

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, December 2, 2014**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present:** P. Abbas, F. Abboud, M. Adamek, S. Ali, A. Amendola, C. Benson, M. Blumberg, J. Buatti, T. Burstain, S. Campo, D. Caplan, S. Daack-Hirsch, B. Eckstein, A. Ersig, N. Fethke, C. Fox, E. Gillan, J. Iverson, Z. Jin, N. Langguth, G. Lee, K. Light-McGroary, T. Mabry, W. Maury, J. McNamara, P. Muhly, D. Murry, J. Murry, M. Nikolas, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, Y. Sato, D. Segaloff, L. Segre, S. Seibert, P. Snyder, C. Sponsler, L. Storrs, C. Swan, B. Thompson, T. Treat, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, T. Yahr, E. Ziegler.
- Officers Present:** C. Bohannon, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused:** J. Bates, P. Brophy, J. Colgan, D. Dawson, F. Durham, J. Foote, T. Havens, A. Kwitek, U. Mallik, A. Merino, R. Rocha, P. Romitti, J. Wang, R. Williams.
- Senators Absent:** S. Baker, K. Brown, G. Buettner, D. Drake, K. Glenn, K. Kieran, J. Klesney-Tait, A. Lee, W. Schmidt, H. Udaykumar.
- Guests:** J. Brennan (Vice President for Strategic Communication), J. Cox (History), R. Fumerton (Philosophy), S. Johnson (Office of the Ombudsperson), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
  - A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Treat moved and Professor Snyder seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
  - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (October 28, 2014) – Professor Treat moved and Professor Ali seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
  - C. Committee Appointments (Christina Bohannon, Chair, Committee on Committees)
    - Kristian Markon (Psychology) to replace Songhai Chen (Pharmacology) on the Faculty Staff Parking Appeals Committee, 2014-16Professor Campo moved and Professor Ali seconded that the appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
  - D. Faculty Senate Elections 2015 Vacancy Tally – President Thomas reminded the group that in April the Senate had voted to allow research-track faculty members representation in the Faculty Senate. The vacancy tally includes the 30 research-

track faculty members in the voting pool. All of those research-track faculty members are in the Carver College of Medicine. Professor Abboud moved and Professor Campo seconded that the Faculty Senate Elections 2015 Vacancy Tally be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

- *Bruce Rastetter, President, Board of Regents, State of Iowa*

President Thomas introduced Bruce Rastetter, President of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. President Rastetter was appointed to the Board by Governor Branstad in 2011 and elected as the 18th President of the Board of Regents in June 2013. He is a graduate of the University of Iowa. More specifically, President Rastetter is an alumnus of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, having majored in Political Science. Following graduation, he returned to his north-central Iowa home and has become a highly successful entrepreneur. He is currently the CEO of Summit Group, which grew out of his early farming enterprises, and now has broad interests including agriculture, renewable energy and international development. President Thomas also welcomed President Pro-tem Katie Mulholland, the superintendent of nearby Linn-Marr School district and a recent Iowa Superintendent of the Year. She has served as President Pro Tem of the Board of Regents since 2013. And, President Thomas welcomed Regent Hannah Walsh, the student regent from the University of Iowa, who would be joining the group after class.

President Thomas noted that President Rastetter and other Board members have been accessible and willing to engage with faculty leadership and also with faculty more broadly. She added that, while there has not always been agreement, the Regents' ongoing willingness to listen to the faculty perspective on the critical issues facing our campus was appreciated.

President Rastetter began his remarks by noting that the university has a long and strong tradition of shared governance, including active engagement with the Board of Regents. He indicated his commitment to following in that tradition. He looked forward to today's dialogue, as a way to continue to work together with faculty to build a stronger university, for the benefit of Iowans and people around the world. He stressed that he would like to thank each senator for the multi-faceted work they do to contribute to the university's success. In spite of this success, President Rastetter expressed the opinion that the university could do better. He challenged the faculty to help lift UI into the ranks of the top ten public universities. He asked the faculty for their suggestions on how to achieve this goal.

