

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, October 24, 2017**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present:** F. Ahmad, J. Ankrum, J. Barker, C. Barnhardt, J. Buckley, D. Caplan, K. Culp, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, F. Durham, A. Durnev, B. Elias, M. Foley Nicpon, E. Gillan, L. Glass, D. Gooblar, D. Hall, S. Harwani, A. Hosmanek, A. Jung, C. Kletzing, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, B. Kyles, K. Lamping, M. Lehan Mackin, J. Logsdon, T. Long, L. MacGillivray, U. Mallik, T. Midtrod, J. Moore, M. Nikolas, R. Oral, T. Peters, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, G. Russell, A. Stapleton, J. Streit, K. Tachau, S. Vigmostad, S. Vos, E. Wasserman, D. Wesemann, D. Whaley, D. Wurster, J. Yockey.
- Officers Present:** R. Ganim, P. Snyder, T. Vaughn, R. Williams.
- Senators Excused:** C. Bradley, J. Colgan, A. Deshpande, E. Finzel, T. Gallanis, A. Hooks, T. Marshall, L. Ostedgaard, J. Reinhardt, G. Ryan, M. Voigt, J. Welburn.
- Senators Absent:** L. Allen, R. Balakrishnan, C. Benson, R. Boudreau, P. Brophy, B. Dixon, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, I. Grumbach, K. Messingham, R. Sah, E. Sander, D. Segaloff, J. Szot, C. Thomas.
- Guests:** C. Brochu (Earth & Environmental Sciences/CLAS Faculty Assembly), C. Creekmur (Cinematic Arts), S. Curry (Provost), J. Keller (Interim Vice President for Research), T. Mangum (English), D. Matheson (Sport & Recreation Management), C. McKinney (Office of Strategic Communication), F. Mitros (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Moeller (Office of the Provost), T. Rice (Des Moines Programs), J. Sessions (History), L. Snetselaar (Office of the Provost), 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 – President Snyder pointed out that this year descriptive paragraphs appear under each New Business item on the Senate agenda, so that senators can be more prepared for meetings. He also noted that an item had been added to today’s agenda after the agenda had been sent out last week; Interim Provost Curry will give an update on the dean search in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In order to make time for this new item, a report on the Committee on Access and Use of Faculty Data has been moved to the December meeting. Professor**

Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (September 12, 2017) – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Russ Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - None at this time

### III. New Business

- *Academic Organization 2020 Update (Tom Rice, Office of the Provost and John Keller, Interim Vice President for Research and Economic Development, and Associate Provost for Graduate and Professional Education and Dean of the Graduate College)*

President Snyder reminded the group that the university has been in the process of reimagining our academic structures. The first phase of the process is coming to a close, with the recent release of the Phase I report. Interim Vice President Keller is one of the authors of that report. The second phase of the process will be led by Professor Rice, who will chair the Phase II task force.

Interim Vice President Keller commented that earlier this year, the Phase I task force had been put together by then-Provost Barry Butler. The task force was re-charged by Interim Provost Curry following Provost Butler's departure from the university. In both stages, the Phase I task force had been charged with looking at opportunities to advance our teaching and research missions and determining whether we have the right academic structure to accomplish the university's goals. The task force was comprised of four deans who conducted numerous interviews. The Phase I report is a summary of the many thoughts the group heard from those whom they interviewed. The report does not contain any recommendations made directly by the four deans, but instead discusses principles, themes, and challenging issues gleaned from the interviews. These elements will likely be readjusted by the Phase II process, for which they will serve as the starting point. Interim Vice President Keller commented that everyone interviewed by the task force indicated that the status quo is not acceptable and that the university is not living up to its full potential.

