

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, February 14, 2017
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: F. Ahmad, C. Barnhardt, R. Boudreau, C. Brochu, G. Buettner, D. Caplan, J. Colgan, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, P. Dilley, F. Durham, B. Eckstein, M. Foley Nicpon, R. Ganim, E. Gidal, D. Hall, A. Jung, A. Kwitek, K. Lamping, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, U. Mallik, T. Marshall, K. Messingham, T. Midtrod, M. Nikolas, R. Oral, L. Ostedgaard, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, P. Romitti, G. Ryan, A. Saftlas, R. Sah, L. Segre, J. Streit, J. Szot, K. Tachau, J. Taylor, S. Vigmostad, S. Vos, E. Wasserman, J. Welburn, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, D. Wurster.
- Officers Present: E. Dove, E. Gillan, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: P. Brophy, A. Durnev, T. Gallanis, J. Kolker, T. Treat, J. Yockey.
- Senators Absent: L. Allen, R. Balakrishnan, J. Barker, C. Benson, M. Blumberg, K. Culp, B. Dixon, S. Duck, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, I. Grumbach, S. Harwani, Z. Jin, J. Klesney-Tait, W. Maury, J. Scott, D. Segaloff, C. Thomas, H. Udaykumar, M. Voigt, J. Wang.
- Guests: E. Bendler (*Daily Iowan*), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), M. Payne (*Daily Iowan*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Vaughn called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – President Vaughn noted that one item, *Teaching Assistant Training Program Pilot*, was removed from the agenda after it was distributed. This item will be re-scheduled for the next Senate meeting. Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Brochu seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (December 6, 2016) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Vigmostad seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Pete Snyder, Chair, Committee on Committees)
- H. S. Udaykumar (Mechanical Engineering) to fill the unexpired term of Christina Bohannan (Law) on the Committee on the Selection and Review of Central Academic Officials, 2017-19

- Marcia Ward (Health Management & Policy) to the Committee on Rules and Bylaws, Spring 2017

Professor Vigmostad moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *President's Report (Tom Vaughn)*

President Vaughn reported that Professor Christina Bohannon, who had been serving as past president, has been appointed to a faculty fellow position in the Provost's Office. Therefore, she has stepped down from her Faculty Senate role. President Vaughn commented that Professor Bohannon served as vice president and president during difficult times. During those two years, she worked very hard and demonstrated an amazing ability to see the broad picture, while still paying attention to details. She did a fantastic job and President Vaughn misses her advice and counsel. Replacing her will be Professor Ed Dove, a former Senate president. This will be the third time that Professor Dove has taken on the past president role, reflecting the caliber of Professor Dove's dedication to faculty, as well as the high regard in which he is held. His insights and suggestions in these past few weeks have been invaluable, President Vaughn commented.

Turning to events in the legislature, President Vaughn observed that the tenure bill most likely will not move out of committee. President Harreld and the Board of Regents, State of Iowa have expressed opposition to the bill. President Vaughn praised the letter to the press written by Professor Tachau and Professor Lois Cox explaining the benefits of tenure. A bill proposing revisions to Chapter 20 is being closely watched by the Senate officers. On behalf of the officers, President Vaughn expressed support for our students and staff to maintain competitive wages, benefits, and working conditions regardless of union status. Graduate student training is a core part of our mission. Graduate student involvement in our research is critical for them, as well as for faculty scholarship. Their involvement in teaching allows them to grow as professionals, while also fulfilling some of the university's teaching needs. Staff provide all sorts of infrastructure support so that faculty can fulfill their teaching and research goals. Staff also support students in many ways. The Faculty Senate officers recently met with their counterparts in undergraduate, graduate, and staff leadership. It was the consensus that we should all wait and see what emerges from the legislature before taking a public stance on the matter. President Vaughn reminded the group that Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and Dean of the Graduate College John Keller had recently – in the midst of ongoing negotiations – made a strong statement in favor of a competitive wage and benefit package to recruit the most talented graduate students.

Another legislative issue concerns the use of a particular stem cell line, crucial to medical research at the university. Efforts are being made to insert language into the proposed bill that would protect this stem cell line. The Senate officers continue to monitor the recent Executive Order on immigration, which is now in the courts. It is unclear at this time whether a new Order will be issued. President Vaughn reminded the group that the Senate officers had earlier circulated a mass email affirming the importance of diversity and inclusion. He has been in contact with his counterparts at other Big Ten institutions regarding a possible coordinated response. The Faculty Senate's Committee on Academic Values, chaired by Professor Steve

McGuire, and Governmental Relations Committee, chaired by Professor Jerry Anthony, are also both looking into these issues.

