FACULTY COUNCIL  
Tuesday, August 30, 2016  
3:30 – 5:15 pm  
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre  

MINUTES


Officers Present: C. Bohannan, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.


Councilors Absent: None.

Guests: D. Cunning (Philosophy), D. Drake (Dows Institute), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), M. O’Hara (Psychological & Brain Sciences), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals
   A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Campo moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 12, 2016) – Past President Bohannan moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 20, 2016) – President Vaughn pointed out that several items had been added to the agenda since it had been distributed: the annual report of the Office of the Ombudsperson, an update from the Office of Outreach and Engagement, and a report on the AAUP sanction. Professor Tachau moved and Professor Campo seconded that the revised draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   D. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
      • Joseph Szot (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Karl Thomas (Internal Medicine) on the Faculty Council, 2016-19
      • Paul Dilley (Classics) to fill the unexpired term of Jennifer Iverson (Music) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-17
      • Steve Duck (Communication Studies) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-17
      • Saireh Harwani (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Karl Thomas (Internal Medicine) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-19
• Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (German) to fill the unexpired term of Meara Habashi (Psychological & Brain Sciences) on the Council on Teaching, 2016-18
• Weimian Han (Mathematics) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Research Council, 2016-17
• Tracy Osborn (Political Science) to fill the unexpired term of Nicole Grosland (Biomedical Engineering) on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2016-20
• Tong Li (Mathematics) to fill the unexpired term of Jon Wilcox (English) on the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2016-18
• Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) to fill the unexpired term of Claire Sponsler (English) on the Committee on the Selection & Review of Central Academic Officials, 2016-17
• Chris Pigge (Chemistry) to the Financial Aid Advisory Committee, 2016-19
• Mitchell Kelly (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations) to the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2016-21
• Ann Rhodes (Nursing) to the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, 2016-19
• Ali Hasan (Philosophy) to the Judicial Commission, 2016-19
• Paul Gowder (Law) to the Judicial Commission, 2016-19

Professor Ryan moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously. Secretary Gillan commented on the passing of Professor Claire Sponsler, a member of the Faculty Senate, over the summer. He noted that not only was Professor Sponsler a valued member of her department and her field (English) but that she was also active in service to the university and the community.

III. New Business
• President's Report (Tom Vaughn)

President Vaughn began his report by mentioning that the Board of Regents, State of Iowa has revised its operations manual. Most of these revisions do not impact faculty, but President Vaughn pointed out several that do. The Board’s policy on academic freedom previously used the word faculty to refer to all individuals engaged in teaching, but that has been changed to teachers, so that teaching assistants, staff, and other non-faculty individuals would be covered by the policy. The policy also now includes some specific protections for freedom in research and research publications that parallel American Association of University Professors (AAUP) language. President Vaughn added that he, Past President Bohannan, and Vice President Snyder had participated in an orientation for new Regent Michael Richards over the summer, along with faculty members from the shared governance bodies of ISU and UNI. The Faculty Senate officers also plan to meet with Regents and Board staff at next month’s Board of Regents meeting on campus. President Vaughn indicated that proposals were made last spring to invite Regents to shadow faculty members to learn more about their work and for faculty members to host an orientation session for the Regents. Both proposals have been well-received by the Regents, so now preparations must be made to carry out these proposals.

Professor Tachau asked how these proposals for faculty interaction with the Regents fit with the Faculty Senate’s vote of no confidence in the Regents last fall. President Vaughn responded
that the vote of no confidence was based on what the Regents had done during the presidential search; the vote does not preclude working with them moving forward. Professor Tachau reminded the group that the vote had indicated that the Senate does not have confidence in the Regents’ ability to govern the university. She asked if the Regents had done anything to change that view. President Vaughn expressed the opinion that faculty could help the Regents do their job better by educating them about faculty work. Professor Marshall commented that her dean believes strongly in communicating what faculty do to a wide audience, including to the Regents. Professor Tachau appreciated this point, but observed that this was a difficult problem. She added that it might not be the will of the Senate to extend these opportunities to the Regents. How should we convey to the Regents that what they did in the presidential search is unforgiveable until they make amends? She wondered about the wisdom of continuing to work with the Regents, who betrayed our trust. She added that the faculty as a whole might not support faculty interaction with the Regents.