Vice President Bohannon indicated that she appreciated President Rastetter's remarks recognizing and valuing faculty research, but she noted that the performance-based funding model, according to which state appropriations are to be divided, allocates only 5% for research, while 60% is allocated for in-state enrollment. She questioned how the goal of rising in the ranks of research universities could be reconciled with the funding model. President Rastetter reminded the group that several years ago when he had first joined the Board, the universities had been experiencing funding losses, which had not been restored when economic conditions improved. In the past three years, however, state funding has finally increased. He noted that when state support drops, tuition rises, leading to increases in student debt and threats to accessibility and affordability. He pointed out that the performance-based funding model

allocates 40% to categories such as progress to degree and degree attainment, areas in which UI already excels. Because the Regents institutions are public universities, they should remain accessible to all Iowans. He stressed that the model only applies to state funding, not to tuition or research revenue. The model did not originally allocate funding based on graduate and professional students, but after input from the Faculty Senate officers, 5% was allocated to this category. He added that while the existing funding model, that simply allocated funds 40% to UI, 40% to ISU, and 20% to UNI, may have been appropriate in the past, the recent drop in resident students at UI and the large rise in resident students at ISU have required the creation of a new model, to allocate resources more fairly.

The Board still remains committed to the recruitment of out-of-state and international students. The Board has also supported the construction of several new residence halls on the UI campus, partly because first-year students who live on campus are more likely to return to campus for their sophomore year. President Rastetter added that the Regents have requested an additional \$12.9 million from the legislature to backfill UI's budget. He projected that if the Regents' budget request is successful, UI will experience a 4.3% increase in state appropriations next year. He encouraged faculty members to work with the Regents toward this goal. UI is projected to add 5,000 more students over the next few years. This enrollment growth will provide resources to help propel the university upward in the national rankings for public institutions.

A senator observed that in the Regents' appropriations request, there is language indicating that the performance-based model is designed to incent the universities to achieve the objectives of the Board and of the state. Given that President Rastetter's comments seemed to indicate that the Regents were pleased with UI overall, she questioned what objectives UI was being incented to achieve. President Rastetter responded that the Regents needed to keep in mind their responsibilities to the state, which includes treating all three universities fairly. He added that this responsibility requires having a percentage of state taxpayer dollars follow Iowa students into Iowa's public universities. He reminded the group that both the College of Law and the Tippie College of Business were recently able to increase their enrollments, through the recruitment efforts of faculty members. Also, UI scholarship funds totaling \$20 million are available today that weren't available a year ago. He commented that all three institutions have room for improvement in areas such as degree completion and time to graduation. Helping students graduate on time, by making sure that required classes are available, could make a significant impact on student debt. President Rastetter indicated that the Regents plan to revisit the performance-based funding model every year. If there are unintended consequences, then changes can be made. There have clearly been unintended consequences of the existing funding model, however.

Professor Treat expressed her appreciation for President Rastetter's appearance today. She indicated that she was gravely concerned about the effect of the performance-based funding model on the relations among the three universities, on the state's private colleges, and on the citizens of Iowa. She also said that, because of the funding model's heavy emphasis on undergraduate enrollment, she felt that she was working in a state that devalued professional training and research, activities on which she, and many other faculty members, spend 40% of

their time. Although she was not opposed to performance-based funding in principle, she commented that the values of this particular model were out of sync with what we would want for higher education in the state, making UI a demoralizing place to work at this time. President Rastetter responded that this was an unfortunate reaction, because this was certainly not the goal or perspective of the Board. He reminded the group that the total budget for all three institutions was \$3.8 billion. The allocation from the state is \$510 million. The funding model only allows for a 2% shift in resources per year. He expressed doubt that UI would ever experience the projected loss of funds because it would fare well in competition.

On the other hand, President Rastetter continued, the Board has a responsibility to address the issue of undergraduate student dollars. After the last seven years, with the rise in resident students at ISU and the drop at UI, UI now receives \$13,400 per resident student, ISU receives \$8,800 per resident student, and UNI receives \$8,200 per resident student. Thus, ISU is punished for its success in recruiting resident students. President Rastetter added that the Board would re-visit the model if it appears that the institutions do not have the resources to support their programs. He noted that about 5,000 high school graduates leave the state annually to continue their education elsewhere. The Board also supports the articulation agreements between the universities and the community colleges, an arrangement that facilitates affordability and accessibility. And, the Board will continue to ask the legislature for the resources to grow all three universities.