The Campus Inclusion Team (CIT) is now in place. President Vaughn reminded the group that this entity grew out of a proposal for a bias assessment response team that had raised concerns about academic freedom and freedom of speech. The CIT will not be investigative or punitive, but will function somewhat similarly to the Office of the Ombudsperson and work with students informally to resolve issues. In cases of policy violations, however, students would be directed to the appropriate offices to file complaints. The Committee on Academic Values played a crucial role in the development of the CIT.

President Vaughn's final topic was the 2020 Academic Organizational Structure Study, proposed last month by Provost Butler. Four deans have been charged with organizing and facilitating the study (not with shaping any future restructuring). The Senate officers have reached out to Provost Butler with a request that faculty be involved in this effort from the beginning. Provost Butler has been invited to speak with the Faculty Council and Senate in the near future about the study. Professor Mallik suggested that several departmental executive officers from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences join the four deans as organizers of the study.

- *AAUP Sanction Update (Sandy Daack-Hirsch, Chair, Ad Hoc AAUP Sanction Removal Committee)*

Professor Daack-Hirsch reminded the group that the committee includes Professors Frank Durham, Christie Thomas, Russell Ganim, Justine Kolker, and Ed Gillan (Faculty Senate Secretary). The group began meeting in November, when they reviewed the sanction report and the AAUP's Redbook policies on presidential searches, as well as clarified their charge. The committee also had the opportunity to speak with Professor Dan Power of the University of Northern Iowa. Professor Power was co-chair of UNI's recent presidential search and gave input on the search process there and on faculty interaction with the Regents during the search. Professor Daack-Hirsch noted that the Faculty Senate officers have been in contact with President Harreld and Board of Regents Executive Director Bob Donnelly to inform them about the committee's existence and activities. President Harreld indicated to Professor Daack-Hirsch that he supports the committee's efforts and stands ready to assist when needed.

In December the committee met with members of the local AAUP Chapter to discuss the sanction report and the processes and procedures that led to the sanction. They also discussed the processes and procedures to have the sanction removed. The committee plans to produce a best practices document that will be based on the sanction report, the Redbook policies, procedures for previous UI presidential searches, and guidelines from the Association of Governing Boards. This best practices document will have a positive slant, focusing on what works well. The committee envisions this to be a collaborative and iterative process with the committee receiving feedback from the AAUP, the President's Office, and the Board of Regents. Regarding timeline, the committee plans to produce a draft document by the end of the spring semester. Feedback will be collected in the summer and fall and changes will be made to the

draft. A site visit from the AAUP will likely take place in late fall or early spring and the final document will be submitted to the AAUP in the summer of 2018.

Professor Macfarland noted that at an earlier meeting he had requested assurance from the committee that it believed the local AAUP chapter to be diligently pursuing the lifting of the sanction. Professor Daack-Hirsch responded that the local AAUP chapter has been supportive of the committee's work and has reached out to the national AAUP to inform staff there of the committee's efforts. The local AAUP chapter also intends to provide feedback throughout the development of the best practices document. Professor Macfarland asked if the local AAUP chapter has pledged to introduce a motion at the next national AAUP meeting to have the sanction lifted. Professor Daack-Hirsch responded that yes, through the mutual development of the timeline, the local chapter had expressed the intention to introduce such a motion. This would take place at the summer 2018 meeting, since the best practices document will not be in final form in time for the summer 2017 meeting. Professor Macfarland wondered, nevertheless, why such a motion could not be proposed at the summer 2017 meeting. Professor Daack-Hirsch responded that the process would not be as simple as proposing a motion. There are actions that need to be taken before the sanction can be lifted. Professor Tachau, a member of the local AAUP chapter, noted that the national AAUP, like any professional organization, has rules and procedures that must be followed. While the local chapter will certainly be supportive of the UI, there are elected delegates who will vote on the issue.

Secretary Gillan, a member of the AAUP Sanction Removal Committee, asked for clarification about motions at the annual meeting, specifically whether motions from the floor are allowed. Professor Tachau explained that motions from the floor regarding matters already on the agenda are not allowed; such motions need to be submitted several months prior to the meeting. The governance committee that brought the sanction motion forward must also bring forward a motion to lift the sanction. For this to happen, a site visit must have occurred and the site visit committee must have written a report. The governance committee must have time to review and approve the report and then submit a recommendation to the AAUP council. The council then makes a recommendation to the full meeting. Professor Wilder asked if the pending lawsuit against the Board of Regents regarding the presidential search would have an impact on the sanction. Professor Daack-Hirsch responded that it was unclear at this time, but that the committee is monitoring the progress of the lawsuit.

