

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

MINUTES

Councilors Present: M. Abou Alaiwa, B. Ayati, R. Curto, L. Durairaj, A. Farag, N. Greyser, J. Koch, C. McMillan, M. McQuistan, M. Santillan, D. Shane, A. Shibli-Rahhal, C. Vogel.

Officers Present: R. Curtu, E. Gillan, C. Just, C. Sheerin.

Councilors Excused: J. Gutierrez, J. Sa-Aadu, M. Schroeder.

Councilors Absent: J. Kline.

Guests: M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Geist (Office of the Provost), A. Guernsey (Faculty Judicial Commission), D. Jamieson (Vice President for Medical Affairs), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Koch moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 16, 2024) – Professor Santillan moved and Professor Greyser seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 17, 2024) – President Sheerin indicated that changes may be made to the draft agenda prior to the Senate meeting. Professor Farag moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Rodica Curtu, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Vogel moved and Professor Santillan seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - *The full list of appointments is appended to these minutes.*

III. New Business

- *Councilor and Officer Introductions*

At this first Faculty Council meeting of the academic year, Councilors introduced themselves and indicated their collegiate affiliations and length of time on the Council.

- *Denise Jamieson, Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine*

Vice President Jamieson thanked Councilors for their service in shared governance, observing that the interactive, representative governance structure at UI differed considerably from the much weaker governance structure at her previous institution. She noted that the academic year for new medical students began recently with memorable white coat ceremonies and commented that she enjoyed being at a medical school that follows the rhythms of the academic calendar and is well integrated into the university.

Turning to a brief update on UI Health Care, Vice President Jamieson stated that improvement of access to health care is one of the biggest challenges facing the organization. She emphasized that UI Health Care has an obligation to support care across the state, through treating patients, training the next generation of health care professionals, and conducting innovative research. Vice President Jamieson reminded the group that UI Health Care recently acquired Mercy Hospital in downtown Iowa City and has transitioned the hospital, along with many of the former Mercy employees, into the UI Health Care system. Also, UI Health Care will open a new hospital with an orthopedic focus in North Liberty, while a new in-patient care tower is planned for the main campus. Throughout this ambitious expansion of capacity, focus will remain on integrating all the UI Health Care facilities into one seamless health system. A new branding campaign aligns UI Health Care with the University of Iowa brand, as well.

Professor McQuistan asked about the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in patient care at UI Health Care facilities. Vice President Jamieson responded that one of the ways in which AI is currently used in patient care is to comb through the medical record to generate a summary of a patient's health history. Voice recognition to generate provider notes is another usage of AI in patient care. Both of these AI technologies are [HIPAA](#)-compliant, she added, and they do not replace the judgement of the physician. AI usage has also now been incorporated into the medical school curriculum, Vice President Jamieson noted.

Past President Gillan observed that the number of clinical-track faculty has grown in the Carver College of Medicine (CCOM), while the number of tenure-track faculty has generally remained flat. He wondered if this had caused any tension among CCOM faculty. Vice President Jamieson responded that the CCOM has followed national trends in having a smaller proportion of tenure-track faculty vs clinical-track faculty. The overall number of tenure-track faculty is not dropping in the CCOM, however, which is a testament to UI's efforts to preserve and promote the academic mission of the college.

Returning to the topic of access, Professor Farag asked about concrete measures undertaken by UI Health Care to improve access for patients, who sometimes wait months for appointments. Vice President Jamieson acknowledged that access is a complicated problem. More space for ambulatory care is needed, not just at the main hospital but across the Iowa City area and beyond. Staffing is also a significant component of the access issue. Recruitment and retention of qualified staff is an ongoing challenge. UI Health Care has increased usage of search firms, while also seeking to decrease usage of agency nurses and temporary staff. For some specialties, such as anesthesiologists, recruitment of highly-skilled individuals from abroad has

been a tactic. President Sheerin advocated for the role of shared governance in the development of strategy around recruitment and retention.