Professor Tachau noted the emphasis in the report on the need for *flexible* and *nimble* units. She asked what *nimble* meant in this context. Interim Vice President Keller responded that this referred to more autonomous decision-making, not constrained by hierarchies that could prevent units from moving in certain directions. A unit could find itself hindered by its size, or by collegiate policies and procedures. He added that we are in a rapidly-changing environment that requires a structure and flexibility to allow us to move in different directions as the environmental variables change around us. Professor Mallik asked for clarification of the goals of both phases. Interim Vice President Keller responded that Phase I carried out an environmental scan of common themes, principles, and challenges heard across the campus. Professor Mallik asked if Phase II would be bound by the themes of Phase I. Interim Vice President Keller answered that Phase II would not be restricted by Phase I.

Professor Kletzing asked if units outside the academic realm were considered by the Phase I task force (facilities, information technology services, etc.). Interim Vice President Keller responded that the four deans were tasked with looking at the academic arena; there are various other committees looking at non-academic parts of the university enterprise. Professor Kletzing pointed out that academic unit nimbleness and agility are facilitated by non-academic units. Interim Vice President Keller concurred. Professor Mangum, an audience member, asked for clarification regarding which colleges are referred to in the Phase I report when *large colleges* are discussed. Interim Vice President Keller responded that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and the Carver College of Medicine (CCOM) were not the only colleges that fall into that category. He added that the task force found it worthwhile to consider what is the right size for a unit to be manageable, accountable, and responsible for its mission. Professor Stapleton perceived a contradiction in the *Themes* section of the report between consolidating units to promote productivity and building community for student success within smaller units. Interim Vice President Keller observed that this is a difficult balance to achieve.

Professor Tachau commented that one of the duties of the Faculty Senate is to protect shared governance. Two particular aspects of the report touch on shared governance. The first aspect concerns rotating departmental executive officers (DEO's). The report asserts that *rotating DEO structures in some areas impede progress*. Professor Tachau took issue with this statement, noting that for several decades, a distinction has been made between department *heads*, common in medical schools, who are selected by a higher administrator and have considerable authority, and department *chairs*, who derive their ability to serve from the consent of their colleagues, even though they are appointed by deans. The latter is the standard model in CLAS. The rotating nature of the position keeps the DEO accountable both to the department and to the dean. While this model does hinder swift decision-making from the top down, it facilitates consensus from the bottom up. The other aspect touching on shared governance, Professor Tachau continued, is the suggestion that the General Education curriculum be *overseen by a central university office*. She noted that since the thirteenth century, curriculum has been overseen by the faculty. It would be a radical change to remove control from the faculty and put it into the hands of administrators. If the Faculty Senate decides that there should be more input into the curriculum from those outside CLAS, then the Senate could establish a curriculum committee, as other university senates have done.

Professor Rice then addressed the Senate. He acknowledged that there has been concern about the Phase I report and the work that the Phase II committee might take up. He explained to the group that the Phase II task force does not have specific instructions nor does it have any specific goals in mind. The task force is starting from a blank slate. The group intends to review the Phase I report and the strategic plan, as well as to do considerable outside reading regarding university organization. There are also plans to interview some university administrators from around the country, such as the president of Arizona State University, about recent reorganizing experiences at their institutions. Professor Rice indicated that he sees the task force's role as facilitating a campus-wide discussion about how we might better organize our university to meet the goals of our strategic plan. The task force will likely have several dozen meetings with various campus groups. Recommendations that the group eventually makes will come from feedback gathered from the faculty and other groups on campus, so he encouraged faculty to

make their views known to the task force members. Feedback can be submitted through the Academic Organizational Structure 2020 website, <https://uiowa.edu/acad-org-2020/>. It is also possible to request a meeting with the task force. A series of town hall meetings will be scheduled to begin in November. The task force is looking forward to listening to faculty, staff, and students, and hopes to hear ideas of some significance. This listening phase is expected to last for a month or so.