- *University Budget Update (Terry Johnson, University Chief Financial Officer & Treasurer)*

Mr. Johnson began his presentation by showing a graphic illustrating the trending of university budget models. Two of the most common types of models are the incremental budgeting model and the Responsibility Center Management model. The UI has traditionally been closer to the incremental budgeting model, which is at one end of the budgeting model spectrum. This means that when new revenue comes in during a given year, due to factors such as larger enrollment or tuition increases, the central administration identifies the new revenue and then determines how that revenue will be distributed across the university. At the other end of the spectrum is Responsibility Center Management (RCM). In this model, all revenues are recorded within collegiate budgets. Colleges' direct expenses are recorded this way (as in incremental budgeting), but there are processes to allocate central overhead costs relating to

students, finance and operations, the President's office, etc. to the collegiate budgets. Universities at either end of the spectrum appear to be moving toward the center, toward a hybrid approach. The incremental approach lacks incentives to create new revenues or control costs. Universities using the RCM approach, however, have become more siloed and university-wide strategic thinking is difficult. A hybrid model incentivizes revenue growth and cost containment, while also providing funding for strategic initiatives.

Turning to the university's current budget situation, Mr. Johnson observed that Governor Branstad proposed cutting the state budget by about \$110 million, of which \$25.8 million in cuts would be directed to the Regents institutions. The legislature has recommended a budget cut of \$18 million for the Regents institutions, of which \$8 million will be directed to the UI (\$8 million to ISU and \$2 million to UNI). That cut will occur during the current fiscal year, not next year. The UI already faced a budget deficit this fiscal year of \$16.7 million. This deficit was caused by several factors, including a change in the mix of resident vs. domestic non-resident students (more of the former vs. fewer of the latter) this academic year, fewer international students, the reclassification of veterans from non-resident to resident students at public universities, and an increase in financial aid. In ten years, undergraduate financial aid has increased by 165%.

Mr. Johnson next discussed how the university plans to address this budget shortfall. He indicated that some money is always set aside in the central budget for contingencies. Contingency funding has been used, for example, to pay consultants. This contingency funding will be cut by \$2.5 million. Although the university has now completed all of the flood-related new construction, \$8.0 million had been set aside to cover adjustments that may be uncovered by routine federal audits related to the university's receipt of FEMA assistance. This \$8.0 million will now be put toward the budget shortfall. If further FEMA-related expenses occur, they will be funded through strategic initiative requests. Considering the university's exemplary record in tracking flood-related expenses, the central administration is hopeful that there will be no adjustments. The Summer Hawk program previously funded undergraduate student summer study up to 12 credit hours (a heavy course load for the shorter summer session). This would have led to a \$1.5 million loss in the program in 2017. Changes will be made to the program starting this summer to allow the program to break even or perhaps make a slight profit for the collegiate units. Funded credit hours will be capped at six. This drop in summer enrollment will lead to a reduction of \$5.0 million in Summer Hawk incentive funding to the colleges. Lastly, overall student aid will be adjusted to cover the final \$7.7 million. This brings the university to the \$24.7 million in necessary savings.

President Harreld has developed several initiatives that Mr. Johnson listed in his next slide. The President would like to increase the university's ranking and improve faculty pay relative to peer institutions. He would also like for staff to be paid competitively. Growing the university's areas of excellence is a priority. As determined at a budget retreat last spring, budget decisions will be made based upon the principles of student success, quality metrics, UI values, and forward thinking. And, investment in strategic initiatives from a pool of funds created in every budget cycle is essential. Turning to the timeline for the 2018 fiscal year (FY2018), Mr. Johnson noted that yesterday the UI Budget Retreat Team met. This group includes the deans, the vice

presidents, the collegiate budget officers, and shared governance leadership. In late March, one-on-one meetings will occur with each business unit (collegiate or vice presidential unit) in order to finalize units' budgets based on what is known about the university budget at that point in time. While the state appropriation for next year is still not known, the governor has indicated that he intends to increase the Regents institutions' budget by 2% in FY2018 and in FY2019. Another Budget Retreat Team meeting will occur on May 9, when the President will present the FY2018 budget to the group.

