I. Call to Order – President Sharp called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

II. Approvals

A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Thompson moved and Professor Drake seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. Faculty Council Minutes (February 19, 2008) – Professor Thompson moved and Professor Drake seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

C. Faculty Senate Agenda (March 25, 2008) – Professor Catney moved and Professor Thompson seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. Update on Provost Search (Michael O’Hara)
Three candidates (Robert Sternberg, Suzanne Ortega, and Arlene Karney) came to campus last week. Two more candidates will be coming next week, with names to be announced this Friday and next Tuesday. The search committee will present its report to President Mason on Friday morning, March 14. Vice President
O’Hara urged everyone to come to the candidates’ public events and fill out the online evaluation forms.

IV. New Business

• UIHC CEO Search Committee (Ann Williamson, Associate Vice President for Nursing and Chief Nursing Officer, UIHC and Mary Greer, Health Care Information Systems)

Ann Williamson stated that the search is underway for the next UIHC CEO. This person will also hold the title of Associate Vice President for Clinical Affairs. The search committee consists of 23 people, including faculty, regents, and staff. A professional search firm, Heidrick and Struggles, has been retained. The search process is following standard procedures. The search committee met for the first time on February 5, and continues to meet every Tuesday morning. Vice President for Medical Affairs Jean Robillard is the hiring authority, and he gave the charge to the committee. The process will include defining what qualifications the search committee is looking for and beginning to gather names and recruit candidates, the stage in which the committee is presently located. Interviews will then be done and the candidates will be presented to VPMA Robillard. The timeline calls for the first round of interviews to be done in mid-April, and the second round to be done in mid-May. Recommendations will be made to VPMA Robillard by Memorial Day.

Questions the search committee has been considering include: What do we want the CEO to accomplish in the next several years? What challenges and opportunities lie ahead for UIHC and the communities we serve? How will we judge success in this position? These types of questions help the committee identify the type of person they are looking for. Dr. Williamson then asked the group for input.

Vice President O’Hara commented that this sounds more like a COO, rather than a CEO, considering the reporting structural changes that have been done recently at UIHC. He requested that the range of this person’s authority be clarified, and how that would differ from the past when the CEO reported directly to the UI president. Dr. Williamson said that this is a process in evolution. Ms. Greer added that there would be two titles attached to this position, Associate Vice President for Clinical Affairs and CEO. President Sharp questioned, if there were to be a split in the two positions currently held by Dr. Robillard (Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine), where would the dean be in relation to the VP? The dean would report to the VPMA. The CEO would be on par. There is an effort here to build a senior leadership team for UI Health Care. Vice President O’Hara said that historically there has been recruitment for the CEO from a certain pool, namely people who want to run a university hospital. Are we recruiting from the same pool as in the past, or from a different pool, in which the aspirations also differ? Past President Kurtz added, is the next rung of the ladder for these potential candidates, head of a hospital, or is this the apex of the job? Dr. Williamson responded that some would see this as the apex; many university hospitals (Duke, Penn, etc.) have this same model. The search firm has indicated to the committee that some potential candidates would be very comfortable with this structure, while others would not be comfortable at
all. There should be no trouble filling this position with a high-quality person. She added that the Council’s concerns would be taken back to the search committee. Past President Kurtz explained that the Council wasn’t concerned, just ignorant of the new structure, as previously the hospital director reported directly to the UI president; now that person would report to the VPMA. He requested clarification of Dr. Williamson’s prior comment on reporting duties of the Dean of the Carver College of Medicine, as deans typically report to the provost. She clarified that she was referring to the business aspect of UI Health Care, not the academic aspect. President Sharp commented that the previous hospital director was very involved in the community, and people liked that. Ms. Greer responded that search committee member Nancy Willis, a community resident from outside the university, has advocated for those qualities in applicants. Professor Boyle questioned if candidates were being sought who were eligible to be tenured. Is the search committee looking for someone with an academic base or a business base? Dr. Williamson answered that they were looking for someone with a business base who has been in similar positions, with an understanding of health care delivery within an academic environment. President Sharp thanked the two for their presentation, as often people don’t know what’s going on at the hospital. Ms. Greer requested that names of possible candidates be conveyed to Kathleen Barbee at 353-8465. The person taking the position is expected to be in place by the fall.

• Revision to the Operations Manual policy regarding clinical faculty as PI on grants (Mike O’Hara)

Vice President O’Hara stated this was simply a matter of cleaning up some outdated language in the Operations Manual (III.17.17(4)). In this policy, the phrase “clinical faculty” was used in the sense of volunteers in clinical settings. “Clinical” now has a precise and different meaning. What we want to do is eliminate the word “clinical” (faculty) from the list of those prohibited from serving as project directors on university grants and contracts. Clinical faculty now regularly apply for and receive grants. This policy edit was approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee. Past President Kurtz asked what title is now given to the people formerly known as clinical faculty. Associate Provost Johnson explained that they are now called “adjunct.” Professor Boyle requested clarification whether this policy related only to people who are non-salaried. In the College of Engineering, there are PI’s who are not faculty, but research staff. Vice President O’Hara responded that this refers to people who are both non-salaried and not on campus. The reason they are adjunct is because they have no other university faculty appointment. Individuals who also hold positions as research scientists would be eligible to be PI’s. Nothing would change in terms of practice. Associate Provost Johnson noted that this issue came to light because the office of the Vice President for Research had to sign off on every exception, and they were seeing lots of exceptions because of the many clinical track faculty who are PI’s. Past President Kurtz requested confirmation that adjuncts, whether salaried or not, are not permitted to be PI’s. Associate Provost Johnson confirmed this.
Professor Justman moved and Professor Drake seconded that the edit to the policy be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

• University SSN plan update (Associate Provost Susan Johnson; Jane Drews, University Information Technology Security Officer; Steve Fleagle, Chief Information Officer)

Associate Provost Susan Johnson stated there is now a mandate that we eliminate the unnecessary storage of social security numbers (SSN’s). SSN’s are abundant on personal computers all around campus. Information Technology will soon be sending a letter out to all faculty and staff regarding the scanning of all university computers to search for SSN’s. The letter indicates that a software tool called Identity Finder will be used to flag files that contain SSN’s. A draft of this letter was included in the agenda attachments. Jane Drews, University Information Technology Security Officer, stated that this letter was presented to the Council for their feedback.

