

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, March 24, 2026
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: A. Achenbach, L. Adams, R. Alambert, B. Andrews, B. Ayati, J. Bunch, M. Dannenberg, A. Estapa, A. Farag, J. Geerling, A. Goedken, J. Goetz, B. Gonzalez, D. Greenwood-Sanchez, P. Groves, B. G'Sell, C. Hamann, A. Hasan, C. Hogden, E. Johnson, M. Knight, J. Koch, S. Larson, H. Metcalf, A. Miers, N. Mohr, B. Nottingham-Spencer, M. Ohl, T. Rietz, A. Ryan, M. Santillan, M. Schroeder, D. Shane, A. Shibli-Rahhal, W. Story, J. Streeter, K. Thiel, E. Thomas, D. Trusty, C. Vogel, K. Vogelgesang, M. Wald, E. Walker, S. Warren, E. Welder, K. Whitaker, J. Wilde, F. Williams, K. Worthington.
- Officers Present: R. Curto, N. Greysen, C. Just, C. Sheerin.
- Senators Excused: J. Bermick, E. Carlisle, N. Hamzeh, J. Kline, A. Panos, R. Peter, J. Radley, J. Simmons, J. Staber, M. Swee.
- Senators Absent: M. Abou Alaiwa, S. Abuhammoud, J. Barker, A. Bassuk, C. Benson, M. Bhatti, E. Destruel, A. Mangalam, P. McGonagill, C. McMillan, N. Pagedar, J. Sukalski, D. Tranel, A. Uc, B. Young.
- Guests: C. Aicher (Student-HESA MA), O. Akomeah (Student-HESA MA), M. Bruno (Division of Student Life), E. Decker (Student-HESA MA), J. Domatob (Student-HESA MA), Y. Dominguez (Student-HESA MA), M. G. Durham (Office of the Ombudsperson), M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council), E. Gillan (Office of the Provost Review Committee), A. Hanson (Office of the Provost), A. Harry Mills (Student-PhD interdisciplinary), A. Kearney (Student-HESA MA), E. Kelly (Student-HESA MA), S. Kim (Student-HESA MA), J. Luster (Student-HESA MA), C. Pass (Office of the Ombudsperson), A. Reams (Division of Student Life), C. Reese (Office of the Ombudsperson), B. Thomas (Office of the Provost), O. Young (Student-HESA MA), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office), one illegible signature.

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Vogel moved and Professor Walker seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (February 10, 2026) – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Metcalf seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Roxanna Curto, Chair, Committee on Committees) –
 - *None at this time*

III. New Business

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

Professor Meenakshi Gigi Durham, Faculty Ombudsperson, began the Office’s presentation of its FY25 [annual report](#). She explained that visitors are categorized by the Office according to their position at the university. In FY25, as is typical, the largest category of visitors to the Office was staff. Faculty comprised 24% of visitors (110 individuals). Students visited the Office in numbers similar to faculty. The visitor category of *other* refers to patients, alumni, parents, etc. Turning to the types of concerns that faculty visitors brought to the Office, Professor Durham noted that each visitor could be coded for more than one concern. The coding categories are based on the International Ombuds Association coding categories. The largest group of concerns related to evaluative relationships (34%), which could refer to one’s own supervisor or to the individual(s) that one supervises. The next largest group of concerns related to career (& academic) progression and development (21%). This group of concerns involved issues such as promotion and tenure. Peer and colleague relationships represented 13% of concerns. Within those larger categories of concern, sub-concerns could be identified, with the largest being communication-evaluative. Regarding faculty relationship types, 45% of faculty visitors had a concern related to someone to whom they reported, while 23% of faculty visitors had a concern related to someone who reported to them and 25% had a concern related to peer relationships.

