April 1, 1999

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Faculty Senate Motion Summary

1997-98

[All main 1997-98 motions passed by the Faculty Senate are included in this summary except for those motions that were procedural in nature and that were superseded by subsequent motions or were motions to approve committee appointments and/or Faculty Council and Faculty Senate replacements. Council motions that were passed by the Faculty Senate in a similar form were also excluded.]

Faculty Senate Meeting - September 16, 1997

1. Approval of Amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution

The Senate passed the following amendment:

Resolved that Article I, Section 3 and Article IV, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate Constitution (Operations Manual Sections 10.022 and 10.025) should be amended to delete the word "instructor" from the Constitution.

As amended, the affected portions of Article I, Section 3 and Article IV, Section 1 would read as follows (deletions are indicated by strikeouts, additions by highlighting):

Article I, Section 3 amendment:

"3. For purposes of this Constitution: Faculty who hold tenured appointments are all those faculty who have been awarded or appointed with tenure as tenure is defined in the University of Iowa Operations Manual. Faculty who hold nontenured appointments are all those faculty who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor ~~or instructor~~ and who hold neither tenure nor a clinical appointment. . . ."

Article IV, Section 1 amendment:

"**1. General Rules.** Elections are held annually under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Elections. Tenured, nontenured and salaried clinical faculty who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor ~~and instructor~~ are considered members of the faculty and eligible to vote. . . ."

ACTION: The amendment was subsequently approved by faculty referendum, by President Coleman and by the Board of Regents. It has been incorporated in the 1999 Operations Manual.

2. Senate recommendations to the Provost concerning "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision Making"

a. The Senate endorsed the following recommendations to the Provost:

- **RE: p. 8, I C (3): Student teaching evaluations held in the department "for reasons of confidentiality."** The last part of I C (3), which currently reads "which are in the department's custody rather than the candidate's for reasons of confidentiality," should be deleted and replaced by "which may have been solicited by the department as part of its regular tenure review process."

ACTION: The Provost adopted the Senate recommendation. [See Guideline I.C.(6).]

- **RE: p. 9, I D (2) (b): Promotion to full professor.** The parenthetical expression at the end of this item should be entirely deleted. The expression reads: "(in the case of a

promotion to full professor, the letter should emphasize that the reviewer should concentrate on the candidate's scholarship since his or her last promotion.)"

ACTION: The Provost's final Guidelines allow each college to specify by rule "what sample or portion of the candidate's work each reviewer is to evaluate." [See Guideline I.D.(2)(b).]

- **RE: p. 9, I D (2) (b): Number of external reviewers.** The current parenthetical expression specifying a number of reviewers, which reads "(or a narrow range of numbers of reviewers, in either case no fewer than five)" should be replaced by "(in no case fewer than three, with a recommended range of four to eight)."

ACTION: The Provost adopted the Senate recommendation in part. In the final Guidelines, the parenthetical reads "(with a recommended range of four to eight)" without any reference to a minimum number of external reviewers. [See Guideline I.D.(2)(b).]

- **RE: p. 12, I F (1): Where faculty vote on Promotion and Tenure decisions.** The wording of I F (1) should be changed to express the Senate's concern that a) every faculty member get only one vote in the promotion and tenure process and b) except for the collegiate Dean and the Provost, all faculty vote and participate in discussions of members of their own department at the departmental level only. The second part of this recommendation means that faculty who are members of the Collegiate Consulting Group may not vote or participate in the discussion of members of their own departments at the level of collegiate deliberations.

ACTION: The Provost adopted the Senate recommendation. [See Guideline I.G.(2).]

- **RE: p. 13, I G (4) and p. 16, II C (3): "Educational need" and the tenure decision.**
  Item II. C (3) on p. 16 should be entirely deleted. Item I. G (4) should be deleted, with the first part of the item, from "If" to the semicolon moved to follow upon the existing sentence in G (2). Thus, G (2) would read in full:
  Based on the Promotion Record, the Departmental Executive Officer will recommend that promotion be granted or denied in a separate letter to the collegiate Dean for each candidate. If the Departmental Executive Officer recommends that the candidate be promoted, the Departmental Executive Officer's letter to the Dean will address any negative aspects of the promotion record.

ACTION: The Provost adopted the substance of the Senate recommendation. [See Guidelines I.H.(1)-(4).]

- **RE: Motion for review of "educational need" in the Operations Manual**. The Office of the Provost should review the policy on educational need as it appears in the Operations Manual [III-10.1a(4)(c)].

ACTION: The Provost reports that this recommendation has not yet been acted on. The focus of the Provost's office has been on the implementation of the "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision Making." When that process is complete, the Provost will take appropriate steps to review the "educational need" policy.

