

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 16, 2024
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Zoom

MINUTES

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

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

Councilors Excused: J. Gutierrez, J. Kline, M. McQuistan, M. Schroeder.

Councilors Absent: E. Welder.

Guests: A. Byrd (Office of the General Counsel), S. Fleagle (Information Technology Services), M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Geist (Office of the Provost), I. Martínez-Marrero (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion), R. Napoli (University Human Resources), S. Reddy (*Daily Iowan*), K. Shust (Office of the General Counsel), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Gillan called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. He noted that the Senate officers had decided to move the Council meeting to Zoom today because of the potential for severe weather.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – President Gillan noted that a change was made to the title of the second agenda item in new business after the meeting materials were sent out to Councilors. Professor Santillan moved and Professor Durairaj seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 5, 2024) – Professor Shibli-Rahhal moved and Professor Just seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 30, 2024) – President Gillan indicated that changes may be made to the draft agenda prior to the Senate meeting. He also observed that there will be two parts to the April 30 meeting, with election of officers (vice president and secretary) taking place in the second part. Professor Shibli-Rahhal moved and Professor Santillan seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Ed Gillan) – Professor Koch moved and Professor Santillan seconded that the Faculty Senate and Council election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously. President Gillan thanked the departing Councilors for their service: Professors Anderson, Mangum, and Welder.

- E. Committee Appointments (Caroline Sheerin, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Sheerin indicated that one additional appointment (Warren to Judicial Commission) was made after the meeting materials were sent out to Councilors. Professor Just moved and Professor Farag seconded that the revised 2024-25 committee appointment recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *AI: Overview and Our Response (Steve Fleagle, Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services)*

Mr. Fleagle prefaced his remarks by noting that he has been at the university for forty years and has found artificial intelligence (AI) to be one of the technologies for which it is extremely difficult to predict the trajectory. There are so many ways in which AI could potentially affect the university and higher education in general, as well as our larger society. The impact of AI could be truly transformational, in either positive or negative ways, he added. Mr. Fleagle then explained that AI is the use of technology to perform tasks that would normally require aspects of human intelligence, such as visual perception and decision-making. Most AI is trained on large data sets to learn patterns and then to use those patterns to predict what comes next. AI has a long history, going back to the 1950's, with periodic large breakthroughs. The release of ChatGPT at the end of 2022 made AI more widely accessible. ChatGPT is one of several large language models (LLMs). LLMs are sophisticated statistical models that predict probable word sequences in response to a prompt. Mr. Fleagle then used several simple examples to illustrate how word sequences can be predicted.

Data analytics is one area in which AI can be very useful, Mr. Fleagle continued, because of its ability to analyze large sets of data quickly and from multiple perspectives. In his observation, the university generates more data than we can analyze, so AI could be a tool for using data more effectively, whether in administrative or research activities. AI tools are continuously evolving, presenting numerous opportunities and concerns. Mr. Fleagle indicated that he advises those considering the use of AI in their work to “keep a human in the loop,” that is, to review the results of whatever task you have given AI. Studies have shown that when human intelligence is combined with AI, the results are better than those obtained from human intelligence or AI alone.

AI is already being used in many ways in university research, from healthcare to driving safety. Faculty are using AI in instruction and guidance, as well. The Tippie College of Business in particular has found numerous ways to incorporate AI into the student experience. Mr. Fleagle noted an Obermann Center [event](#) that took place in November featured faculty members in a wide range of disciplines speaking about their use of AI in teaching and research. In order to provide direction and guidance to the campus community about AI usage, several committees have recently been formed, Mr. Fleagle continued. About a year ago, university administrators formed an administrative AI committee, initially to review policy. The group is now looking at ways AI can be used to improve efficiency in administrative units. An academic AI committee, comprised mainly of faculty members, formed last summer in order to provide guidance to faculty and students regarding the use of AI in the classroom. A research AI committee, also

mainly faculty members, has been formed to study how AI could be used to enhance our research enterprise. The OneIT AI committee includes IT employees across campus who support the work of the other AI committees. The new AI Steering Committee, formed recently by Provost Kregel, includes members of the other AI committees. This new committee was charged with assessing campus AI use and future plans; describing the overall direction for AI on campus; and coordinating existing committees.