Corey Pass, Senior Assistant Ombudsperson, continued the presentation, addressing faculty risk categories. He indicated that types of risk to the university and to the visitor are determined for each visit to the Office. Loss of productivity has frequently emerged as the most prevalent risk category for many faculty visitors and it did so in FY25, as well. The potential for internal/external grievance was the second most prevalent risk category and turnover the third most prevalent. The Office also analyzes each case for complexity. Mr. Pass indicated that complexity refers to the amount of work required by a situation in order to arrive at a resolution. Most cases in FY25 fell into the green category, meaning that the situations were relatively straightforward; there was a decrease in situations falling into the more complex yellow and red categories. The Office engaged in a variety of actions in support of faculty visitors, Mr. Pass continued. The most commonly-employed, at 39% of actions, was consultation/problem solving. Office staff helped faculty visitors to see their situation from many different angles, thus allowing visitors to make the best decisions possible for their circumstances. Coaching made up 19% of actions on behalf of faculty visitors last year, while listening came in third at 15%.

University Ombudsperson Chanelle Reese then described the types of services that the Office provided last year to faculty. Conflict/Dispute Resolution was the most commonly utilized service, by 38% of visitors. Information, utilized by 28% of visitors, was a service that involved review of university policies and procedures, and the gathering of information on behalf of visitors. Safe Space was utilized by 34% of visitors; the Office addressed visitors' concerns about sensitive information and confidentiality. Turning to faculty outcomes, Ms. Reese noted that 87% of situations were informally managed; this is the Office's preferred outcome. In 9% of situations, a formal process was chosen by the visitor. The provision of information only was the outcome in 2% of situations. In addition to meeting with visitors, the Office provides services such as 3Practice Circles/Group Facilitation, outreach events, and data trend presentations. Ms. Reese referred the group to the annual report for the Office's satisfaction survey results. She concluded the presentation by noting recent positive comments from Office visitors.

Professor Metcalf commented that through her involvement in other academic organizations she has heard of faculty members who currently feel vulnerable as a result of recent legislative and policy initiatives. Some faculty members have mentioned being the target of unwelcome comments or behavior. Professor Metcalf asked if visitors to the Office have described experiences such as these. Ms. Reese responded that some reports of this nature had reached the Office. The Ombudspersons have reached out to university leadership with requests to provide more timely information to faculty as circumstances evolve. Observing the Office's commitment to confidentiality, Professor Farag asked how situations in which multiple complaints arise from a single department are handled. Ms. Reese responded that identifying patterns of behavior and then determining what visitors would like leadership to know is usually the best way to proceed. Office staff can then try to approach the appropriate leadership about the patterns of behavior in a way that maintains confidentiality. If this is not possible, Office staff can make a more general presentation to the leadership, emphasizing that a particular theme is of special concern and should be addressed. A senator expressed concern about an overall visitor satisfaction rate of about 75% with the Office, although he noted the challenges inherent in the Office's work. Ms. Reese indicated that the satisfaction rate in recent years has ranged from the low 80's to the low 70's.

- *Office of the Provost Review Report (Ed Gillan, Chair, Office of the Provost Review Committee)*

Professor Gillan explained that, during his year as Faculty Senate Past President, he had been tasked by Faculty Senate President Caroline Sheerin with chairing the review committee for the [Office of the Provost](#). The other members of the review committee were Julianna Pacheco (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Dan Shane (Public Health), Amal Shibli-Rahhal (Medicine), Sarah Vigmostad (Engineering), and Carissa Vogel (Law). Bill Bernhard, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at the University of Illinois, served as the external reviewer. The Policy Manual indicates that [reviews of central administrative offices](#) should be conducted on a seven-year cycle; however, because of the pandemic and several interim appointments, the last review of the Office of the Provost took place in 2014. The review committee decided to limit their attention to the previous five years and focus on the topics of student success, faculty excellence, strategic planning, collegiate collaboration, and campus communications. Professor Gillan reminded the group that the Office of the Provost spans a wide range of campus entities and

initiatives, including the Registrar, the Center for Teaching, Hancher Auditorium, faculty development, undergraduate instruction, and many others, in addition to the colleges.

Throughout the fall semester, the review committee conducted nearly 30 interviews with collegiate leadership groups, senior university leadership, and Office of the Provost senior leadership and senior staff, among others. To gain additional feedback, the review committee distributed a Qualtrics survey to individuals who interact frequently with the Office. Members of the Faculty Senate and the Staff Council were also included among the survey recipients. President Gillan explained that two reports were then produced by the review committee, following Policy Manual rules. One report covers the central administrative office and becomes public when [posted](#) on the Faculty Senate website. The other report covers the central administrative officer and remains confidential, shared only with the university president.

