MINUTES


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

Officer Excused: R. Ganim.


Councilors Absent: C. Thomas.

Guests: G. Agrawal (College of Law), S. Curry (Provost), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), E. Gillan (Chemistry; Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee), W. Jacobson (Office of the Provost), S. Klatt (Office of Finance and Operations), T. Mangum (Obermann Center for Advanced Studies), D. Szeszcycki (Office of the Provost), M. Valencia (HESA), 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 Benson moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 6, 2018) – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Szot seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 24, 2018) – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results – Professor Marshall moved and Professor Foley Nicpon seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Wasserman asked for clarification about Senate eligibility for faculty with term appointments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. President Snyder reminded the group that currently only faculty on the tenure, clinical, research and instructional tracks are eligible for service on the Faculty Senate. Instructional-track faculty began serving on the Senate last year, following passage of the new instructional-track faculty policy. Faculty who hold visiting and adjunct appointments are not eligible for Senate service at this time. President Snyder added that each college, not just CLAS, has a significant number of
faculty on various tracks who are not eligible for Senate service. He commented that the Senate may want at some point to discuss the possible inclusion of these other tracks in the Senate. Should faculty members with short-term contracts be included, or should Senate membership be limited to those with longer-term relationships with the university? In response to a question, President Snyder indicated that there are collegiate caps on the numbers of faculty members on the clinical, research, and instructional tracks in the Senate.

E. 2018-19 Committee Recommendations – Professor Wurster moved and Professor Ryan seconded that the committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

• **Operations Manual Revisions Related to Instructional-Track Faculty (Ed Gillan, Chair, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and Diane Finnerty, Assistant Provost for Faculty)**

Professor Gillan explained that the passage of the instructional-track faculty policy several years ago had precipitated some updates to various other policies in the Operations Manual. These updates have been approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committees.

One of these updates is to add instructional-track faculty to the definition of “regular faculty” in the Emeritus Status for Retirees Policy (Operations Manual III. Human Resources, 11.7): (2) "Regular faculty," when used in this Section, means tenured faculty or, salaried clinical or, research, or instructional track faculty of the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor at any rank.

The second update is the removal of “renewable term” faculty from the Fixed-Term Faculty Appointments Policy (Operations Manual III. Human Resources, 10.12), because this is the former status of the instructional-track faculty, who now have their own policy. The Fixed-Term Faculty Appointments Policy still applies to adjunct and visiting faculty. Several Provost Office-approved fixed-term categories have been added to the policy:

Fixed-term faculty appointments include: 1) adjunct, 2) renewable term, and 3) visiting faculty, lecturer (fixed-term), instructor, associate, and assistant in instruction.

President Snyder observed that these updates were simply a matter of “cleaning up” details in the policies. Professor Wurster suggested a grammatical edit (in bold italics) to the text of the first update, (2) "Regular faculty," when used in this Section, means tenured faculty or, salaried clinical or, research, or instructional track faculty of the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor at any rank.

Professor Wurster moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the proposed Operations Manual revisions to language for new instructional-track faculty be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
• **Provost Search (Gail Agrawal, Dean, College of Law and Teresa Mangum, Director, Obermann Center for Advanced Studies; search committee co-chairs)**

  Dean Agrawal explained that a new provost is anticipated to be on campus in late spring, with a term briefly overlapping that of Interim Provost Curry, who is scheduled to step down on June 30, 2019. The membership of the search committee is expected to be announced soon. Recommendations for members had been widely solicited. The university has contracted with the search firm Isaacson, Miller. Representatives of the firm will be on campus in early May to meet with a variety of groups regarding the search. Work on the job description and website will take place during the summer and the search will be launched in August before the start of classes. Airport interviews will likely take place between the Thanksgiving and the winter breaks, but candidates will not be brought to campus until approximately the second week of spring semester classes. President Harreld has authorized the committee to bring up to four candidates to campus and, after the on-campus interviews, he would like for the committee to present him with a list of two finalists. The co-chairs are currently seeking thoughts and insights from the campus community as they prepare to meet with the search firm. They would also like names of potential provost candidates. Dean Agrawal then asked the group what the search committee should be looking for in a new provost – characteristics, experience, background, etc.

  President Snyder asked if there would be efforts to examine the existing Provost Office structure as part of the search process. Dean Agrawal responded that a review of the Provost Office structure is not being planned as part of the provost search at this time. Professor Mangum added that, in conversation with campus groups and individuals, it would be helpful to learn whether there are activities that the Provost Office could be engaged in that it is not currently. Asking what people would like for a new provost to do within the first year in office is another way of soliciting this information.

  Past President Vaughn encouraged the solicitation of a diverse pool of applicants. He also commented that candidates should have a strong appreciation for the liberal arts, as well as experience in facilitating interdisciplinary work. Secretary Williams commented that candidates should have experience at public institutions of comparable size, a long history of devoted leadership, and a thorough understanding of higher education. President Snyder reiterated the need for candidates with experience at public universities because of the unique challenges these institutions face. Professor Marshall suggested that candidates be good communicators to internal and external constituents. Secretary Williams indicated that she would be looking for a history of consensus building with people at all levels, along with an appreciation of shared governance. And, candidates should understand the mission of public education. President Snyder commented that candidates should have credibility in building and leading academic programs, because this is the most important duty of a provost. Also, a new provost will need to find the ideal balance between undergraduate and graduate education, given the budget issues that the university is facing.