Mr. Johnson then discussed the university's new general education fund (GEF) budget model. He indicated that President Harreld thinks that the incremental budgeting approach used historically at UI does not provide the right incentives for academics, research or even central administration. President Harreld would like to move to a value-based, principle-based, more transparent process. The formation of the Budget Retreat Team, a large group of individuals from across campus, is a result of this new process. The new budget model must provide flexibility to support the strategic plan. The deans frequently express concern regarding the costs to implement the strategic plan. The basis for making many financial decisions will be the GEF "Collegiate Economic Analysis." This analysis involves distributing the university's revenue among the colleges. Aid for a college's students will also be moved to that college's budget, as will indirect cost recoveries.

One of the goals of the new budget model is to maximize net tuition. Because of the performance-based funding model proposed by the Regents several years ago, the university began bringing in large numbers of students. Efforts are now being made to rein in the student aid budget that this influx created. We also need to accommodate long-term trends in state appropriations, which may not even keep up with the inflation rate, although President Harreld will continue to fight for state funding. The new model must incentivize new revenue development along with cost containment, with the latter referring primarily to overhead costs. A pool of funding for strategic initiatives must be maintained. Colleges and units must have responsibility and accountability for their own budgets. In President Harreld's view, the incremental budgeting approach does not foster this accountability. Other goals of the new model include improving salary competitiveness vs. peers and enhancing multi-year projections.

Related to central administrative overhead costs, President Harreld would like to create shared cost center advisory committees. Each committee would be comprised of two deans, service area leaders/experts, faculty, and staff. Shared service area committee themes would include enrollment management/student financial aid, student academic support, student life, research and economic development, buildings and grounds support, information technology services, and central administrative support. Each committee would review service levels and budgets within its theme area. Any savings realized from these reviews would flow back to the colleges for reinvestment in academic and research programs.

Mr. Johnson then displayed a slide showing university GEF revenues and expenses with a total budget of \$603,630,000, in the Collegiate Economic Analysis format that he had referred to earlier. Revenue sources included tuition (less, financial aid), indirect cost recoveries, and state appropriation. Collegiate budget officers have been meeting weekly, using a more detailed

version of this analysis, to consider various big-picture budget issues, such as the fairest way to distribute tuition revenue and the state appropriation among the colleges. Work on this effort is ongoing and an initial draft plan is being reviewed. Advice has been sought from universities that have already gone through this process. A senator noted that student living expenses, which are a contributor to student debt, were not included in this slide. Mr. Johnson indicated that the university has been creating a series of videos, one of which deals with student debt, for the public. (Here is one of the videos, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FVngOPNdU2Q>.) Professor Barnhardt asked for clarification about proposed cuts to student aid. Mr. Johnson responded that need-based aid would be protected. He added that, in an effort to attract more students to UI, the university had begun offering an increased amount of merit-based aid; this is the aid that will be reined in. Regarding the Summer Hawk program, he noted that capping funding at six credit hours will lead to better academic outcomes for students; six credit hours is a more manageable course load for the summer session. In terms of both student success and the university budget, this is a positive change.

Following up on the Summer Hawk program issue, Professor Tachau commented that it appeared that this program was not discussed with undergraduate college deans prior to implementation. She questioned the decision to cut the Summer Hawk incentive funding to colleges to save \$5.0 million as part of efforts to address the FY2017 budget deficit (referred to earlier in Mr. Johnson's presentation). She added that it was her understanding that this \$5.0 million was used to pay the instructors teaching the courses in the Summer Hawk program, as well as to subsidize faculty research and travel within departments. Professor Tachau expressed support for scaling back a program that never had a viable business model. However, she wondered how the program would survive when departments no longer have access to these funds. Mr. Johnson stressed that the university is trying to protect the Summer Hawk program by striking the right balance given the economics of the situation. He indicated that Provost Butler had met with the deans to discuss the reduction in credit hours and the reduction in the incentive for the program. Mr. Johnson suggested that senators should engage with their deans about this or any other areas of concern raised by his presentation today. Professor Tachau observed that deans are at-will employees and may not be in a position to question these budget decisions. Professor Ganim commented that the financial incentive for the Summer Hawk program had been instituted in part to encourage an entrepreneurial effort within the colleges. The disappearance of the incentive will likely diminish this effort. He asked when these changes would take effect. Mr. Johnson indicated that they would take effect this summer.