Past President Bohannan noted that while Senators were discussing the no-confidence vote at last fall’s meeting, they also discussed the importance of telling the faculty’s story better. This would not preclude doing other things; for example, at the Senate officers’ meeting with Regent Richards, the officers explained why the faculty had been upset regarding the presidential search and also explained the importance of shared governance. Past President Bohannan added that she did not see how progress could be made without engagement with the Regents. Professor Durham commented that the new UNI presidential search could serve as a test case to determine if the Regents had learned from the UI presidential search. President Vaughn noted that the next Senate meeting, during which the AAUP sanction will be one of the agenda items, would be a good opportunity for senators to debate our relationship with the Regents. Past President Bohannan stressed that these proposals for faculty interaction with the Regents had been discussed with and approved by the Faculty Council during the previous academic year, following the appointment of President Harreld. She added that it was entirely appropriate for this year’s Council to engage in a new discussion regarding how to move forward with the Regents.

President Vaughn went on to explain that over the summer the Shared Governance Coordinating Committee on Inclusion and Campus Climate was formed by the administration and the shared governance bodies. This group meets weekly to allow members to provide updates to each other on climate and inclusion efforts underway. Past President Bohannan is the Faculty Senate’s primary delegate to this group. President Vaughn reminded Councilors that last spring an announcement was made about the formation of a Bias Assessment Response Team (BART) and a draft plan for the team was created. Concerns were raised, however, about freedom of speech and academic freedom issues, so the plan was rewritten over the summer. Turning to the topic of the recent AAUP sanction of the University of Iowa, President Vaughn opened the floor for discussion. Professor Voigt asked how the AAUP sanction affected UI. Professor Tachau (a member of the UI Chapter of the AAUP) related what she had heard from faculty at a sanctioned institution. Failed searches for provosts and deans were common at that university, as those seeking administrative positions were wary of how they would be treated by the governing board. Recruitment and retention of faculty at the associate and full
professor levels were also a challenge. Each sanctioned institution has had a circumstance that is
different from all others. The sanction essentially serves as a warning to those who consider
coming to the institution that adequate conditions of academic governance do not exist there.
Professor Tachau noted that institutions eventually try hard to get off the sanctioned list. A
college was recently removed from the list after 50 or 60 years.

Professor Campo asked if the sanction could be lifted with the current Board members still
in place, or only after they rotate off over time. Professor Tachau speculated that it could happen
either way. Professor Ganim wondered how long the UI might expect to be sanctioned. Professor
Tachau responded that this would depend on what action, if any, the university would take. It
appears that the current Board does not plan to take any action, although perhaps individual
Board members may be interested in trying to lift the sanction. Past President Bohannan
stressed the need to engage with Board members individually; they do not all necessarily hold
the same beliefs.

President Vaughn then briefly spoke about the annual Faculty Council/Administrative
retreat, held this year on August 15. The retreat was intended to begin a conversation regarding
how best to support faculty so that they can be successful here and therefore contribute to the
university’s success. While a large portion of the discussion came from the perspective of
administrators, the dialog nevertheless was wide-ranging and positive. President Vaughn
encouraged Councilors to send ideas and feedback to him. Professor Wasserman thought that
the discussion was thin on the faculty development aspect. He recalled that during his Faculty
Senate presidency he had suggested that faculty-run workshops be held to provide mentorship,
particularly for mid-career faculty to propel them past the associate level. A similar suggestion
was made at the retreat. Professor Wasserman stressed that faculty members must look out for
each other. Professor Ganim commented that Faculty Senate could support the development of
such workshops. Past President Bohannan urged that suggestions be put forth regarding how to
develop these workshops. President Vaughn added that we could form a subcommittee to work
on this issue.