Professor Kletzing stressed the need for additional communication from the task force in this initial, listening phase, including at least one more mass email message with the link to the 2020 website. He also urged that the task force, to the extent possible under the charge, consider the support role that non-academic units play in facilitating faculty work. Professor Logsdon suggested that the task force use the town hall meetings as a venue to reach those who do not belong to pre-existing groups with whom the task force plans to meet. He added that the task force should hold its first town hall meeting soon and follow up with frequent, additional events. Professor Tachau commented that the university is not particularly accessible to people with disabilities. She suggested that the task force make a recommendation that the university investigate how to become more accessible to people with a wide range of disabilities.

Professor Oral expressed interest in knowing how communication moves from the top down and from the bottom up in individual colleges. She indicated that she was not aware of any efforts in the Carver College of Medicine to gather input from faculty on the 2020 initiative, so that this input could guide administrators in their discussions with the task force. Professor Rice encouraged senators to contact the task force about speaking with groups within colleges that represent the faculty viewpoint. Professor Mallik suggested that moderators be used at the town hall meetings, to facilitate constructive dialogue between the task force and the audience. Professor Buckley asked for clarification regarding the timeline for the process. She expressed concern that the time set aside for listening to the campus was too short. She also wondered about the timeline's relationship to transitions in upper administration. Professor Rice responded that the task force's timeline was not tied to any administrative transitions. He added that he anticipated the listening phase to last throughout the process. The task force would likely meet again with groups to get feedback on proposed recommendations during the spring semester.

Professor Mallik requested that the task force issue periodic updates on progress, with summaries of feedback, for the sake of transparency. Professor Mangum expressed deep concern about waiting to hire a CLAS dean until the 2020 process concludes. She stated that she wanted the college to have strong leadership as soon as possible. Via applause, many senators concurred. In closing his remarks, Professor Rice indicated that he expected the 2020 process to conclude by the end of the spring semester. President Snyder noted that Professor Rice and Interim Vice President Keller have been very responsive to the Senate officers throughout the 2020 process. Professor Rice meets frequently with the Senate officers to update them on progress. President Snyder indicated that faculty can provide input through the Senate officers and through the faculty members of the 2020 task force, as well as online through the 2020 website.

- *Dean Search Update (Sue Curry, Interim Executive Vice President and Provost)*

President Snyder noted that questions have arisen in recent Council and Senate meetings about various dean searches, particularly about the timing of the search for a dean for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. He thanked Interim Provost Curry for coming to the Senate meeting today to discuss these issues.

Interim Provost Curry commented that undoubtedly the group would ask when the search for a new CLAS dean would begin and why a search wasn't underway yet. She noted that she had received very little notice before stepping into the interim provost role. There had also been very little notice that the current CLAS dean would not continue beyond the initial five-year appointment. She had assumed that her interim appointment would only last about twelve months. Since CLAS is a large college, she thought that a permanent provost should choose the CLAS dean. Interim Provost Curry also explained that the Academic Organization 2020 initiative is underway. It is not a set of conclusions awaiting a report, but everything is on the table in terms of restructuring. We will not know until that initiative concludes what kind of position we will be recruiting for. Therefore, the search will not begin this academic year and an interim dean will be appointed. That interim dean will serve for at least a year. In the spring semester, Interim Provost Curry will gather input regarding candidates for the interim dean position and make an appointment by the end of April.

Professor Kletzing commented that there appeared to be a double standard at work between the two largest colleges (CLAS and CCOM), because CCOM has just hired a vice president for medical affairs/dean. He found the plan to wait to hire a dean to be disturbing, especially since an interim dean will have limited decision-making capability. He added that CLAS has felt rudderless for some time. There would also no doubt be greater interest in the 2020 initiative if a search were underway. Interim Provost Curry responded that there was not a double standard. The CCOM search was for the combined positions of vice president for medical affairs and dean; President Harreld, therefore, made that hire. Professor Tachau commented that she appreciated Interim Provost Curry's frankness. She indicated her intention to be equally frank, on behalf of the CLAS faculty who teach 90% of our students at some point. Not having a search underway for a permanent dean is unacceptable. Important budget decisions are currently being made without the input of a permanent dean. She added that CLAS faculty deserve to have a college that is functioning well. Professor Mallik stressed that CLAS needs to be maintained at the same level of excellence as the other colleges; currently, the opposite seems to be happening. We must keep the future of the college in mind as we make decisions.