Professor Gardinier, representative of the Emeritus Faculty Council, asked if the political climate of the state had affected recruitment of staff and medical students. Vice President Jamieson emphasized that UI Health Care would follow the law. She added that prospective recruits are encouraged to come to Iowa so that they can make a substantial impact, by helping to solve issues related to access, to maternity care deserts, and to disparity in care.

- *Judicial Commission 2023-24 Report (Alison Guernsey, Presiding Officer)*

Professor Guernsey indicated that she has been in the role of the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Judicial Commission for about one year. She explained that her report today would be mostly historical in nature and should not serve as a predictor of future Judicial Commission activity, given the recently-enacted changes to the [Faculty Dispute Procedures](#). The Faculty Judicial Commission, she continued, is a [group](#) of no fewer than 30 members from the tenure, clinical, research, and instructional tracks who are willing to adjudicate two types of cases. The first type of case involves faculty members' challenges to UI administrative decisions that fall within the scope of the dispute procedures policy, while the second type involves the university's attempt to implement sanctions against a faculty member for a variety of alleged/previously proven behavior. Under the first category, a faculty member can bring a case relating to, for example, denial of tenure or the perception that a university action has negatively impacted the terms or conditions of the faculty member's employment. Under the second category, the university can initiate proceedings if there is reason to believe that a faculty member has violated a policy relating to, for example, professional ethics or academic responsibilities. Professor Guernsey emphasized that the utilization of the Judicial Commission is a very important and robust way for faculty members to check the university's power. She has observed that the Judicial Commission members who are appointed as panelists take their responsibilities very seriously.

Looking at historical usage of the Judicial Commission over the past ten years, the average case frequency is about one or two cases per year, Professor Guernsey noted. She predicted, however, that case numbers may rise because of the recent expansion of the Faculty Dispute Procedures to include additional faculty tracks. Professor Guernsey then very briefly described the recent work of the Judicial Commission. As part of her update, she highly praised the new Investigating Officer, Kristine Zayko, whose appointment to that position was [approved](#) by the Faculty Senate last October. This is the first time that the university has engaged the services of an Investigating Officer who is not a UI staff member and the new arrangement is working very well. She also praised the faculty panelists, who are called upon to do a substantial amount of work on very short notice.

Professor Guernsey commented that as part of her duties as Presiding Officer, she is sometimes asked to explain university policies to faculty members who are considering pursuit of a dispute. She does not provide legal advice, however. In concluding her report, Professor Guernsey reminded the group that, although a revised version of the Faculty Dispute Procedures policy has been adopted and more types of faculty members now have access to it, the policy still covers the same substantive grounds. President Sheerin pointed out that the dispute procedures

are not quite as robust for faculty members on the specialized (clinical, research, instructional) tracks as they are for faculty on the tenure track.

Past President Gillan reminded the group that the Faculty Senate has the responsibility of appointing faculty members to the Faculty Judicial Commission. Professor Guernsey encouraged Councilors to recruit faculty members from their colleges for service on the Commission. She added that, because of the infrequency with which disputes advance to hearings, most members of the Commission will not be called for service on a panel. When panelists are needed, however, it is very helpful for Professor Guernsey to have a large pool of potential panelists from which to choose, given the difficulty of coordinating schedules, etc. Diverse, broad, deep representation is also needed on panels, so that faculty members with disputes feel that their circumstances are understood.

Professor McQuistan asked if faculty members involved in dispute processes continue to work at the university until their disputes are resolved. Professor Guernsey responded that the answer to that question was generally outside the scope of her duties, but added that in her experience, in situations in which the faculty member has initiated the dispute, most likely that person is still working at the university. In situations in which the university has initiated the proceedings, the faculty member's interim employment status can depend on which policy is the basis for the proceedings. Professor Durairaj asked if faculty members from one particular college were predominant in the cases that occurred over the past ten years or if the cases were more widely spread among colleges. Professor Guernsey indicated that she was not able to provide an answer because case data was not coded for collegiate affiliation of the faculty member.