Professor Gillan then highlighted several of the review report's recommendations. More timely guidance to collegiate leadership regarding externally-driven issues was emphasized. Engagement with colleges that reflected their needs, sizes, and level of dependence on university funding was encouraged. The report also supported the Office's efforts to implement new mechanisms to obtain internal and external feedback. Initiatives for faculty recruitment, retention and development were widely praised by stakeholders, who urged their continuation by means of strong support from the Office. Communication strategies around the P3 and SPARC funding opportunities could be improved to clarify what faculty- or collegiate-driven projects would qualify for support. Stakeholders suggested that the provost and senior Office leadership increase their visibility in order to inform the campus more widely of Office initiatives and successes. And, collegiate leadership expressed an interest in participating more fully in the development of strategies for crisis management. President Just thanked Professor Gillan and the entire review committee for their outstanding work.

- *Collaborative Care Model (Maria Bruno, Assistant Vice President for Student Life, Division of Student Life and Angie Reams, Associate Vice President and Dean of Students, Division of Student Life)*

Dr. Reams reminded the group that since 2013, the Division of Student Life has been sharing a student resource folder widely across campus. Recently, the Division has been looking into creating an interactive digital collaborative care model that can be accessed online. The model will illustrate all of the campus resources available to support students and will thus decrease confusion regarding where to send students in need. Dr. Reams emphasized that there is no need for faculty members to become experts on campus resources for students; assistance will be available to ensure that students are directed to the appropriate resource.

Dr. Bruno displayed the diagram of multiple campus resource offices that provide the majority of comprehensive care for student needs. She explained that this model was adapted from one created by Eric Wood, director of the Counseling & Mental Health Center at Texas Christian University. Here at the UI, Dr. Bruno indicated, the model will be used as a wayfinding tool for faculty and staff. Once the diagram is digitized, each office in the model will have a link to its homepage. Hovering over the office name will generate a brief description of the office's services. There are plans for the online diagram to be housed on the [Well-Being at Iowa](#) website.

Dr. Bruno added that plans currently call for moving Student Health and University Counseling Services from the west side of campus into the Iowa Memorial Union, specifically into the space where the Iowa House Hotel used to be. Also moving into that space will be Student Wellness, Student Care and Assistance, the Basic Needs office, and the program manager of the Well-Being and Mental Health Campus Collaborative. She emphasized that faculty members who are unclear where to send a student in need should send that student to [Student Care and Assistance](#) as their first stop. This office offers non-clinical case management; staff there will determine what resource(s) best fit(s) a student's situation. Dr. Bruno then asked for feedback on the comprehensive care model from Senators. She noted that several weeks ago the Faculty Council had suggested that a link to the diagram be embedded in course syllabi.

Professor Trusty asked how this model interacts with the Excelling@Iowa and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences student report forms. Dr. Bruno responded that her team will meet with the Excelling@Iowa group soon to address this issue so that operations can be streamlined. Professor Knight commented that she had recently had an experience with a student who was unable to advocate for themselves. She wondered how best to get resources to such a student. Dr. Reams noted that this is not an uncommon situation, unfortunately, but the resources listed on the model will take the initiative to contact the student. Past President Sheerin requested clarification regarding the purview of Excelling@Iowa. Dr. Bruno explained that [Excelling@Iowa](#) is a home-grown resource and a component of the [Pathways to Excellence](#) initiative, which enhances student success by contributing to institutional goals for retention and graduation. Dr. Reams added that Excelling@Iowa originated in a survey conducted with first-year and transfer students to identify early on the support services that a new student might need. She also observed that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has a pilot shared case manager with Student Care and Assistance.

Professor Worthington suggested that related resources (academic, mental health) be clustered together on the diagram. Professor Streeter suggested that the diagram be displayed on digital bulletin boards across campus and include QR codes. Dr. Reams noted that the diagram may also be included on the UI mobile app. Secretary Greyser praised the constellation of care resources offered by the university. Dr. Bruno suggested that staff from the Student Care and Assistance office be invited to the Senate to give a presentation.