- **RE: p. 8, I C (2): Peer observation of teaching**. The phrase set off by dashes in item I C (2), which currently reads "– which may or may not include peer observation of teaching –", should be replaced by the phrase "– which must include peer observation if practicable – ".

ACTION: The Provost adopted the Senate recommendation. [See Guideline I.C.(2).]

b. The Senate further resolved, as a recommendation to the Provost:

That it is the sense of the Senate that
1. the candidate have the opportunity to read and to respond to the Promotion Record, consisting of the dossier and the internal reviews, in writing before the DCG and the DEO examine the Promotion Record and make their recommendations. The candidate's response becomes part of the Promotion Record.
2. the candidate may respond in writing to the DCG's report and the DEO's letter to the Dean, and that this response becomes part of the Promotion Record.
3. the candidate may respond in writing to the Dean's letter to the Provost, and that this response becomes part of the Promotion Record.

ACTION: The final Guidelines adopted by the Provost are consistent with most, but not all, of the Senate recommendation. There are two main differences between the Provost's Guidelines and the Senate recommendation. First, the candidate is not given the opportunity to respond to the entire Promotion Record prior to consideration of the Record by the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) and the DEO. Rather, the candidate is only entitled to review "internal peer evaluations" and correct "errors" in those evaluations prior to DCG and DEO consideration of the Record. [See Guidelines I.F.(1)-(2).] Second, after the DCG and DEO recommendations are forwarded to the Dean (or after the Dean's recommendation is forwarded to the Provost), the candidate's access to the Promotion Record is limited by restrictions not contained in the Senate recommendation. In particular, the candidate's access to confidential external peer evaluations or to confidential student evaluations is restricted to cases in which a negative recommendation on tenure or promotion has been forwarded by one of the relevant decision makers. Moreover, the external peer evaluations and the confidential student evaluations (and, in fact, the Promotion Record as a whole) must be redacted to protect confidentiality. [See Guidelines I.I.(2); II.D.(2).]

Faculty Senate Meeting - October 14, 1997

Approval of Recommended Changes to wording of item II.B (4) in the draft "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision Making at the University of Iowa".

The Senate approved a motion to change the wording of item II. B (4) in the draft "Guidelines", specifically to insert the following underlined text *after* part of the first existing sentence, so that the item will read:

"II. B. (4) The Collegiate Consulting Group will meet to discuss the Candidate's qualifications. Upon reviewing the Promotion Record, if the Collegiate Consulting Group determines that it needs more information and/or clarification, the Collegiate Consulting Group can submit a written set of questions to the Departmental Executive Officer, requesting a written response within a stipulated time-period. The questions as well as the responses will be placed in the Promotion Record. [*Secretary's clarification:* The wording of the rest of II B. (4) could stay in this item or be moved to a separate item; we did not discuss these details as part of the motion under consideration.]"

ACTION: The Provost adopted the substance of the Senate recommendation. [See Guideline II.B.(4).]

Faculty Senate Meeting - April 28, 1998

Approval of changing the charge to the Committee on Faculty Welfare as found in Article III, Section 4 of the Bylaws of the University of Iowa Faculty Senate and Council (omitted text is indicated by strikeout, added text is underlined):

The Faculty Senate approved the following amendment to the charge to the Committee on Faculty Welfare contained in the Faculty Senate Bylaws:

"The Committee on Faculty Welfare (1) receives inquiries about, examines, and makes recommendations concerning University policies, ~~and~~ procedures and other issues which ~~affect~~

relate to the ~~welfare~~ quality of ~~the~~ faculty life; (2) provides information and advice to individual faculty members with respect to faculty grievance and development~~, and in situations not covered by established University procedures conducts its own inquiries~~; (3) ~~prepares an annual report on the reasons for resignations of faculty members with assistance from the office of Academic Affairs and with other appropriate offices and officers~~ gathers and publicizes information on faculty needs and concerns; and (4) monitors University performance and policies ~~and performance~~ in achieving and maintaining a satisfied and diverse faculty."

ACTION: The Senate Bylaws were revised to reflect this amendment.

Approval of 1996-97 Motion Summary

The Senate approved the 1996-97 Motion Summary, with the understanding that then Vice-President Wiley would check to be sure that updates of the Operations Manual reflected changes to the Constitution allowing for interim election of a vice-president if the office becomes vacant and increases in P&S representation on the Library Committee that had been approved by the Senate.

ACTION: The 1999 Operations Manual reflects the relevant changes to the Constitution and to the Committee on University Libraries Charter.

Faculty Council Meeting - October 28, 1997

The Council approved a motion expressing its support for the concept of a Faculty and Staff Center.

ACTION: Planning is underway for a Faculty/Staff/Retiree Center in the Iowa Memorial Union. Space has been designated for the Center, and Faculty Senate and Staff Council offices will be moved to that space as soon as it is vacated by its current occupants.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Carlson
Vice President, Faculty Senate