Mr. Fleagle then displayed a list of AI-related tools and resources on campus. The [AI web hub](#) on the Information Technology Services (ITS) website provides answers and guidance for common AI-related questions. [Copilot](#) is the generative AI model that ITS considers best for most people on campus, partly because it is free for the UI community and partly because users' information is protected. With other AI models, he commented, there is the risk that users' intellectual property will be absorbed into the model. The UI agreement with Microsoft for the use of Copilot specifies that no history will be kept of users' information. Mr. Fleagle noted that the websites of the Office of Teaching, Learning, & Technology, the Center for Teaching, and the Office of the Provost all have resources related to AI and teaching. The [Iowa Initiative for Artificial Intelligence](#) is another resource available to the campus community.

Turning to campus next steps regarding AI, Mr. Fleagle explained that the AI Steering Committee will be working with colleges and departments to assess their current and planned AI use. The Steering Committee will also develop an overall campus direction for AI. ITS will continue to assess emerging AI tools and update guidance for their use. Mr. Fleagle acknowledged that this is a challenging task because of the speed with which AI is evolving. UI is working with a group of other research universities on learning resources and training that can be offered to faculty, staff, and students. And, ITS continues to develop support models for AI users on campus.

President Gillan asked if examples of improper use of AI by students in coursework are archived anywhere, so that faculty members can become aware of and watch out for these techniques. Mr. Fleagle responded that this has not been done so far, but that he would convey this suggestion to the Office of Teaching, Learning, & Technology. Professor Mangum asked if there was data regarding how many UI faculty members have even attempted to use AI. Mr. Fleagle noted that there were about 700 responses to a faculty survey on AI in the fall. Around 8% of respondents felt that they were AI experts. Another 12% felt that they were advanced users. Over 50% indicated that they had never even tried it. Professor Mangum suggested that faculty members be provided with an opportunity to experiment with AI, so that they can begin to understand how it works. From this basic level of knowledge, they could then determine what they *do* and *do not* want to use it for. Mr. Fleagle indicated that the Copilot site includes a list of tasks with which a novice user might want to experiment. He suggested that brainstorming and drafting might be several of those tasks. He reminded the group that Copilot will forget all of the user's information once the program is closed.

Professor Santillan asked about the data security around Copilot. For example, could patient data be entered into Copilot? Mr. Fleagle responded that, although this data would remain confidential in accordance with the UI's agreement with Microsoft, the university has not yet

formulated policies around patient-related data and AI. Thus, he recommended that patient data not be entered into Copilot. However, this may be possible in the future, as the university's use of AI evolves. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez expressed concern about ethical issues related to AI, particularly the issue of bias. She recommended that faculty members with a background in the humanities and especially in philosophy be added to academically-related AI committees in order to address ethical issues involved in the use of AI. Mr. Fleagle noted that some humanities faculty members already sit on these committees, but he appreciated the emphasis on addressing ethical issues in AI with the appropriate faculty members.

Professor Shibli-Rahhal commented that a student had been putting clinical presentation data (not patient data) into Copilot, which then would generate potential diagnoses. She had reminded the student that diagnosis is a skill which doctors must master without the aid of a computer. Also, there are many nuances to diagnosis that written notes cannot fully convey. She commented that the Carver College of Medicine likely should develop AI-use guidelines that clearly indicate the benefits and the shortfalls of AI-assisted diagnosis. However, she was unsure where to begin to create such guidelines. Mr. Fleagle responded that her remarks were an excellent beginning and he offered to connect Professor Shibli-Rahhal with those in the Office of the Provost and the Office of Teaching, Learning, & Technology to assist with the creation of such resources.

- *Expanding Our Data Set: Belonging as a Factor in Employee Experience (Isandra Martínez-Marrero, Director of Cultural Engagement and Analytics, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and Rachel Napoli, Executive Human Resources Director, Organizational Effectiveness, University Human Resources)*

Ms. Napoli began the presentation, indicating that this year, there would be only one campuswide employee experience survey. In past survey cycles, she observed, faculty and staff had been invited to participate in both the Working at Iowa survey and the Campus Climate survey. With the 2024 cycle, the university will move to a single survey that will measure both engagement and belonging. There are several reasons why an integrated survey has been developed, Ms. Napoli explained. First, there is a critical need for data on the faculty and staff experiences. In fact, obtaining this data has been identified as a tactic for both the faculty success and the staff success components of the strategic plan. This data is used in decision-making at all levels of the university. Moving to a single survey is also a way to mitigate survey fatigue. Second, an integrated survey will permit a holistic understanding of work and belonging experiences. Employees who feel they belong are more likely to feel engaged at work, Ms. Napoli pointed out. Third, a more sustainable process to capture and disseminate survey data needs to be defined. Ms. Napoli reminded the group that during the last survey cycle, in 2022, the results of the Working at Iowa and the Campus Climate Surveys were released together with a cohesive message, although the surveys had been administered at different times. If this practice is to continue, then moving forward it makes sense to combine the administration of the surveys, as well. A combined survey would facilitate the clarification of messaging, streamline distribution, set a foundation for benchmarking in the future, produce a single data set for action planning, and shift focus from data gathering to data analysis and action planning.