Referring to President Rastetter's earlier remark that he would like to see UI enter the ranks of the top ten public research universities, a senator asked him to explain what that means to him, noting that universities are rated according to quality of the faculty, quality of the students, etc. President Rastetter responded that it refers to a dental school that graduates about 70% of the dentists in Iowa, and a medical school that is one of the top twenty in the country and provides high quality doctors for the state. He added that the Board does not get involved in allocating resources within the university, but instead, for example, responds to the university's requests for new facilities, such as the proposed pharmacy building, which will significantly impact the College of Pharmacy in many positive ways. The senator pressed for an explanation of how to reach top ten status based on the new funding model, which takes resources away from UI. President Rastetter responded that one way to reach that goal was to grow the university overall through increased enrollment.

Professor Seibert expressed concern regarding how to grow the university while focusing recruitment efforts on a fixed pool of resident students. He added that it would not be desirable for no Iowa students to leave the state to attend college, so the alternatives would be to recruit students from outside the state or to take students from the other Iowa universities. The latter option would create competition among the Iowa schools. President Rastetter commented that in the Board's budget request to the legislature, UI would receive more money than it did last year. He added that UI is being asked to compete in a very small way, so that it maintains the mission of an Iowa public university using state tax dollars. No tuition dollars will be affected by the model. Increased infrastructure needs generated by this recruitment effort will most likely be supported by the Board.

Professor Seibert commented that the financial loss to UI through the new funding model shouldn't be minimized. He calculated that this was a 21% reduction in state funds for UI. If about one third of the university's budget comes from the state, then this is a 7% budget reduction to the general education fund for UI. Even if the university receives the requested \$12.9 million, that would only cover one year. Under the budget model, the university would then continue to lose 7% of its funding each year thereafter. President Rastetter responded that he expected the university to improve in various categories under the funding model, so that it would not lose so much funding. The Board would also not hesitate to ask the legislature for additional funding in future years. He added that the Board does not expect that UI will actually experience the projected \$47 million loss in funding.

Observing that each of the three universities has its own characteristics and strengths, a senator noted that different strengths require differing levels of financial resources. He asked if creating one model for all three institutions for the sake of fairness would destroy the uniqueness of each institution. President Rastetter responded that he did not think this would happen because only a small part of the institutions' budgets would be affected. He reiterated that the Board has a responsibility to make sure that some state dollars go towards Iowa students. Many states have already implemented performance-based funding models. The Board has been careful to minimize the impact of the shifts in funding through asking for the \$12.9 million backfill from the legislature. The senator followed up by commenting that where the funds are allocated appears to represent the vision of the Board for the institutions. He added that faculty are not opposed to a funding model; they just want the model to be proportionate to their understanding of UI's vision and mission, which is de-emphasized in this model.

Professor Muhly recalled that during his time as an undergraduate at UI in the 1960's, the university began placing a heavy emphasis on graduate and professional programs, because these programs create the visibility of the institution. Those programs must be promoted in order to raise the rankings of the university. The new performance-based funding model does not promote the university's visibility or rankings. A senator commented that President Rastetter's emphasis on UI becoming a top ten public research university seems to imply becoming the state's flagship institution. He asked how UI would then fit in with the other two institutions. President Rastetter commented that UNI is a comprehensive university, heavily dependent on in-state enrollment and state funding. ISU is a significant research university. The Board has tried to halt the decline in state funding, which has had a particularly negative effect on UNI. He stressed that only 2% of the institutions' budgets are affected by the shift in funding, which should not impact the individual missions of the institutions.

