

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, March 6, 2018
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: C. Benson, F. Durham, A. Durnev, M. Foley Nicpon, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, R. Oral, E. Prussing, J. Szot, C. Thomas, E. Wasserman, D. Wurster, J. Yockey.

Officers Present: R. Ganim, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn, R. Williams.

Councilors Excused: G. Ryan, K. Tachau, S. Vigmostad.

Councilors Absent: A. Deshpande.

Guests: E. Gillan (Chemistry; Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee), J. Lavery (Staff Council), F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), K. Ward (University Human Resources), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

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

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Durham seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (January 23, 2018) – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 27, 2018) – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Russ Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - *None at this time*

III. New Business

- *President Bruce Harreld*

President Harreld explained that the university had begun a process several years ago to shift the way we allocate resources across campus. He added that we have seen a decades-long trend of de-appropriation by the state. This trend is likely to continue into the future. In the recent past, central administration was the recipient of funds, which it then doled out to the colleges. We have now gained a better picture of the revenue and expenses of each college, as well as of the resources (libraries, information technology, central administration, etc.) shared among colleges. Under the new budgeting model, colleges will have greater control over their destinies, with 70% of collegiate revenue remaining within the college, while the other 30% will

go towards services shared among the colleges. Cuts in appropriations will be divided, 60% to the colleges and 40% to the shared services. Colleges will now have the opportunity to creatively address their own needs. It is unclear at this time what our impending de-appropriation from the state will be. President Harreld commented that we need to speak widely about the state's generational disinvestment in higher education. Administrators have written opinion pieces in local newspapers and President Harreld has made numerous presentations to legislators. Students have been particularly vocal. Legislators have indicated that we have made an impact this time, but we will likely need to continue voicing our concerns in the future. As a result of continuous de-appropriation from the state, our ranking in *U.S. News and World Report* has dropped. While one may question the reliability of such rankings, it is clear that the university's ranking is important to students and their parents, as an indication of the value of a UI degree. It is likely that we will see a tuition increase, but no decisions will be made until we see what happens to our state appropriation. While this is helpful for the university, students will therefore not learn what next year's tuition will be until June. However, this situation is typical of many other institutions. President Harreld praised the members of the current Board of Regents, State of Iowa for their dedicated stewardship of the Regents institutions.

President Harreld showed a presentation that he has been giving frequently to legislators. He indicated that several peer institutions in nearby states have seen increased allocations. Over the past twenty years, Iowa's budget has increased while support for the Regents institutions has gone down. President Harreld observed that Iowa has resources, but it has chosen to disinvest in higher education. The more we hold people accountable for that, the better off we are. Increases in faculty salaries have helped to boost our rankings in some areas. President Harreld showed data indicating that our student retention rate is 86%. While this is higher than the national average, it is below the average for our peer group. We need more mentoring, tutoring and other kinds of support programs to improve our retention rate. Other institutions are more selective, however, and this may boost their retention rates. President Harreld noted that when we accept students who may be at risk for struggling academically and financially, we also provide them with a list of resources they can turn to for assistance. Some students decide at this point not to attend the university. An increasing number of our admitted students each year are first-generation and we must be sensitive to their needs.

Stressing that the Board of Regents controls in-state undergraduate tuition, President Harreld commented that the graduate and professional colleges are free to set their own tuition rates. They can also make adjustments to their ratio of in-state to out-of-state students. Professor Marshall observed that in her college, students pay extra fees that remain in the college, while a portion of the tuition has gone back to the university. If colleges are now allowed to retain more of their tuition revenue, there may not be a need for these extra fees. President Harreld noted that while most state institutions have been de-appropriated, they have been able to increase their tuition at a much faster rate than Iowa has. Professor Durham commented that there is a wider political landscape in the country that questions the value of higher education. President Harreld stressed that we must do a better job of telling the university's story, in order to correct misperceptions among the public. Professor Wasserman commented that some legislators have focused attention on tax breaks that the state has given to corporations, thereby reducing state revenue.

President Harreld commented that in the last few years, he has been investigating what the university does with its intellectual property, how to support more university research, and how to further develop the intellectual property we have on campus. We have enormous talent at the university and we need to re-think our approach to research and economic development. He commented that every dollar spent at our institution generates three dollars in economic prosperity for our region. He added that the university is not an expense to be cut, but an asset to be invested in. Institutions in other parts of the country have had considerable success in economic development.