Ms. Martínez-Marrero then described plans for the preparation and administration of the new integrated survey. She indicated that the strong “Working at Iowa” survey branding, highly recognizable to faculty and staff, would be retained. She continued, noting that the question set would be refined and streamlined to focus on the themes of work, belonging, and engagement. To elicit some preliminary feedback, the revised survey would be piloted with a group of faculty and staff prior to administration to the entire faculty and staff. The integration of the two surveys has been a collaboration between the Organizational Effectiveness unit of University Human Resources (UHR) and the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DDEI). The two offices will partner with the College of Public Health, specifically with [Professor Jacob Oleson](#), on analysis and data dissemination. Communication of the survey results to campus leaders will be simplified by the integrated survey’s generation of a single data set.

On specific aspects of the survey, additional partnerships will be sought with ITS and with UI Health Care. Ms. Martínez-Marrero noted that UI Health Care conducts its own engagement survey through a collaboration with Press Ganey. Some of the previous Working at Iowa survey questions have been incorporated into the Press Ganey survey. An Advisory Committee for the integrated survey has brought together representatives from UHR, DDEI, and shared governance to provide additional feedback as work on the survey progresses. Currently, the Advisory Committee is reviewing a draft question set. Soon, in collaboration with College of Public Health partners, reports will be designed and the pilot survey will be created. The integrated survey will be administered to faculty and staff across campus this fall. Reports will be created and distributed in the fall and spring. Immediate next steps call for sharing the survey overview with key stakeholders (currently underway), refining the survey questions (also underway), developing strategies to engage target audiences (faculty and staff) in order to maintain and even increase the typically high response rate, and developing guidelines and resources for data dissemination and action planning.

President Gillan noted that he is a member of the integrated survey’s Advisory Committee. He asked about the plans for the survey pilot. Ms. Martínez-Marrero indicated that the purpose of the pilot is to make sure that the questions are clear to respondents, to determine the length of time needed to complete the survey, and to ensure that all survey focus areas are covered. Secretary Charlton noted that it can be challenging to entice people to take a survey; she asked if messaging strategies are being considered to encourage responses. Ms. Napoli responded that the Working at Iowa response rate has typically been high, around 70%. However, that high response rate may not automatically carry over to the integrated survey. She appreciated the suggestion to carefully consider messaging strategies. President Gillan commented on the need to track survey responses over time to determine whether progress has been made. Ms. Martínez-Marrero responded that university leaders had indicated that they would like to benchmark UI data against data from other institutions. Originally, third-party survey products were considered, but then rejected as too costly. Some informal benchmarking will still be possible with the 2024 survey, but plans for the 2026 survey call for a more rigorous effort to benchmark.

- *Faculty Policy Revisions ([Policy Manual III.10](#)) (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan directed the group’s attention to the handout they had received which illustrated changes proposed to faculty policies for the specialized tracks (clinical, research,

instructional). These proposed changes came about as a result of the approval of the revised [Faculty Dispute Procedures](#) at the March 26 Senate meeting and as a response to concerns raised in the [five-year review](#) of the instructional-track faculty policy.

President Gillan then went on to describe the specific changes that are proposed. First, the structure of the faculty policy section in the Policy Manual has been altered. Currently, each faculty track has its own section in III.10. The proposal calls for a new section, *Specialized Track Faculty*, to be created within III.10, with subsections for the clinical, research, and instructional tracks. Several changes are proposed within the subsections for consistency across the three tracks. These changes include clarification that in all specialized tracks, the initial appointment is the probationary appointment and that notice of university decisions is delivered by email. Any language in the three specialized track policies referring to five-year reviews has also been deleted (because these required reviews have been completed). Proposed changes unique to the instructional track include the deletion of wording that non-renewal cannot be disputed in the first six years, deletion of wording that the dean or DEO can deny a promotion request, and deletion of the section on the track-specific dispute procedures (because the instructional track now shares revised dispute procedures, described in the Faculty Dispute Procedures policy, with the clinical and research tracks). All of these changes have been proposed in order to bring the specialized faculty track policies into alignment with the revised dispute procedures.