Professor Murry expressed concern about continuous readjustment of the funding model, as well as about the competition among the institutions for students that will likely ensue. Assuming that UI is highly successful in competing for students, to the detriment of ISU and UNI, what will be the Board's reaction and how will they adjust the funding model? Is this the goal that the Board envisioned? President Rastetter responded that he did not expect the impact on the other two institutions to be significant. He also expected that the funding model, because of its clear metrics, will enhance state funding going forward. This phenomenon has been

observed in other states. Professor Murry followed up by asking if competition among the three universities was the intention of the Board. President Rastetter commented that students choose a university for a variety of reasons, such as economic factors and degrees and majors offered. He did not see it as a competition, but an opportunity for each university to improve and grow. Professor Caplan commented that it was his understanding that the decision whether to adopt the funding model was now in the hands of legislators. He asked if President Rastetter had any insight into legislators' opinions of the model. President Rastetter responded that it was still early in the process. The Board will present their budget request to the governor soon, with the goal of having the governor include the request in the proposed budget he presents to the legislature. President Rastetter thought that reaction to the model might depend on the districts the legislators represent, but that legislators, in general, would appreciate that the Board developed a funding model. The reaction thus far has been mostly positive.

Professor Wilder asked by what rating system we would determine whether UI has entered the ranks of the top ten public research universities. President Rastetter responded that most likely it would be one of the rating systems, such as *U.S. News & World Report* or *Bloomberg*, which is routinely presented to the Board. Professor Storrs reiterated that faculty are not opposed to a performance-based funding model in general, but that they would want the model to reflect the priorities of UI as a research university. She asked if any states that have top ten research universities have performance-based funding models that so heavily emphasize undergraduate enrollment. President Pro-Tem Mulholland responded that the Board committee which looked at other states' models did not focus specifically on those states with top ten research universities. The committee had felt strongly that since only a portion of the institutions' operating budgets was affected, they wanted to reflect how the connection between obtaining consistent, predictable funding from the legislature would translate to the universities. The model was an effort to give legislators something concrete to base annual allocations on, without having to spend time each year in lengthy negotiations. It would still be up to each institution to determine what made it unique.

Professor Segre commented that it was her understanding that the Board was making an effort to be fair to the three institutions, because a greater proportion of state funds were coming to UI, when UI had fewer resident students than ISU and UNI. President Rastetter noted that the existing funding model (40% UI, 40% ISU, 20% UNI) had been developed when the universities had roughly equal percentages of resident students. In fact, UI's portion of the state allocation has evolved to 47%, ISU's portion to 36%, and UNI's portion to 17%. The Board's new funding model allows legislators to track where state funds are going. He reiterated that the Board is charged with being good stewards of Iowans' tax dollars, not just with being fair to each institution. Professor Segre observed that the university engages in many other activities besides undergraduate education, activities that Iowans no doubt want the university to continue, such as graduate and professional education. President Rastetter stressed that the funding model is unlikely to have an impact on graduate and professional education, and that the Board has requested that any funds to be transferred away from UI be backfilled by the legislature. In the Board's proposed budget, the university should receive more general education funds than it did last year.

Professor Prussing commented that it appears that the state legislature has a relatively narrow view of what higher education is, and the Board is charged with responding to that narrow view and defending the state universities. She expressed the opinion that faculty were uncomfortable with what seems to be the Board's adoption of some of those narrow views. She added that there seems to be a lack of awareness in general in the state about the purposes of higher education, and while the Board is asking faculty to join with them in advocating for the funding model, the faculty would like for the Board to join with them in promoting greater awareness of the purposes of higher education and its benefits for the state. President Rastetter urged faculty to make themselves and their work more visible throughout the state. This will demonstrate the value of the university to Iowa taxpayers.

President Thomas thanked the Regents for coming to the Senate meeting and encouraged faculty to consider how to meet President Rastetter's challenge for the UI to become a top ten public research university.

- *Office of the Ombudsperson Annual Report (Susan Johnson, Ombudsperson)*

Professor Johnson presented the Office's 28<sup>th</sup> annual report, covering the 2013-14 academic year, to the Senate. She explained that the Office offers services to the entire campus and practices under the International Ombuds Association's standards of practice, which include confidentiality, neutrality, informality and independence. Last year the Office gave 32 annual report presentations, 42 informational presentations, and 53 workshops on conflict management. Professor Johnson offers workshops that focus on the role of email in the initiation and exacerbation of conflict. Professor Johnson and her colleague Cynthia Joyce are available to present workshops to interested groups across campus.