We need to improve student success, President Harreld continued, and we need to invest in more support mechanisms. We also need to be more purposeful about the time that students spend outside the classroom and how we use that time to reinforce what takes place in the classroom. Data indicates that the longer students stay in the residence halls, the better they perform academically. Turning to faculty salaries, President Harreld indicated that we are now at the mean of our peer group, although there are still pockets of the university that need improvement. Regarding affordability, he commented that the Board of Regents is considering the implementation of a five-year model for tuition increases, thereby providing stability for students and their families. A significant portion of each increase goes toward additional student financial aid. Award-winning efficiency is saving the university money which can then be put toward our strategic initiatives. Centralization, standardization, and automation of services are major factors in increasing efficiency. Professor Wasserman cautioned that this increased efficiency puts additional burdens on staff, who may hesitate to voice their concerns. While efficiency may make financial gains, effectiveness may suffer.

President Harreld explained that two years ago, administrators began discussions about how to improve upon resource allocation processes at the university. The group established principles for how to approach any improvements. These principles included focusing on student success, quality indicators, institutional values, and shaping the future. The first step was for each college to figure out its own economics; this had never been done before. There are interesting opportunities for additional interdisciplinary research and teaching, so a mechanism must be created for cost sharing. Boards are being created for various central services, such as information technology, to ensure that resources are being managed as carefully and transparently as possible. Efforts are now underway to implement the new budget allocation model (BAM), so that we keep as many resources as possible within the colleges, without crowding out the central services. President Harreld urged Councilors to think about the governance processes within their colleges. Resource allocation decisions will be made closer to the people doing the teaching and the research. He observed that the degree of shared governance currently varies widely among the colleges; all colleges must develop a robust system of shared governance moving forward.

Professor Lehan Mackin asked if financial aid decisions will go through the colleges now or if they would still be centralized. President Harreld responded that both would occur, but that the streams should be better coordinated. Professor Oral commented that there is an effort underway nationwide to privatize public universities, placing more of the financial burden of higher education on students and families. Keeping the big picture in mind, she advocated for a

calm but sturdy fight with legislators to help them understand that the current trend of disinvestment is not sustainable. She asked what the university's long-term strategy was to deal with this challenge. President Harreld responded that he asks his audiences to consider the consequences if all universities were private. He added that he thinks this would be a disaster for our country. He would like the faculty's help in telling the university's story to the people of Iowa. He commented that this is hard work, but that we should remain optimistic. Vice President Ganim asked about the timetable for the roll-out of the new budget model. President Harreld said that presentations would be made to faculty and collegiate groups starting this month. Secretary Williams asked if funds would be allocated centrally for interdisciplinary work. President Harreld indicated that a specific amount would not be set aside in the budget, but funds would become available through efficiency cost-savings and Path Forward initiatives. Professor Wasserman asked about the Academic Organization Structure 2020 project and what President Harreld hoped to obtain from that effort. President Harreld commented that there are pockets of the university, such as the performing arts, that are somewhat buried structurally, and he hoped to find a way to give them more prominence. He would also like to support cross-college initiatives more. He added that we must build a culture in which we ask challenging questions and are not afraid of failure.

- *Volunteer Time Release Policy (John Laverty, Staff Council President and Ed Gillan, Chair, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee)*

President Snyder explained that this policy had originated with the UI Staff Council. It has been revised and approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee. It will eventually be inserted into the Operations Manual, if it makes its way through the approval process.

President Laverty began his presentation by commenting that he has developed a good working relationship with President Snyder and that this is much appreciated by Staff Council. Turning to the policy, President Laverty indicated that the concept grew out of discussions in the Staff Council Human Resources Committee several years ago. The committee had received reports that supervisors and departments around campus were unevenly allowing staff to volunteer for university-related events and functions (e.g., On Iowa). Staff members were receiving mass email messages from the University President or the Provost urging them to volunteer for these events. Some supervisors allowed staff members to use work time for these activities while others insisted that they use vacation time, or prohibited them from participating in events during work hours. Certainly there are staff members, such as nurses or campus police officers, whose presence on campus is critical. Staff Council worked closely with University Human Resources to create the policy, consulting with the General Counsel. After the policy was presented to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, some revisions were made to clarify that the policy relates only to university-sponsored activities (not to the employee's church activities, for example). President Snyder added that the Office of the Provost has reviewed the draft policy, as well.