Professor Daack-Hirsch observed that colleges are being disincentivized to offer online programs because the money earned from those programs is not coming back to the college that offered the program. Mr. Johnson responded that within the current FY2017 budget colleges have kept 86% of the revenue from online courses. There will be incentives under the new budget model to offer online courses and create new programs because revenue will flow to the colleges. He reminded the group that university overhead costs (student services, research, etc.) will also be allocated among the colleges. Professor Barnhardt asked for clarification regarding how student aid will be pushed out to the colleges. Mr. Johnson responded that an individual student's tuition and aid will both be allocated to that student's college. Professor Barnhardt questioned whether colleges that have students with greater amounts of need will see

enrollment drop because of unmet need. Mr. Johnson responded that the university is seeking to find the ideal balance between enrollment and aid. This will be a collective effort with representation from every collegiate unit.

Professor Mallik commented that in the past the university budgeting process has been rather mysterious and it has been difficult to find specific information about it. She asked if, with this new budgeting model, there will be a central place where one can find general and more specific details about the budget. Mr. Johnson responded that it is the intention of the new model to make budget information publicly accessible. The university community will grapple with issues such as reductions in overhead costs [balancing direct collegiate costs and UI central services overhead costs] and appropriate tuition levels in a transparent way. Professor Wilder commented that unexpected costs are presumably included in university overhead. Avoiding such costs when possible is advisable. He asked where workers compensation costs fall in the university budget and what the university is doing to avoid such costs. Mr. Johnson responded that workers compensation costs are spread throughout the university in the fringe benefit category. Fringe benefit rates are negotiated every year. Programs throughout the university seek to minimize employee injury.

Mr. Johnson then turned to the role that faculty can play within the new budgeting process. He indicated that President Harreld would like for the deans to be more accountable for their collegiate budgets. Mr. Johnson urged faculty members to engage with their deans on their collegiate budgets, as well as on the university's strategic initiatives. Faculty members also have the opportunity to serve on various large university-wide committees: the Strategic Implementation Team, the Operations Team, the Budget Retreat Team, and the Shared Cost Center Advisory Committees. Interested faculty members should consult with the Senate leadership regarding these service opportunities. And, faculty members should engage with the faculty representatives on these committees.

Professor Menninger, of the Emeritus Faculty Council, commented that it appeared to him that one college was responsible for bringing in the bulk of the tuition and fee income, but it is siphoned off by other colleges. He asked if President Harreld's new budgeting model aims to stop this siphoning. Mr. Johnson responded that the university is very complex and some of its activities must be subsidized. He added that the new budget model is intended to help us make decisions regarding how to deploy university resources most effectively. Every college will need to determine its bottom line; for some it may be a plus, for others a minus. If, for example, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has a surplus and subsidizes a college with a deficit, is that an acceptable situation? These are issues that the university community must resolve, because there are many entities across campus that do not cover their own costs. Professor Mallik commented that the situation that Professor Menninger referred to has been a source of great frustration. She urged that it be taken into account in future budget deliberations. Mr. Johnson reaffirmed that President Harreld wants the budget process to be transparent and inclusive. If we choose, for example, to take money from one college to give to another, this should be done thoughtfully and carefully.

A senator noted that a drop in international student enrollment was one of the causes of the university's budget shortfall. She asked if there were plans, therefore, to increase international student enrollment. Mr. Johnson responded that the university would like to become less dependent financially on international student enrollment. While we welcome the presence of international students on campus, enrollments of such students fluctuate for reasons that sometimes are unclear. Therefore, it is more difficult to make budget projections based on international student enrollment than it is on resident and non-resident domestic student enrollment. Professor Brochu asked if the savings realized through deficit reduction would be proportionately returned to the colleges that incurred the deficits. For example, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences has carried most of the burden for the Summer Hawk program. Mr. Johnson responded that this issue is under consideration. In the future, under the new budget model, any savings that a college realizes would flow to the bottom line of that college.

Professor Tachau pointed out that *research* and *externally-funded research* are not synonymous. There are disciplines in which faculty members' research is rarely funded externally, but instead comes from the GEF, in order to maintain our status as a research university. She then asked if her Senate colleagues from other colleges believed that their deans would make collegiate budget information readily available to faculty members. She suggested that Mr. Johnson's office make this information available to the entire university community on a centrally-maintained website. Professor Buettner asked how the other (non-GEF) pieces of the university budget fit into this new model. Mr. Johnson indicated that the entire university budget is about \$3.8 billion, but that the administration is focused on applying the collegiate economic analysis model to the GEF-supported units. Other segments of the university budget may come under consideration in the future. Professor Lehan Mackin asked if only collegiate units contribute to the GEF, or do other units, such as Athletics, also contribute? Mr. Johnson responded that Athletics, like other units, is billed monthly by the university for overhead. Athletics is also starting to make contributions to the GEF, beyond the overhead assessment.

