. To his knowledge, this was the first time that such a report had been made. Councilors observed that other colleges do not have collegiate shared governance bodies, or that the activities of these bodies have a narrow focus. Associate Provost for Faculty Geist indicated that the Collegiate Executive Committee in the Carver College of Medicine is the governing body in the college from the faculty perspective, although the committee's primary role has been distilled to promotion and tenure. Professor Gutierrez advocated for the creation of a periodic formal Senate report that could be shared widely with faculty. This report could include links to offices and services mentioned in the report. Professor Koch commented that, at her previous institution, minutes of Senate meetings were sent out to all faculty. President Gillan noted that we do not do that here, but that the approved Council and Senate minutes are [posted](#) on the Senate [website](#). Since many Senators within a college may not have met before, the Senate could try to foster introductions within collegiate delegations, he

added. Professor Anderson suggested that, at the first Council and Senate meetings of the year, the Senate president could provide an overview of the expectations for and responsibilities of Councilors and Senators.

Professor Santillan noted the utility of *The Loop* for getting news and information to UI Health Care employees and suggested that this could be another venue for providing easily digestible bits of information about Senate activities. Professor Curto commented that the *Iowa Now* could be another periodic venue for Senate information. Professor Koch followed up on Professor Santillan's point that information on Senate activities provided to faculty be more digestible than what is found in the meeting minutes – perhaps a list of bullet points, for example.

Secretary Charlton commented that her collegiate delegation has begun meeting with their dean, who may then put them on the agenda at collegiate faculty meetings to provide updates on Senate activity. Professor Shibli-Rahhal noted that her dean has invited the collegiate Councilors to a dinner. Professor Anderson emphasized that increased visibility for Senate activity would lead to greater appreciation for shared governance among faculty. Secretary Charlton added that we must influence collegiate culture so that service on Senate is seen as prestigious and important. Vice President Sheerin remarked upon the university's siloed structure, in which faculty members identify with their colleges, rather than with the university as a whole. Senate service makes cross-collegiate connections possible, as well as fosters an identification with the wider university. Secretary Charlton concurred that this exposure to faculty across the university is one of the benefits of Senate service. The Senate officers encouraged additional suggestions for communicating widely with faculty members.

President Gillan had also requested that Councilors bring up any new or ongoing concerns from their faculty constituents. Professor Gutierrez shared concerns brought up via email by Professor Welder, who was unable to attend today. Professor Welder's concerns related to health care provider shortages in the community and to the challenges of faculty recruitment. Professor Gutierrez concurred with Professor Welder's observation that morale seems to have improved in their college; she speculated that the new dean's efforts to facilitate communication were contributing to the morale boost. Professor Gutierrez also expressed the view that the recent UIHC merger with Mercy Hospital has been managed well. Professor Santillan commented that faculty recruitment appears to be a challenge across the university. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez noted that Professor Welder's concerns could help frame the Council's conversation with Carver College of Medicine Dean Jamieson, who will be a guest at the April Council meeting.

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

V. Executive Session

- Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Recipients
- Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service Recipients

Professor Durairaj moved and Professor Farag seconded that the Faculty Council move into executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

President Gillan announced the 2024 recipients of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service. He reminded the group that this information is confidential until the public announcement at the March 26 Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Anderson moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the Faculty Council move out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 26, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 16, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.

VII. Adjournment – Professor Curto moved and Professor Durairaj seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Gillan adjourned the meeting at 4:45 pm.