Professor Campo expressed some concern about the administration’s focus at the retreat on
issues that they thought were impacting faculty morale, such as not doing enough to reward the
top 5% of performers, as well as not doing enough to get rid of the bottom 1% of performers. She
commented that the administration seemed to take a “stick” approach rather than a “carrot”
approach and were not looking at the faculty as a whole. She added that the faculty were more
interested in the “carrot” approach. President Vaughn cited statistics from the Gallup
organization indicating that about 30% of employees are very engaged, 15% of employees are
disengaged, and the rest are somewhat engaged. Professor Wasserman commented that most
faculty are intrinsically motivated. Resources other than money, such as time, are also
important. For example, the opportunity to take leave time in order to develop a grant proposal
with other faculty members would be very appealing. Professor Tachau suggested that the
Faculty Senate’s Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee look into these issues. Vice
President Snyder noted that the administration is currently focused on Association of American
Universities (AAU) metrics. Some of these metrics are driven by mid-career faculty, so he
thought that there would be much interest on campus, including from central administration, in supporting faculty at this stage.

- **Committee on Academic Values Update (Christina Bohannan)**
  
  Past President Bohannan reminded the group that this committee had been created by the Senate last spring to study issues such as academic freedom, tenure, shared governance, freedom of expression, etc. The committee’s first item of business had been to review a proposal for a Bias Assessment Response Team. Such teams have been put in place at a number of other institutions to address reports of bias on campus. Professor Yockey had served on a committee to review the proposal and had raised issues regarding academic freedom and freedom of speech, as did the Faculty Senate officers. President Harreld and Provost Butler then requested that the Faculty Senate, via the Committee on Academic Values, revise the proposal. The committee fused concerns over diversity and inclusion with concerns about academic freedom and free expression to draft a document that faculty could be comfortable with. Past President Bohannan now serves on a small committee that is developing the details for implementation. This entity will likely be called the Campus Inclusion Team. It will not be investigative or punitive, but will be focused on caring for students, as well as on educating them on the importance of free expression. Alleged policy violations will, however, be addressed by the appropriate office.

  Professor Voigt commented that we can try to improve people’s sensitivities to create a more inclusive environment on campus, but that one’s reactions to situations are a matter of personal responsibility, which the university can also help foster in our students. Past President Bohannan added that we can teach students the tools to deal with these issues, but that we should not be shielding students from them. Professor Ganim, a member of the Committee on Academic Values, commented that the committee had had thorough discussions on this topic. Professor Tachau thanked the committee for their work thus far. She suggested that at some point the committee take up the issue of the university’s webpages, which she finds not very welcoming to a range of diversity.

- **Strategy Implementation Team/Top Ten Initiatives Update (Pete Snyder)**

  Vice President Snyder indicated that two different committees are currently at work, the Strategy Implementation Team (SIT) and the Operations Team (OT). He explained that the budgeting process on campus has recently changed. Base budgeting has now been decentralised to the colleges. We will hear more about this at a future Senate meeting. New budget initiatives, however, while previously driven by the administration, are now being generated from the ideas of faculty, staff and students (as well as of central administration and the deans), giving us an unprecedented role in the budgeting process. The SIT and the OT do the same thing, but in different time frames (the former in 1-5 years and the latter within 18 months). Suggestions the shared governance groups had collected from their constituents were passed on to these two teams. Part of the role of the strategic plan is to feed more suggestions to the teams over the next five years. Also, a new effort to gather ideas for our “top ten initiatives” will get underway shortly.

  Faculty members are well-represented on both SIT and OT. The SIT and OT will review and prioritize all the suggestions received and then pass them on to the appropriate subject expert
task forces, which are currently being formed. These task forces will be comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Focus areas for the SIT task forces include national research standing, underrepresented minority participation in graduate/professional programs, the undergraduate academic experience, campus climate, the strategic budgeting process, and campus housing and dining. OT task force focus areas include academic affairs; diversity and inclusion; parking and transportation; health and wellness; safety on campus; student life; sustainability; facilities and grounds; and communication, morale and messaging. Vice President Snyder commented that the SIT and OT will be accepting and prioritizing proposals on an ongoing basis. Past President Bohannan noted that much of the material that Vice President for Research and Economic Development Dan Reed presented at the retreat was generated by the SIT National Research Standing subject expert task force. Vice President Snyder added that the SIT is still developing its processes, but that he is encouraged to see faculty having a greater voice in planning than ever before.