President Gillan then described changes proposed in response to recommendations made in the five-year review report of the instructional-track faculty policy. The report had raised a major concern regarding the stated absence of a notification period for non-renewal in the first six years of an instructor/assistant professor instructional-track appointment. This wording is being removed from the policy, replaced with proposed language providing probationary instructional-track faculty members with a non-renewal notice period of two months for the academic year and three months for the fiscal year. A six-month non-renewal notice period is proposed for all other faculty on the instructional track. The non-renewal notice period is another area in which consistency is sought across the specialized tracks, President Gillan emphasized. Current non-renewal notice periods for the research track are similar to the proposed notice periods for the instructional track, so no changes are contemplated for the research track. For the clinical track, however, a non-renewal notice period of one year is currently in place for clinical-track faculty who have served for two or more years. This maximum notice period will be reduced to six months, to maintain consistency with the other two tracks. Thus, instructional-track faculty will experience a policy gain as a result of the proposed revisions, while the clinical-track faculty will experience a loss. President Gillan noted that the revised notice periods will provide all specialized-track faculty with time to submit a formal dispute of a non-renewal while still in the contract period. Concluding his presentation, President Gillan commented that, when the instructional-track policy was first created, compromises were made in order to implement the policy. The five-year review has provided an opportunity to make substantial improvements to the policy. Professor Curto praised the positive changes proposed for the instructional-track faculty and thanked the Senate officers for their work on the proposed revisions.

Professor Shibli-Rahhal moved and Professor Curto seconded that the proposed Faculty Policy revisions be approved and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion carried unanimously.

- *College of Engineering Proposed Research Track Policy (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan explained that the research track was established at the request primarily of the Carver College of Medicine. At the time of its proposal, there was concern among the faculty at large that the track would grow at a rapid pace. A provision was inserted into the proposed university-wide policy, mandating that all proposed collegiate research track policies be approved by the Faculty Senate. No other track policy contains such a provision. Thus far, the Senate has approved research tracks for the Carver College of Medicine (2008), the College of Public Health (2010), and the College of Pharmacy (2011). Recently, the College of Engineering and the College of Education have worked with the Office of the Provost to write collegiate research track policies that are compliant with the university-wide policy. The Faculty Senate Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee has had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on both proposed policies. Engineering's proposed policy was vetted by their collegiate executive council with feedback from faculty in several departments and some center directors. Education's proposed policy was vetted through faculty, staff, and graduate student groups.

Professor Fox asked for clarification regarding the vetting process for Education. President Gillan responded that it was his understanding that feedback was sought in various ways, including through a survey and open forum, as well as from collegiate faculty shared governance and advisory bodies. Professor Koch, from Education, observed that the proposed policy seemed to have wide support throughout the college and that the college appeared to closely adhere to the required process for its development. Professor Fox commented that if the faculty in the college supported the proposal, she did not wish to impede the proposed policy's progress. Professor Mangum asked for clarification regarding the funding of research-track faculty lines. President Gillan reminded the group that the research track policy forbids the use of general education funds to support research-track lines. Research-track faculty must be supported by grant funding or by additional funds to which a college might have access. A tenure-track line, for example, could not be repurposed to support a research-track faculty member.

Professor Santillan moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the proposed College of Engineering research track policy be approved and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion carried unanimously.

- *College of Education Proposed Research Track Policy (Ed Gillan)*

Professor Shibli-Rahhal moved and Professor Santillan seconded that the proposed College of Education research track policy be approved and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for consideration. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan indicated that the administrative review report of the Office of the Vice President for Research has been finalized. He has received the report, which will soon be posted on the Faculty Senate [website](#). The review committee chair will give a brief summary of the

review report at the April 30 Senate meeting. President Gillan noted that the search committee for the new Vice President for Research has been constituted. Secretary Charlton will serve on the committee. And, the administrative review of the Office of the President is underway. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez is chairing that committee.

Some additional appointments to the [Faculty Judicial Commission](#) will be made later in the year to increase the specialized-track faculty membership on the Commission, in order to align with the revised Faculty Dispute Procedures.

Reminding the group of the first annual University Faculty and Staff Awards Ceremony, scheduled for Tuesday, April 30, President Gillan invited Councilors to attend the ceremony at Hancher immediately after the Senate meeting.

President Gillan concluded his report by noting that the Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat, which he had organized early in his presidential year, was just eight months ago. He thanked Councilors for their engagement, support, and advice over the past year. Because of their efforts and service, he was confident that shared governance was alive and functioning well at the University of Iowa! Vice President Sheerin led Councilors in a round of applause to thank President Gillan for his exceptional work this year.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Koch indicated that she would later communicate with the Senate officers about an issue that had arisen during the meeting.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 30, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Mangum moved and Professor Anderson seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Gillan adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.