A faculty member asked whether it wouldn't be better to hire a CLAS dean prior to the completion of the 2020 initiative, so that s/he could have input into the process. Interim Provost Curry commented that she is excited about the 2020 initiative, because many people have ideas for how to improve the university. She added that if she were a leader coming into the college, she would be glad to have a blueprint for improvement that was created through an aspirational shared governance process. If the process is still underway and the results are unclear when dean candidates come to campus, however, this could make candidates uncomfortable. Professor Logsdon asked who would be appointing the new dean, the interim provost or a permanent provost? Related to that, when will the search for a permanent provost get

underway? Interim Provost Curry responded that President Harreld would need to answer the latter question. Regarding the former question, she noted that President Harreld had indicated to her that he did not want to put a permanent provost in right away, but in about 12-18 months. She is now seven months into her interim position, so she would likely remain for 18 months total since it takes a year to do a search. Therefore, Interim Provost Curry will probably be the person who hires the new CLAS dean. Professor Logsdon observed that it appears that we are not waiting for a permanent provost in order to hire a new CLAS dean. Interim Provost Curry indicated that she had originally thought we should wait for a permanent provost, but her thinking has changed on this matter. She added that there are currently many opportunities for faculty members to involve themselves in shared governance: the 2020 initiative, the Path Forward process, and central service review committees. The university has tremendous potential that we are trying to realize through these shared governance processes.

Professor Barnhardt thanked Interim Provost Curry for her frankness. She asked what vision and values Interim Provost Curry would be looking for in an interim CLAS dean. Interim Provost Curry responded that an interim dean would need to possess all of the attributes that would be expected of a permanent dean. She added that she believed it was possible to be a strong interim dean and in some ways an interim appointment confers a greater sense of freedom. Professor Barnhardt expressed hope that CLAS faculty could weigh in with their own preferences for the characteristics of an interim dean. A faculty member commented that she would like to restate more strongly what some of her CLAS colleagues present had already said, which is that she believed that by delaying a search for a permanent dean, Interim Provost Curry is disrespecting the knowledge, authority and expertise of the scholars, teachers, and administrators in CLAS. The delay also disenfranchises CLAS and sends a clear message that strong leadership from CLAS is not necessary to the 2020 initiative, nor is it desired for the 2020 initiative, and that university life can proceed as though the largest college in the university that is educating the vast majority of students doesn't matter to this process. She reiterated that it is disrespectful and disenfranchising; although this is strong language, she stated that Interim Provost Curry needed to know how many CLAS faculty think about this situation. Via applause, some senators concurred. Interim Provost Curry acknowledged the comments and stressed that this was not her intended message to CLAS faculty.

Professor Brochu, chair of CLAS Faculty Assembly, commented that many CLAS faculty are alarmed by the 2020 initiative and interpret the Phase I report as targeting the college. He added that the combination of the Phase I report and the delay in the search for a dean strikes many CLAS faculty as ominous. Interim Provost Curry indicated that she is deeply committed to the university and that CLAS is a great college with amazing faculty. Professor Brochu stated that without CLAS, the university would cease to exist, which cannot be said about any other college. Interim Provost Curry responded that the university is a system. People choose to come here because of the collective that creates this AAU Research I university. Without the other colleges, CLAS would not be part of a university and this would impact who chooses to come here. This is not a contest regarding who is or is not the most valuable. Interim Provost Curry stressed that she wanted to hear what senators had to say today, but that she would not make any promises that she could not deliver on.