Professor Voigt asked if threat and opportunity assessments had been performed as we develop plans for the future. Vice President Snyder responded that there was a sense that we not wait to move things forward. Priorities are generally based on the previous strategic plan. Professor Tachau asked how the SIT and OT subject expert task forces were interfacing with the charter committees. President Vaughn answered that the Senate officers seek task force members from charter committee membership when appropriate. Professor Ganim, a member of the Strategic Plan Development Group, commented that his committee is pushing for articulation between the strategic plan and the activities of the SIT and OT. There needs to be a mechanism to ensure that the values and principles set forth in the strategic plan are followed through in the SIT and OT processes. There must be a continuous flow of communication. Vice President Snyder commented that the strategic plan is intended to drive the entire process.

Secretary Gillan reiterated Professor Tachau’s point that we must ensure that the new committees coming into existence engage with our already-existing shared governance structures. Professor Durham, co-chair of the Faculty Staff Budget Committee, for example, serves on the SIT and on the SIT subject expert task force on the strategic budgeting process. Professor Durham commented that the Faculty Staff Budget Committee may be restructured to better represent the units that are receiving blocks of funding. President Vaughn indicated that the faculty have been asked to produce suggestions toward a “top ten initiative” list for the short and long terms. It has not been decided yet how these suggestions will be compiled. Vice President Snyder proposed building some of the ideas put forth at the retreat into the initiatives. Secretary Gillan advocated for contacting the charter committee chairs for suggestions. Several councilors urged that information on the strategic plan process, along with the SIT and OT, be made more readily accessible on university websites.

• Strategic Plan Update (David Cunning, Strategic Plan Development Group Co-chair)
Professor Cunning explained that a series of open forum meetings were planned for the next several weeks to allow the campus community to offer feedback on the strategic plan draft. He noted that some feedback has already come in. For example, the plan contains language regarding the addition of more tenure-track lines, and suggestions were made regarding how that should be done. Should some colleges be singled out for additional lines? Also, perhaps the
plan should direct the deans to replace retired tenure-track faculty with new tenure-track faculty (rather than replacing them with non-tenure-track faculty or using the money for other purposes). While the multi-cultural center proposed by the plan was well-received by some, others thought that the center would divert funds away from already-existing entities, which should instead be the target for greater investment. Some feedback emphasized the extent to which the UI relies on its people, and there were comments indicating that staff sometimes feel like second-class citizens on campus. However, faculty can be powerful advocates for staff. The goal of providing a leadership experience for every student evoked questions regarding how this might be done, as well as the observation that leadership experiences would need to be vastly different to accommodate a wide range of students' needs.

Professor Cunning commented that there were questions regarding how various aspects of the plan would actually be carried out. People also wanted to know the costs of these initiatives. Professor Cunning indicated that strategic plans often do not include dollar amounts. Details about costs and implementation will likely be worked out by other groups, including the SIT and OT subject expert task forces, with significant input from faculty, staff and students. Past President Bohannan asked for further clarification regarding the inclusion of dollar amounts in the strategic plan. Professor Cunning reiterated that this is not typically done, but noted that such concerns expressed in the feedback may be caused by suspicion on campus regarding the administration’s direction over the next few years. Vice President Snyder commented that the subject expert task forces will be reporting back to the SIT and the OT, which will ensure that projects remain consistent with the values of the strategic plan. Professor Ganim noted that it was not the intent of the strategic plan to indicate winners and losers, but to outline values and objectives that we think are reasonable and aspirational over a five-year period. Professor Cunning expressed the hope that the strategic plan document reflects the voices of all those who have weighed in over these past months. He added that the draft plan is due to Provost Butler on October 1. The councilors thanked Professor Cunning and the members of the Strategic Plan Development Group for their extensive work.