Past President Kurtz asked for clarification of the procedures. Steve Fleagle, Chief Information Officer, explained that faculty would work with their local IT people to run the software, which will merely flag the SSN’s, then the user would decide whether or not to delete the numbers. Ms. Drew added that IT is working with the colleges to develop strategies appropriate for each college. This initial letter will be broadly distributed; the local IT units will follow up. She noted that people cannot be asked to go through all of their electronic files individually; this software tool can do that work for them. Professor Catney observed that there is a June 30 deadline to eliminate or protect the preserved SSN’s, what will be done after that deadline? Ms. Drew responded that the June 30 deadline has been in place for two years. In response to another question, she added that the software has been licensed for several years and periodically people will be asked to check their machines. Mr. Fleagle added that SSN’s are no longer stored to the extent previously; scans will not need to be done often. For example, university identification numbers, rather than SSNs, are now used as part of the grading process.

In response to additional questions, Ms. Drews and Mr. Fleagle explained that IT will turn on the software on the servers, while users will turn on the software on their own computers. Departments will work out appropriate ways to deal with shared files. It was stressed that individuals will be able to decide whether or not to retain the SSN’s. University ID’s have been replacing SSN’s for a long time now; IT will assist people in converting files. The university will continue to securely retain SSN’s for payroll, financial aid, student loans, health insurance, and research. There are strict procedures for other processes requiring SSN’s, such as criminal background checks. If the software program falsely identifies a number as an SSN, it will not delete the number; again, the program only flags the numbers, and the users determine whether or not to delete them. The program has a very user-friendly interface. Files can be marked so they are not searched a second time. Although the scan may take some time, the damage done by stolen SSN’s would take a much greater amount of time to fix. Overall, the program is very efficient. It is a Windows program, but can run on Mac’s. If SSN’s must be retained, they must be heavily protected.
In order to engage faculty in the process, it was suggested to stress that individuals can have control of the process. It should also be highlighted how this initiative can protect us from identity theft and other harm. The scanning is mandatory, but what you delete is for the user to decide. Mr. Fleagle added that the Operations Manual details acceptable use of SSN’s, and we should all be compliant with the policies stated there. The use of this specific software is one way to be compliant, but if an individual has used a different means to reach compliance, that is fine. Colleges and departments, working with their local IT people, will follow up to make sure the process is done.

• **Should we establish the rank of Senior Lecturer?** (Associate Provost Susan Johnson)

Associate Provost Johnson stated that the idea of creating a senior lecturer rank arose several years ago. There are a significant number of people who are full time lecturers and have been for a number of years. Perhaps a title could be created that would recognize their long-time contributions. She referred to a report called “Making the Best of Both Worlds,” issued by the University of Michigan’s Center for the Education of Women, that addresses these issues. Associate Provost Johnson has looked at the policies of about twelve other institutions. ISU, three or four of the Big 10, and the UT system, among others, have this rank. A senior lecturer is typically defined as someone who has been a full time lecturer for at least 5-6 years, and has met certain performance criteria. Past President Kurtz expressed concern that if we do establish this rank, that it doesn’t generate an enormous amount of bureaucracy to move someone from lecturer to senior lecturer. The process to move someone from assistant to associate to full professor is already very time-consuming. Associate Provost Johnson would propose that colleges develop their own plans for promotion, although any new rank would have to come to the Provost’s Office for approval. The largest number of lecturers is found in CLAS and Business. Professor D’Alessandro requested clarification of the activities of lecturers. They are faculty, although non-governance, and primarily teach, although they might have advising and some curriculum development duties. Some are part time and some are full time. This promotion process would add another level of administrative activity to the colleges. Some institutions have the full rank assortment of assistant, associate, and full lecturers. Associate Provost Johnson added that some institutions allow for their lecturers to become eligible for five-year contractual appointments. Professor Sa-Aadu commented on the very important role that lecturers perform in the Tippie College of Business. Associate Provost Johnson will draft a policy and bring it to a future Faculty Council meeting.

V. Announcements

• President Sharp stated that the research-track policy is now before President Mason for a final decision on its implementation. There are some concerns regarding the monitoring process for the research track, so the Provost’s Office will draft some monitoring measures. In response to a
question, it was clarified that each college will now need to vote whether or not to adopt the research-track policy. Each college that votes to adopt it will then create its own policy; the college’s faculty, the Faculty Council and the Faculty Senate will all need to approve the collegiate policy. If President Mason decides to adopt the university-wide policy, it must first go to the Council of Provosts and then to the Board of Regents.

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 25, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. We will have a brief reception at 3:00 for David Miles, who will speak at the Senate meeting.
- Faculty Senate Voting Deadline: Saturday, March 8, at Midnight
- Faculty volunteers are still sought for the IPTV annual fundraising event (Saturday, March 8, 12:00 – 5:30, Johnston IA)
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 1, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Commons Room, 302 Schaeffer Hall.
- A Faculty Senate Symposium on benefits will be held in April. The benefits system may be completely restructured, and this will be a chance to hear some of the ideas now circulating regarding that restructuring.

VI. Adjournment – President Sharp adjourned the meeting at 4:35 pm.