Professor Daack-Hirsch commented that, as a faculty member not in CLAS, she had heard today from many faculty who understand very well how CLAS works and how they want it to work, while she had also heard from a provost with power who was listening to the CLAS faculty but not changing her mind, although she was not giving a sound rationale for her decision not to hire a dean. Professor Tachau expressed appreciation for Interim Provost Curry's appearance here today. Referring to Interim Provost Curry's earlier remarks about the AAU, Professor Tachau noted that CLAS has been losing faculty and is not in a position to attract new faculty at this time. While the teaching mission is very important, the university cannot remain an AAU institution without the research that CLAS faculty do. She added that morale is extremely low in CLAS now. Professor Mallik concurred with this perception of the low morale in CLAS.

Interim Provost Curry asked for advice from the group. Professor Kletzing charged her, in the absence of a permanent dean, with protecting and enhancing the CLAS budget and advocating for the college that subsidizes the educational enterprise of other units. A substantial portion of the tuition revenue that CLAS generates does not come back to the college. This is a situation that needs to be remedied for the long-term financial health of the college. Professor Lehan Mackin commented that it appears some middle ground is needed. Perhaps Interim Provost Curry could assure that CLAS would be well-represented in university budget decisions and in restructuring efforts, while guaranteeing CLAS faculty significant input into these processes. Professor Barnhardt suggested that the interim and permanent CLAS deans could be selected through collegiate elections. This would be true shared decision-making. A faculty member requested that there be a commitment from Interim Provost Curry and other top administrators to respect Iowa's open meeting laws and to guarantee that in the future only individuals with genuine academic qualifications will be hired as senior administrative staff.

Professor Wasserman cast doubt on the assertion that the status quo won't do. He commented that a president had been hired in opposition to the wishes of faculty, staff, and students because the university community had been told that we need transformational leadership. At Iowa State University, meanwhile, a president has been hired who had been a long-time dean there, thus disproving the notion that transformational leadership was necessary and that the status quo wouldn't do. He asked why faculty should trust the 2020 process. Faculty in CLAS would be far more likely to engage in the 2020 process if the college had a dean who could speak strongly on behalf of CLAS, a college that does not retain even half of the tuition revenue that it generates. He added that we cannot look upon the undergraduates as a source for funding the entire university and then not give them the quality education that they are paying for. This is a crime against the students and their parents. To tell the faculty of CLAS, the prime reason why the university exists, that it cannot hire a permanent dean for two or three years is unacceptable, disrespectful, and inappropriate. Professor Wasserman acknowledged that in Interim Provost Curry's view this might be a rational thing to do, but in fact this is a process that will do the most harm to the college. Via applause, some senators concurred. He urged that a search immediately get underway with the goal of hiring a dean that will guide the college into the future with due regard for the necessity to increase the collegiate budget and the opportunities to hire tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Interim Provost Curry urged that CLAS faculty not disenfranchise themselves from the 2020 process, but instead provide input to the committee. The committee wants to hear from as many people as possible. If we are relying on one person in a leadership position to guide the process for CLAS, then we are not doing this right. Professor Wasserman reminded the group that the faculty was asked to provide input during the presidential search, but that this input was completely ignored. Professor Elias noted that Interim Provost Curry has indicated that it is not her intent to make the CLAS faculty feel disenfranchised or unimportant. Nevertheless, the CLAS faculty feel this way, which must be acknowledged. He agreed with Interim Provost Curry that the success of the 2020 initiative does not depend on one administrator alone. However, there can be no shared governance if the governed don't feel that the process is legitimate. Interim Provost Curry acknowledged these concerns but was wary of a self-fulfilling prophecy for CLAS. She observed that there is considerable distress around some of the decisions she has made during her short time in her interim position with regard to recruiting leadership for CLAS. She added that even if she were to start a dean search tomorrow, the 2020 process would still happen. She strongly encouraged CLAS faculty to engage in this process. She added that she wanted everyone to speak with each other honestly, to recognize that we share many values and principles, and that we all care about the university and CLAS. She stressed that she does not want faculty to feel disenfranchised and it is possible for her to change her mind based on feedback.