Professor Gillan commented that the draft policy would let supervisors know that they could allow staff members to participate in university-sponsored activities; supervisors may now be under the impression that they cannot do this. He added that the Faculty Policies and

Compensation Committee had initially wondered if the policy should even include faculty, because their time is more flexible and they are expected to engage in service activities (although an activity such as On Iowa would likely not be listed on a faculty member's CV). Including faculty would make the policy more inclusive, however. And, instructional-, clinical-, and research-track faculty may have less flexibility with their time than faculty on the tenure track. Professor Thomas pointed out that some faculty members supervise staff members.

Professor Wurster voiced support for the policy, but observed that it is a statement of philosophy rather than a policy because there is nothing enforceable in the language. Professor Gillan concurred that the policy is aspirational, not prescriptive. In response to a question, President Lavery responded that the policy would most likely be placed near the flex time policy in the Operations Manual. Professor Wasserman asked with whom one would lodge a complaint related to the policy. Kevin Ward, Senior Director of HR Policy and Administration for University Human Resources, indicated that one would go up the usual chain of command. Professor Thomas asked if a monitoring plan has been established to determine if the policy has been successful. President Lavery responded that no formal monitoring plan has been created. He added that many staff members have concerns right now over the university's budget situation. This policy will not only not cost the university any money, but it will also contribute to improved staff morale at this difficult time. Professor Gillan added that these volunteer activities would contribute to the university's positive effect on the community. President Snyder wondered if there could be a way to track faculty and staff volunteer time for the university. Professor Wasserman suggested recording this information on the Academic and Professional Record (APR). Vice President Ganim added that the activity report that faculty members periodically fill out for the Board of Regents was another option. Professor Marshall stressed the morale-boosting aspect of the policy for staff. Professor Wurster noted, however, that staff members can only participate if supervisors allow it. President Lavery commented that Staff Council has been advocating for more training for supervisors.

Professor Thomas moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the Volunteer Time Release Policy be approved. The motion carried with one abstention.

- *President's Report (Pete Snyder)*

President Snyder indicated that a search for a new provost has been announced. Gail Agrawal, Dean of the College of Law, and Teresa Mangum, Director of the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies, will co-chair the committee. Interim Provost Sue Curry will continue to serve until the new provost is named. As mentioned previously, Sarah Gardial, Dean of the Tippie College of Business, and David Ryfe, Director of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, are co-chairing the search committee for the new dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The search firm that will assist the committee visited campus recently and met with the Faculty Senate Officers. An interim dean will be selected; Interim Provost Curry has reached out to the officers for input. She will also be contacting leadership groups in CLAS. Five finalists for the position of dean of the College of Law have come to campus recently and that search will wrap up soon. The first candidate for the position of dean of the College of Public Health is on campus today. Regarding the search for the new vice president for research

and economic development, the search committee has completed a report with recommendations on the structure of the office. Once President Harreld responds to the report, the search committee will write a job description. Other ongoing searches are for the UIHC CEO and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of the University College.

Turning to legislative updates, President Snyder noted that the Iowa Senate has passed a mid-year de-appropriation bill, but the bill has not yet passed the House. Students, faculty, and staff have all been in touch with legislators regarding this issue. The next report of the Revenue Estimating Committee is due on March 9, so we should know more then about the state's financial circumstances. Other legislative activity includes a free speech bill. The Senate officers have been in touch with the Offices of the General Counsel and of Governmental Relations about this bill. Most of the bill reflects current university practice regarding speech. However, the bill makes the entire campus a public forum, meaning that groups could gather and protest without university permission, subject to time, manner, and place restrictions. The hospital and athletics facilities are exempted out of the bill, along with spaces not generally open to the public. There is a passage in the bill that may be in conflict with Iowa's Civil Rights Act. This passage prohibits denial of privilege to a student organization based on the organization's leadership requirements. Shared governance leaders may issue a statement on this bill. The Senate's Committee on Academic Values has also been working on a statement about speech. Professor Yockey commented that there is a tension between freedom of speech and freedom of association. He expressed concern about the bill's language regarding the campus as a public forum.

President Snyder indicated that the AAUP Sanction Removal Committee will meet on April 5 with a representative from the national American Association of University Professors.

A committee has been formed to review the ACE student evaluation forms. Ken Brown, Associate Dean of the Undergraduate Program in Business in the Tippie College of Business, and Tanya Uden-Holman, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Public Health, will co-chair this committee. The committee will be reaching out for input on how to increase the ACE response rate.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 27, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 10, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Szot seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snyder adjourned the meeting at 5:23 pm.