Professor Oral commented that the university's strategic plan seems to imply that units that are working well will receive greater resources, while units that are less successful will see a reduction in resources. But it also appears that the basic needs of all colleges are going to be met. A strong liberal arts and sciences college is the heart of any university and the work the college does is extremely important to the university overall. Therefore, CLAS must receive all the budgetary support it needs to function well. Resources for CLAS seem to have been shrinking for years, however. How will we be able to support CLAS at an appropriate level when we are not only moving resources to other programs, but are also seeing reductions in overall university revenue? Mr. Johnson responded that this will partly be a matter of identifying priorities. The new budget model is intended to encourage revenue growth and generation. Some departments in CLAS may not generate significant revenue, but may be important to the mission of the college, for example. All collegiate deans will be responsible for ensuring the support of units that are essential but not self-supporting. Mr. Johnson also noted that overall university revenue this year is up, not down, over the previous year, although it is not up as much as we would like. He stressed that faculty members should be engaged in the budgeting process as we use this new model to address important questions about the university's priorities and future.

Working at Iowa Survey Results (Teresa Kulper, Director, Human Resource Services, UI Organizational Effectiveness/Organizational Development)

Ms. Kulper reminded the group that the Working at Iowa survey was administered to faculty and staff last October. There was a 60% participation rate, down slightly from the last time the survey was given in 2014, but still relatively high for these types of workplace surveys. Ms. Kulper indicated that workplace engagement positively affects productivity while reducing turnover, absenteeism, and injuries, among other benefits. She noted that Professor Ean Crawford of the Tippie College of Business has served as an advisor for the survey group, providing expertise on employee engagement. The survey indicated agreement rates above 90% with statements such as *I know my work expectations*, *I know my contribution to the mission*, and *I would recommend UI to others for employment*. Professor Crawford's research has shown that the three main drivers of engagement are understanding how one's contribution makes a difference, feeling supported in one's work, and having the opportunity to develop.

There are seven questions that have been asked consistently since the survey was first administered ten years ago. The rate of positive responses to several of these questions has increased during that time frame. The agreement rate with a statement that workplace conflicts are managed constructively has increased 13% from ten years ago, for example. This remains an area for improvement, however, along with distributing workloads fairly, recognizing accomplishments, and the university treating faculty and staff with respect. Collegiate and departmental reports were distributed in December. This month, unit senior leadership has been asked to develop specific work plans to address areas in need of improvement. There are plans to form focus groups in partnership with shared governance to better understand areas for improvement. Ms. Kulper encouraged senators to get involved with these focus groups or with the formation of work plans within their units. Please feel free to contact her with questions or suggestions, teresa-kulper@uiowa.edu.

- *Legislative Initiatives Relevant to the Public Universities (Tom Vaughn)*

Noting that he had already covered various legislative issues in the President's Report, President Vaughn asked senators for any additional comments or concerns. Professor Tachau observed that most of the university's graduate students are in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Campaign to Organize Graduate Students (COGS), the graduate employee union, has asked for faculty support for their position that unions are important for graduate employee success (in relation to the bill proposing revisions to Chapter 20). She added that there is a somewhat overlooked clause in this legislation that could lead to higher health insurance costs for faculty and professional & scientific staff. Professor Tachau also commented that there are state and federal bills under consideration that seek to punish higher education institutions that declare themselves or act as sanctuary campuses. This could have ramifications for our students and colleagues and their families. We need to keep a close eye on all of these bills. President Vaughn concurred and urged that faculty members with ideas to address these issues contact him.

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

V. Announcements

- A special Faculty Senate meeting with our local legislators will be held Friday, February 24, 1:00-3:00 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Professor Macfarland stressed the importance of having representation from both parties at these meetings. Professor Vaughn indicated that the Senate officers and Governmental Relations Committee also plan to reach out to various legislators around the state.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 21, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The online committee recruitment drive will end Friday, March 3. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- The call has gone out for nominations for the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa. Please encourage your colleagues to nominate someone. The deadline to submit nominations is Friday, March 10.
- The Committee on Elections is now accepting nominations for Faculty Senate officer positions. Please contact members of the committee with suggestions, <https://uiowa.edu/facultysenate/committee-elections>.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Vigmostad moved and Professor Brochu seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.