  Dean Agrawal observed that it is clear that we will need a provost who is a strong intellectual leader. This individual will also need a deep understanding of how the institution operates, because s/he will be the spokesperson for the academic budget, as well as the academic voice in the President’s cabinet. A management/administrative skill set will be crucial. Professor
Mangum added that it is very challenging not to let the budget dominate every conversation. Budget should follow values.

Professor Wasserman cautioned against candidates who chase trends, rather than who develop an understanding of an individual institution. He added that we have seen innovations (such as cluster hires) implemented with little or no follow up to assess the value of those initiatives. While innovations are not uniformly unwise, they should be reality-based and data-driven. Professor Mangum commented that we must articulate the strengths of our institution to candidates. We can then ask candidates how they would support these strengths, thereby taking the conversation out of the predictable and into the local, the imaginative and the innovative.

Past President Vaughn suggested that candidates understand the metrics of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and how UI can improve its standing. Secretary Williams advocated for identifying candidates who have a clear understanding of the issues facing professional schools because the new provost will need to navigate the sometimes conflicting interests and needs of all the UI colleges. It may be difficult to screen for these qualities in candidates, but perhaps there could be a very thorough check of references. Dean Agrawal commented that Isaacson, Miller is known for very deep dives on references. Search committee members will also do significant reference checks. In conclusion, Dean Agrawal and Professor Mangum requested that councilors encourage colleagues to engage in the process and to assist in identifying outstanding provost candidates.

- **Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Assurance Argument and Site Visit (Wayne Jacobson, Director, Assessment, Office of the Provost)**

Dr. Jacobson indicated that about eleven months from now a team of Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditors would visit campus, the culmination of an extensive amount of work put forth by the university. The HLC has made significant changes to its procedures since the university last underwent accreditation ten years ago. The previous procedures had been burdensome for institutions and reviewers alike, with the compilation of an enormous randomly-organized self-study along with file cabinets full of hard-copy documentary evidence. The new procedure calls for an ongoing process of building an electronic portfolio, called an assurance argument. Within the portfolio, the institution addresses 21 specific components related to how the accreditation criteria are being met. Relevant documents can be linked to the portfolio. Online updates to the portfolio are made annually, spreading the documentation burden over ten years. An online review (without site visit) is done in year four, serving as a checkpoint. A federal compliance review is completed around the time of the site visit. Within the ten-year timeframe, institutions also choose a three-year window in which to pursue a quality initiative. The UI’s current quality initiative is improvement of the success of first-generation students.

Turning to the timeline for this last year before the site visit, Dr. Jacobson noted that individuals on campus who can prepare contributions regarding the 21 components have been identified and materials have been collected from about half of them. Once all the contributions have been collected, they will be combined into a single document. In the fall, the document will be circulated widely among various leadership groups on campus for review and feedback. The
document will be finalized by the end of the fall semester and submitted to the site reviewers, who will visit campus next March.

- **Executive Session – New UI Budget Model (Interim Provost Sue Curry; Susan Klatt, Director, Financial Management and Budget and University Secretary, Financial Management and Budget, Office of Finance and Operations; and Don Szeszycki, Associate Vice President and Director of Administration and Planning, Office of the Provost) and Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and Michael J. Brody Award Recipients.**

  Professor Szot moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the Council move into executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

  Interim Provost Curry gave a presentation on the new UI budget model that will soon be implemented and answered questions from Councilors. President Snyder announced the recipients of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and the Michael J. Brody Award.

  Professor Lehan Mackin moved and Professor Ryan seconded that the Council move out of executive session. The motion carried unanimously.

- **President’s Report (Pete Snyder)**

  President Snyder indicated that a representative from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Professor Nicholas Fleisher, of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, visited campus on April 5 to evaluate the campus climate for shared governance prior to writing a report to the national office regarding the AAUP sanction of the university. President Snyder expressed the view that Professor Fleisher’s interviews on campus went well.

  Regarding administrative searches, President Snyder informed the group that the College of Public Health dean search committee has forwarded several names to Interim Provost Curry, so we should learn the outcome of that search soon. Chief Diversity Officer Lena Hill has been offered the position of Dean of the College at Washington and Lee University. Vice President for Student Life Melissa Shivers will serve as the interim chief diversity officer. The structure of the Chief Diversity Office will be re-considered and a national search will eventually be launched.

  President Snyder thanked departing Councilors Joe Yockey (Law), Chris Benson (Medicine) and Ginny Ryan (Medicine) for their service. He also thanked Secretary Williams, who cannot attend the April 24 Senate meeting, for her service.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 24, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.
VI. Adjournment – Professor Ryan moved and Professor Marshall seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snyder adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.