- *Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat Discussion/Reactions*

President Sheerin thanked those Councilors who were able to attend the Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat on August 21. She requested that Councilors form small groups to discuss responses to two questions. First, what were their take-aways from the event and what feedback did they have to offer the Senate officers? Second, consider the three themes of the retreat, messaging (especially to students and parents), community engagement (especially perceived barriers) and shared governance (at the university and collegiate levels). What action items come to mind, particularly regarding improvement of shared governance on campus?

Following their small-group discussions, Councilors shared their reactions. The first group praised the value of the information presented at the retreat, especially the data on national and local perceptions of higher education and on enrollment trends. Regarding shared governance, a more formal brief orientation for new Senators would be helpful, especially if the orientation were to include guidance on how to transmit information gained at Senate meetings back to collegiate faculty on a regular basis. President Sheerin reminded the group that the Senate's recently-created short [video](#) is ideal for helping orient Senators, as well as for sharing with colleagues. She pointed out that an orientation conducted during a Senate meeting only reaches those in attendance, while the video is accessible at any time. The Senate officers are also considering other methods of communication with Senators and the entire faculty, such as a newsletter and periodic *Iowa Now* articles.

The members of the second small group commented that communication strategies must differ by college. While some colleges have governance body or all-faculty meetings at which Senate information can be shared, this is not always feasible for larger colleges. For colleges without a history of shared governance, it can be especially difficult to generate interest in Senate activity. While a newsletter or *Iowa Now* article can convey a consistent message, identifying channels through which this message can travel remains a challenge. Past President Gillan encouraged Councilors to forward the future Senate newsletter to their deans' offices so that collegiate administrators can learn more about shared governance, as well. Group members also suggested that more time at Senate meetings be taken up with action items. While presentations by outside guests are informative, perhaps they do not need to consume the bulk of Senate meeting time. President Sheerin acknowledged this concern as one that she has also considered. Councilors observed that even the term *shared governance* is not readily understood by many faculty members. We must make efforts toward explaining this concept to our colleagues. In order to get more feedback from faculty colleagues on issues of concern to them, as well as to expand understanding of the Faculty Senate and of shared governance, President Sheerin suggested that Councilors and Senators host coffee hours or listening posts within their colleges. She further observed that in-person interaction with faculty colleagues from across campus is one of the benefits of serving on the Senate.

The third group commented on possibilities for having more in-depth, perhaps difficult conversations that would more fully convey the sentiments of faculty colleagues. The atmosphere for such conversations could more easily be achieved in a smaller body like the Council, in which Councilors could feel comfortable discussing challenging topics with each other. In the Senate, it can be difficult even to meet the other members of one's collegiate delegation. Perhaps relationship-building could be fostered in some way. President Sheerin contemplated the idea of creating cohorts within the Senate, so that Senators could cultivate relationships with other Senators over the course of the academic year. The fourth group commented that clarification about the extent of the Senate's influence within the shared governance structure might be helpful. Perhaps faculty forums could be held following Senate meetings during which informational presentations are given, so that a wider group of faculty could benefit from receiving this information. Councilors recalled that charter committee chairs had been invited to the Council in the past to provide updates on their activity; perhaps this practice could be resumed.

- *Dissolution of University Safety and Security Charter Committee (Caroline Sheerin)*

President Sheerin reminded the group that the [charter committees](#) are another branch of university-wide shared governance. Charter committees average about 11 members and are comprised of varying combinations of faculty, staff, and students. They focus on issues of concern to the entire campus (e.g., benefits, parking, research). Faculty Senate has responsibility for appointing the faculty members of the charter committees. The [general charter](#) for the committees provides for the establishment of new charter committees, when needed, and also for the modification (including disestablishment) of existing charter committees, if circumstances warrant such an action. Dissolution of a charter committee requires the approval of the shared governance bodies representing faculty, staff, and students. President Sheerin

indicated that today she was requesting that the Faculty Council vote on the proposed dissolution of the [University Safety and Security Charter Committee](#) (USSCC).