Turning to the statistics on visitors to the Office, Professor Johnson noted that last year the number of visitors had increased by 23%. This year's number is about the same, around 600. The proportion of visitors who belong to each of the campus groups (faculty, staff, students, other) has remained steady for the past five years. The category *other* refers to a variety of individuals without a direct affiliation to the university, such as parents, former students and employees, citizens of the community, patients, etc. That number has been moving up slightly. Last year, the Office was visited by 5% of faculty, 2% of staff, and .5% of students. The faculty proportion is somewhat artificially inflated because the denominator includes only tenured/tenure-track, clinical-track and research-track faculty, not adjuncts, lecturers, visiting faculty, etc. However, most faculty visitors do come from the former categories. As is always the case, there is a slight overrepresentation of women and minorities in visitors to the Office, as compared to their numbers on campus.

Regarding visitor concerns, Professor Johnson explained that 59% of visitors expressed a concern about evaluative relationships, that is, a conflict with someone in their hierarchical chain. This could be, for example, a student experiencing a problem with a faculty member or a supervisor experiencing a problem with an employee. Other visitor concerns include peer relationships, career/academic progression, and policy violations, among others. The proportions of concerns among faculty visitors are approximately the same as those among visitors as a whole, and did not change noticeably from the previous year. For many years, the

Office has been tracking visitor concerns about disrespectful behavior. After remaining steady, the number of such concerns has risen again. Similar campus-wide numbers emerged from the Working at Iowa survey from 2010-11.

Each year, the Office highlights areas of concern that have emerged from the year's statistics. This year, the Ombudspersons are again highlighting the general increase in visitors to the Office, which may simply be a result of greater awareness of the Office across campus. There has also been a rise in the number of situations in which people involved in the same conflict are coming to the Office, which can lead to a greater understanding of the scope of the problem and facilitate its resolution. In the last few years, an increasing number of graduate students who have lost funding or not received funding have visited the Office. This situation can be particularly difficult for international students and out-of-state students. The Office is asking departments to craft their offer letters carefully when discussing the possibility of funding. A final concern for the Office is that people are sometimes afraid to move forward with options to resolve a conflict because of fear of retaliation. This fear, however, might actually indicate a lack of awareness of options to address the problem or a concern about one's own culpability coming to light, among other factors.

Visitors to the Office are sent a survey to evaluate their experiences with the Office. This year there was a 46% response rate to the survey, and 72% of those responses were positive. Over half indicated that they had developed skills and approaches that would be helpful in solving future problems. If the Office did not exist, 20% of respondents indicated that they would have pursued formal options to resolve their problem, while 39% indicated that they would have ignored the problem.

Vice President Bohannon asked if the Office's services were open to adjunct faculty and lecturers. Professor Johnson responded that the Office's services were available to everyone on campus. Vice President Bohannon then asked if visitor statistics were kept for the various types of faculty. Professor Johnson answered that the Office did not keep statistics on the rank of faculty visitors. Vice President Bohannon suggested that the Office perhaps do so in the future, as it would be useful for the Senate to know what types of problems are faced by the various faculty groups. Professor Johnson welcomed the suggestion, but noted that the Office sees a tiny percentage of faculty members and it may be difficult to generalize from this small sample. On the other hand, if there was a sudden influx into the Office from a particular faculty group, the Office would take that trend very seriously.

Secretary Vaughn asked what role the Office might play in the development of policy. Professor Johnson indicated that the Office is constrained in what it can do. If the Ombudspersons identify a trend, they can meet with those in a position to address that trend, perhaps through creation or revision of policy. They have done this in the past. Referring to Professor Johnson's remarks about email, President Thomas asked if other types of technology or social media also can be problematic. Professor Johnson observed that in her experience, email is by far the most troublesome. She did not think that the recent rise in the number of visitors was linked to possible conflict arising from emerging technologies or social media.

IV. From the Floor – Past President Lawrence announced that she would be on leave next semester and that former Faculty Senate President Richard Fumerton would be taking her place. She expressed her appreciation to Senators for allowing her to serve them for the past two and a half years. President Thomas thanked Past President Lawrence for her service as an officer.

V. Announcements

- The annual Faculty Senate/Iowa City Area Chamber of Commerce legislative reception will be held on Wednesday, December 10, 4:30-6:00 pm in the rotunda of the Old Capitol. President Thomas urged Senators to come to the reception and engage directly with our local legislators.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, January 27, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 10, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Muhly moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.