Vice President Ganim thanked Interim Provost Curry for speaking to the Senate. He also urged faculty to engage in the 2020 process. He noted that considerable uncertainty has also been generated by the new budgeting process. Without a permanent dean, many CLAS faculty feel that the college will be at a disadvantage when budget decisions are made. Interim Provost Curry explained that we are currently examining our budget model. In every budget decision that has been made thus far, however, the majority of the money that has been allocated out has gone to CLAS. Everyone involved in budgeting cares about the fiscal integrity of every unit on campus. Unfortunately, we have less and less money. Interim Provost Curry has been adamant that we make decisions about budgeting by looking at the university as a whole. President Snyder noted that the 2020 process is scheduled to conclude in the spring semester. He asked what the proposed timeline would be to start a CLAS dean search. Interim Provost Curry responded that this would likely be in the fall semester of 2018, but she could not give a definite date at this time.

- *Minors on Campus Policy (Lon Moeller, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of the University College and Ed Gillan, Chair, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee)*

President Snyder explained that for the last several years a committee has been working on a policy to protect minors who participate in a variety of activities on campus. The Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) has reviewed the policy and recommended some changes, which have been incorporated into the draft presented to the Senate today. The Faculty Council also made recommendations that were incorporated into the draft policy.



Associate Provost Moeller began his presentation by asking the group to consider our collective responsibilities to the young people in our care who come to our campus to participate in programs. He noted that a committee has been working on the policy for four years. He recognized the efforts of FPCC Chair Ed Gillan, who provided feedback on the draft policy early on as chair of the Research Council, and continued to offer useful advice in his present role. Associate Provost Moeller went on to explain that an internal audit in 2011 revealed that the university did not have any way to account for youth programs on campus. The audit recommended central oversight for such programs. The scandal at Penn State University occurred around this same time and caused many universities, including UI, to look at policies and procedures that we have in place to protect young people in our care who are here for academic camps, sports camps, music lessons, etc. It turned out that UI was one of the few Big Ten institutions without a central policy related to the supervision and training of employees who deal with minors and youth programs. There were also no guidelines for minors who volunteer in labs. A study of peer institution policies identified four best practices: a campus-wide policy; required central registration of youth programs and summer camps; a criminal background check for faculty, staff and students who have direct contact with minors; and required training for those same individuals. Developing policy to cover minors who volunteer in research laboratories took a considerable amount of the committee's efforts.

Turning to the draft of the Minors on Campus policy, Associate Provost Moeller walked the group through the policy sections. The policy purpose is based on two fundamental interests, taking on our obligations toward children who are on our campus and informing faculty, staff and students who work with minors of campus requirements and best practices. Under the *Definitions* section, he drew the group's attention to the definitions of *University Youth Programs* and of *Direct Contact*. The former definition is subject to exclusions enumerated in another section. Guidelines for proposal and approval of youth programs are provided, along with a requirement to register approved programs on a central website. An alternate approval process exists for Institutional Review Board-approved research and for minor volunteers who are conducting research. In the latter case, colleges are responsible for developing guidelines, based on templates that will be available from the Provost's Office. Those who have direct contact with minors must undergo criminal background checks every five years. Self-disclosure of arrests or convictions is required. An effective training program for working with minors is under development. A Minors on Campus Advisory Committee has been created to monitor the application of the policy. Associate Provost Moeller added that an existing policy, *Visitors in the Workplace*, has been modified to include a section on minors in the workplace; this section includes a list of high-risk areas in which minors are not permitted.

Professor Nikolas commented that because of the nature of their work, many faculty members are mandatory reporters of child abuse and neglect. She noted that in the *Reporting* section of the policy, it was not clear to whom reports should be made. Professor Nikolas clarified that mandatory reporters are required to report to the Department of Human Services, not just to the university. She suggested that the advisory committee consult with mandatory reporters regarding training and reporting. Professor Oral added that mandatory reporting is required to DHS when a caretaker is involved. If the situation is a professional context, then the police should be called.