A shared governance review of the charter committees undertaken several years ago had revealed that several of the charter committees, including the USSCC, were having difficulty fulfilling their charges, due to various reasons, such as loss of focus. Around the same time, national events had precipitated the university's efforts to reexamine how campus safety and security practices were carried out. As part of these efforts, the Reimaging Campus Safety Action Committee was formed and eventually issued a [report](#). The three key findings of the report were *our current safety systems are not effective for many UI students, particularly the most vulnerable students; additional investment in mental health and basic needs support is essential to student success; and additional community accountability and transparency processes are needed for the UI Department of Public Safety*. One of the report's five recommendations called for the establishment of a presidential board focused on campus safety and accountability. This board would *center marginalized campus members and include members of shared governance and representatives of the broad UI community*. The Campus Safety Improvement Board (CSIB) has now been established. President Sheerin has been asked to participate as the representative of Faculty Senate. She directed Councilors to the CSIB charter in their meeting packet for additional details about membership on the board. Given the greater scope and membership of the CSIB and its overlap with the charge of the USSCC, the shared governance bodies are now being asked to dissolve the USSCC. The Senate officers supported the move to dissolve the USSCC, as did the shared governance charter committee review report.

Councilors sought clarification on the membership of the board as indicated in the charter document. Regarding the *recruited alderpersons*, for which two affinity councils at a time were allocated two-year terms for two individuals, it was unclear if the two representatives had to be one from each council, or if there could be two from one council and none from the other. It was also unclear whether all shared governance representatives served for one year, or if only the students served for one year while the others served for two years (consistent with other members of the board). And, does each shared governance body always have a member on the board, or does the composition of the shared governance component vary from year to year? Councilors expressed dissatisfaction with the rotating nature of the affinity council representation on the board; some Councilors felt that all the affinity councils should have representation on a continuous basis. Concern was expressed that populations most impacted by issues related to campus safety were also those whose representatives most frequently rotated on and off the board, thereby disrupting the institutional memory of the affinity councils. The suggestion was made that the affinity councils could set terms for their own representatives. Councilors indicated that they would like to have their questions regarding the CSIB eventually answered, but were prepared to vote on the dissolution of the charter committee today. President Sheerin reminded the group that the shared governance review of the charter committees had supported the dissolution of the USSCC.

Professor Santillan moved and Professor Farag seconded that the University Safety and Security Charter Committee be dissolved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Caroline Sheerin)*

President Sheerin announced that a significant portion of the September 17 Faculty Senate meeting would consist of a session on understanding academic freedom and free speech. The session is being conducted in conjunction with the Office of the Provost. Similar sessions for the entire faculty will be conducted from late September through mid-October.

A joint shared governance event is planned for September 24. Topics will include diversity, mental health, and academic freedom. More details will be forthcoming.

The October 8 Faculty Council meeting will again feature a Councilor roundtable, so please gather feedback from your colleagues regarding issues to bring forth at the meeting.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 17, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 8, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.

VI. Adjournment – Secretary Just moved and Professor Durairaj seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.

Appendix

Committee Appointments

Charter Committees

Rebecca Clark (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to fill the unexpired term of Alicia Ambler (ESL) on the Access, Opportunity, & Diversity Charter Committee, 2024-26

Carissa Vogel (Law) to fill the unexpired term of Erin Litton (Health & Human Physiology) on the Campus Planning Charter Committee, 2024-25

Mark Bruckner (Theatre Arts) to fill the unexpired term of Blaine Greteman (English) on the Hancher Auditorium Advisory Charter Committee, 2024-26

Faculty Senate Committees

Kay Hegarty (Accounting) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Chris Liebig (Law) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Dan Matheson (Health & Human Physiology) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Newell Ann Van Auken (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Faculty Council

Bruce Ayati (Mathematics) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2024

Christopher-Rasheem McMillan (Dance) to fill the unexpired term of Teresa Mangum (Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies) on the Faculty Council, 2024-25

Faculty Senate

Aron Aji (World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2024

Alison Guernsey (Law) to replace Ryan Sakoda (Law) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2024

Debra Trusty (Classics) to fill the unexpired term of Blaine Greteman (English) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25

Tom Arne Midtrød (History) to fill the unexpired term of Teresa Mangum (Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25

Adam Dupuy (Anatomy and Cell Biology) to fill the unexpired term of David Axelrod (Surgery) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25