- *Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility Policy Revision Overview (Roxanna Curto)*
Vice President Curto explained that the [Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility](#) (PEAR) policy originated in the 1970's and, despite various amendments over the years, has long been in need of a substantial update, especially since the introduction of new faculty tracks beginning in the 1990's. Recent revisions of other significant policies impacting faculty ([Faculty](#), [Faculty Dispute Procedures](#), [Ethics in Research](#), [Conflicts of Interest and Commitment](#)) have only increased the urgency for revising the PEAR policy, so that contradictions and redundancies related to those policies can be removed. Compliance with Iowa Board of Regents policies must also be ensured. Vice President Curto reminded the group that major policy revisions typically go through a process of shared governance review by the Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC), the Faculty Council, and the Faculty Senate.

As has occurred with several recent large policy revisions, a faculty/administrator working group was formed to draft a revision to the PEAR policy. Members of the working group are Deputy General Counsel Maria Lukas and Deputy Counsel Ann Byrd (Office of the General Counsel), Associate Provost for Faculty and Strategic Operations Barry Thomas and Senior Director of Faculty Human Resources Alaina Hanson (Office of the Provost), and faculty members Professor Lindell Joseph (Nursing), Professor Dawn Anderson (Law), and Vice President Curto (Liberal Arts and Sciences and Faculty Senate leadership). The working group has been meeting since August 2025.

The current policy is divided into sections describing responsibilities to students, scholarship, faculty and staff colleagues, the institution, and the community, Vice President Curto continued. Over time, many portions of the policy have begun to overlap with other policies. By December, the working group became convinced that this sprawling policy lacked cohesion and focus. The members reviewed a similar policy relating to staff and decided to reconceptualize the policy based on a new structure. Although she did not discuss specific revisions at this time, Vice President Curto did note that the detailed section regarding responsibilities to students will likely be removed from this policy and revised at a later date.

Shared governance participation in policy formation involves a “back and forth” process between the working group and the FPCC. When the FPCC reviewed the draft policy for the first time, members offered numerous comments, questions, and concerns, all of which were conveyed back to the working group for consideration. Vice President Curto anticipated that a draft policy will be brought to the Council for review on April 14 and to the Senate on April 28.

- *Executive Session*

There were no topics for Executive Session.

- *President’s Report (Craig Just)*

President Just had earlier sent individual messages to all Senators with these news items:

- The University of Iowa’s Charter Committee on Sustainability is launching Campus Roots, an initiative designed to recognize and celebrate sustainable practices across campus. Each year, the committee will select outstanding honorees and commemorate their contributions by planting a tree in their honor on campus.
<https://sustainability.uiowa.edu/campus-roots>
- UI Faculty Senator Hope Metcalf spoke about the Center for Intellectual Freedom at the February 2026 Board of Regents Meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/live/DiMBV-8bl4Q?t=29620s>
- UI Faculty Senator Kara Whitaker presented a study conducted by the Physical Activity and Women’s Health Research Lab at the February 2026 Board of Regents meeting: <https://www.youtube.com/live/gXJgDIlKIsI?t=6952s>
- Regents President Cramer and President Pro Tem Tjaden met with President Just on Thursday, February 19. The discussion included topics such as shared governance, academic freedom, the Iowa Legislature, and the Center for Intellectual Freedom. During

their visit, Regents Cramer and Tjaden also met with other faculty members and officials from athletics and health care.

- The Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee is reviewing proposed revisions to Chapter III.15, "[Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility](#)," developed by a working group of faculty and administrators. A brief update on the revision process will be provided at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 24. The goal is to have the revisions available for Faculty Council review in time for a vote at the April 14 meeting, followed by Faculty Senate consideration and a vote at the April 28 meeting.
- The Board of Regents Office is preparing weekly summaries of Iowa legislative activities relevant to higher education. These summaries (.zip files) can be viewed here: [BOR 2026 Legislative Summaries](#)
- The Faculty Senate's administrative review of the Office of the Vice President for Student Life is underway. A self-study and self-assessment are due to the review committee by March 27, 2026. Caroline Sheerin is the committee chair, with Craig Just serving as co-chair. The review is scheduled for completion by mid-December 2026.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 14, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 28, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Vogel moved and Professor Farag seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Just adjourned the meeting at 4:40 pm.