• **Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics Annual Meeting (Mike O’Hara and David Drake, UI COIA Representatives)**
  
  Professor O’Hara indicated that he has been the UI COIA representative since 2011. Professor Drake has now taken over that role; however, Professor O’Hara had been invited to give a report on the COIA annual meeting that took place in February in Indianapolis at the NCAA national headquarters. He began his presentation with some background on COIA, a coalition of 63 faculty senates of institutions at the NCAA FBS level (the major college football programs). It was founded in 2002, primarily by Big Ten and Pac 12 schools. A majority of the former are currently members. Among the focus areas of COIA are academic integrity, athlete welfare, governance (the role of faculty in overseeing our student athletes), fiscal responsibility (transparency and expenditures), and commercialization. COIA has issued policy papers that address issues around academics, faculty involvement and participation, governance issues, frameworks for reform, etc.

  The COIA annual meeting provided an opportunity for COIA representatives to meet with various members of the NCAA top leadership, to communicate concerns but also to see in which
directions the leadership is moving. COIA members spoke with Oliver Luck, the Executive Vice President for Regulatory Affairs, regarding enforcement and academic fraud, eligibility and the changing definition of amateurism, and time demands on student athletes. This last issue is particularly difficult because all of the NCAA sports have different requirements, making it hard to create one overarching rule. COIA members also learned, from Brian Hainline, NCAA Chief Medical Officer, that one of the biggest current issues for student athletes is mental health (primarily depression, anxiety disorders, and eating disorders). Student athletes are under enormous pressure, in terms of both performance and time management, and this is an issue of which faculty should remain cognizant. Another health-related issue is recovery time. In some sports, student athletes are involved in several contests within a short period of time. In men’s soccer, for example, teams may play two or three games during one weekend. Excessive playing time like this increases the possibility for injuries. A suggestion has been made to spread out the playing time from one season to two, but this also poses difficulties. This is a student welfare issue that is best viewed from a national perspective. Another NCAA official that COIA members spoke with was the Executive Vice President for Law, Policy and Governance, Donald Remy. Much of that conversation dealt with punishment structures and decisions about when and how to investigate an institution for alleged policy infractions. Although it seems unlikely that major change will occur, faculty should nevertheless be aware of anti-trust and unionization efforts underway related to collegiate athletics. Another issue of concern to faculty is academic fraud. The increasing prevalence of online teaching raises the potential for academic fraud.

In concluding his remarks, Professor O’Hara noted that in past appearances before the Council he has advocated for the creation of a Faculty Senate athletics committee that would consider athletics issues on the national stage, rather than solely on our campus. Even if we do not perceive problems at our university, we are part of a wider community of faculty and we must all remain vigilant, especially in light of the enormous amount of money surrounding collegiate athletics. Professor Tachau recalled that one of the biggest concerns of COIA in its earliest years was the “arms race” in athletic facilities and the enormous pressure that placed on university presidents. It has also been difficult over the years for faculty to exert appropriate control over collegiate athletics.

Professor Voigt questioned why athletics is even considered an academic pursuit. Professor O’Hara responded that athletics can be considered an extra-curricular activity that is of high value to the institution. This is particularly true of basketball and football. Professor Daack-Hirsch, whose son is a student athlete, commented that students here are lucky that they can pursue academics and athletics simultaneously, as many student athletes express themselves and their talents through their sport. They may also focus better on their academics because of their sport. Basketball and football, however, have become subject to great monetary pressure, which is unfortunate. Professor O’Hara commented that allegations of sexual assault by student athletes are handled by individual institutions. Professor Drake added that sexual assault is an issue that the NCAA takes very seriously. Professor Ryan and other councilors expressed concern about some of the campus culture issues that may arise when an institution has a high-profile football team. Professor Drake then spoke briefly about his role as one of the two UI Faculty Athletics Representatives (FAR’s). He and the other FAR, Nicole Grosland from
Biomedical Engineering, report to the university president on issues involving academics within the athletics programs. Past President Bohannan and President Vaughn both thanked Professor O’Hara for his five years of service as the UI COIA representative, and also thanked Professor Drake for now taking over that role.

V. Announcements

- Inauguration/Installation Ceremony: President Vaughn indicated that the installation ceremony for UI President Bruce Harreld will take place on Friday, September 16. The week of September 12-16 will be devoted to celebrating the university.
- Several non-substantive edits have been made to the Faculty Senate bylaws (councilors received a handout about these changes). The Committee on Academic Values was also added to the bylaws following the Senate’s vote to create this committee last spring.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 20, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 4, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.