Professor Kletzing pointed out that some undergraduates are still minors. Associate Provost Moeller responded that admitted and enrolled students are excluded from this policy because they are covered by other university policies. There were several questions and comments about minors volunteering in research labs. Associate Provost Moeller indicated that the implementation of the policy should lead to a full accounting of all minor volunteers in research labs. Colleges will create their own guidelines for minors in labs. Professor Gillan commented that faculty members may find it difficult occasionally to distinguish between a minor who is an *occasional* visitor to a lab vs. a *regular* visitor, who would then fall under the Minors on Campus policy. Professor Kletzing added that it may be a challenge to communicate the existence of this new policy to individual faculty members who may sometimes have minor volunteers in their labs. Professor Vigmostad pointed out that the policy requires criminal background checks for faculty, staff, students, and volunteers, but is unclear about the timing for rechecks for students and volunteers. She suggested that this be clarified. Professor Ankrum observed that criminal background checks will not stop all instances of malfeasance, because some perpetrators do not have criminal records. Associate Provost Moeller acknowledged this, but added that the checks are one more level of best practice. Professor Ankrum took issue with requiring training on working with minors every three years; he thought it should be required every year. Professor Barnhardt noted that the policy only applies to on campus programs. She suggested that at some point in the future, a policy should be developed for off campus programs.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the Minors on Campus policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the revised Visitors in the Workplace policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Theme Semester and Office of Outreach & Engagement Update (Linda Snetselaar, Associate Provost for Outreach & Engagement)*

Associate Provost Snetselaar indicated that the topic for the Theme Semester next spring is *Climate for Change* and will focus on how the decisions we make today will impact future generations. She noted that the Theme Semester Initiatives are designed to include all colleges across campus. One of the key goals of the initiatives is to involve faculty, staff, and students in service-oriented community projects. The Office of Outreach and Engagement will host a faculty workshop on November 14 for faculty who are interested in implementing a community engagement project in their classrooms. At the conclusion of the *Climate for Change* Theme Semester, there will be a celebration and exhibition of projects undertaken by faculty, staff and students. Associate Provost Snetselaar also noted that her office had been involved in an event at the Englert Theatre recently showcasing outreach and engagement projects that students are involved in with community partners. President Snyder noted that the Theme Semester Initiatives are an amazing opportunity for faculty to collaborate in research, teaching and engagement.

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

Professor Daack-Hirsch reported that the committee is finishing up work on a best practices document regarding presidential searches. The committee members will then be gathering input on the document from the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), as well as from the national organization. Professor Logsdon suggested that the committee take into consideration the recent results of the presidential search at Iowa State University, given that the sanction was imposed on the University of Iowa because of malfeasance by the Board of Regents.

- *President's Report (Pete Snyder)*

President Snyder gave a report on various items of interest to senators.

A new Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine has been named, Brooks Jackson. Dan Reed has stepped down from the position of Vice President for Research and Economic Development. Dean of the Graduate College John Keller has been named to that position in an interim capacity. A search committee has been announced; chairs will be Professor David Gier from the School of Music and Professor Aliasger Salem from the College of Pharmacy.

Regarding the Board of Regents, Wendy Wintersteen, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Iowa State University, has just been named as the new president of ISU. Faculty there have been pleased with the search process and outcome. Professor Logsdon asked if any polling was done of ISU faculty, staff, and students regarding the presidential candidates. President Snyder indicated that there were two mechanisms for feedback. One of these was an online portal for campus community members to submit comments about the candidates. Also, the search committee met with the Regents just prior to the Regents' interviews of the candidates, in order to give feedback on the candidates. President Snyder added that Mark Braun has been named as the new Executive Director of the Board of Regents. Decisions about tuition levels for next year have been temporarily delayed.

The U.S. Department of Education has rescinded Title IX policy guidance related to sexual violence. This includes the Dear Colleague letter and Q & A from 2011 and 2014. Interim guidance has been issued. No changes are anticipated by administrators to our policies in the short term.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2520D.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 5, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Mallik moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snyder adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.