

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, March 8, 2016**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre**

**MINUTES**

Councilors Present: P. Abbas, S. Ali, C. Benson, S. Daack-Hirsch, E. Gillan, J. Kolker, G. Ryan, J. Wilcox, J. Yockey.

Officers Present: C. Bohannon, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.

Councilors Excused: P. Brophy, S. Campo, H. Udaykumar, S. Vos.

Councilors Absent: T. Havens, S. Seibert, M. Voigt.

Guests: D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Bohannon called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Yockey seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (January 26, 2016) – Professor Wilcox moved and Professor Yockey seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (March 22, 2016) – Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Ryan seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees)
  - None at this time

III. New Business

- *Instructional Faculty Policy (Christina Bohannon)*

President Bohannon reminded the group that the Faculty Council has now had several opportunities to discuss this policy and offer feedback for revisions. The Faculty Senate also had an initial discussion at its last meeting. The latest revision of the policy draft addresses the concerns raised by senators at that meeting. An accompanying summary document describes those changes. The Senate officers are now working with the Office of the Provost to develop an implementation memo to the colleges outlining how to transition their current lecturers to the new titles and ranks provided for in the policy, as well as guiding colleges in the development of their own instructional faculty policies. A university-wide instructional faculty promotion procedures guide is also in the works. Some of the concerns that lecturers have been raising throughout the policy development process will be addressed in these two documents, rather than in the policy itself.

President Bohannon stressed that we should be proud of this policy, as it does serve to lift up members of the university community who are deeply involved in the teaching mission of the institution. The policy provides for greater status and job security, greater transparency in work assignments, a pathway to promotion, access to grievance procedures, and representation in Faculty Senate. The policy now has the support of the Office of the Provost, the deans, the Lecturers Committee, and the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Executive Committee and Lecturers Subcommittee have also had the opportunity to review it.

Professor Wilcox commended the Senate officers on the revisions made to the policy following the February 16 Senate meeting; he felt that the changes accurately reflected the suggestions made at that meeting. He also praised the “soft rollout” of the policy, allowing for an opportunity for many people to become comfortable with it. Professor Gillan also praised the revisions made to the policy. He commented, however, that he found the ten-day window during which an instructional faculty member could file a dispute after a receipt of notice of a university action or non-action to be too brief, especially if the policy encourages the instructional faculty member to seek consultation before filing. He noted that the professional and scientific staff dispute procedures allow the employee a two-week time period to file a grievance following discovery of notification of the university action or non-action. He suggested that perhaps a similar provision should be included in this policy. After all, an instructional faculty member could, for example, leave for the summer and not receive a notification that was sent in May.

President Bohannon observed that, on the other hand, an instructional faculty member could possibly claim that s/he never received the notification. Associate Provost Kregel commented that the consolidated time frame was beneficial for both the instructional faculty member and the department, so that these cases do not drag on. The group discussed whether the policy should refer to delivery of notice in hard copy or electronic format, or both. President Bohannon indicated that the Senate officers would look into this further and, if necessary, make revisions prior to the March 22 Senate meeting. Vice President Vaughn praised the efforts of the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and especially of President Bohannon, Secretary Snyder, and Assistant Provost Diane Finnerty on the policy. President Bohannon expressed appreciation to Associate Provost Kregel and Assistant Provost Finnerty for being terrific partners in working on the policy.

Professor Wilcox moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Instructional Faculty Policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Proposed Committee on Academic Values (Christina Bohannon)*

President Bohannon proposed the formation of a Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Values. The purpose of this new committee would be to advise the Senate and its officers on issues related to the university’s core values, such as tenure, academic freedom, free speech on campus, shared governance, etc. She explained that the impetus for the creation of this committee is the range of events going on at universities around the country, as well as on our own campus, that touch on these values. She cited the placement of a controversial piece of art on the UI Pentacrest in December 2014 as one such event that raised issues regarding diversity

and free speech. Additionally, concerns about academic freedom arose when a new diversity general education requirement was proposed in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In this particular case, the Senate officers worked with the College to come up with an acceptable solution. President Bohannon noted that sometimes our core values intersect and tensions may arise. Therefore, it would be useful to form a standing committee that actively and deeply explores these issues and is ready to offer advice and guidance when the need arises. The committee could also weigh in on policy initiatives. President Bohannon indicated that the Senate officers are often consulted regarding these types of issues and she expected that this practice would continue, but that it would be helpful to have a committee embedded within the shared governance structure that is entirely focused on these important concerns. In case a situation would occur on campus that requires an immediate response, this committee would be well-positioned to provide timely guidance grounded in the university's fundamental values.

Professor Ali noted that the proposal calls for a faculty member from the College of Law always to serve on the committee. She suggested that a seat on the committee also be reserved for a faculty member from the College of Education, particularly someone who studies issues in higher education. President Bohannon responded that a College of Law faculty member was included because of the need for First Amendment expertise. She raised the question, however, of how the committee seats should be allocated. For example, she had considered requiring the membership of a Faculty Senate past president, because of the experience that person would have had dealing with these types of issues while in office. Professor Ali suggested perhaps reserving a seat for a representative from each college, given the broad impact of these issues. Professor Gillan noted the logistical difficulties of a larger committee serving as a rapid response team. Past President Thomas cautioned against making the committee membership too prescriptive, because this could lead to difficulty in filling committee seats, as the Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees has experienced. Vice President Vaughn and Professor Gillan spoke in favor of a committee that would research issues ahead of time and have guidance already formulated for different types of situations. Professor Gillan also stressed the need for deep expertise on the committee, for maximum efficiency. President Bohannon expressed the opinion that the Senate President should have flexibility to select the people with the most relevant knowledge for service on this committee.

Professor Benson asked for further clarification regarding the charge of the committee. He noted that the issues President Bohannon had referred to (academic freedom, tenure, etc.) are huge issues affecting the university. Many other groups on campus address these issues, to some extent. He asked how this new committee would interact with these other groups. President Bohannon responded that a group situated within the established shared governance structure is essential, because it is to shared governance bodies that the administration looks when advice regarding faculty viewpoints is needed. She also stressed that just keeping up with all of these issues on the national stage is time-consuming. There would likely be some overlap with other groups. For example, the committee would need to stay informed about policy statements put forth by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) on a wide range of issues. She added that the officers are frequently asked by administrators to provide members for various ad hoc university committees. The Academic Values Committee would serve as a ready and well-versed pool of individuals for membership on other relevant committees.

Professor Menninger, of the Emeritus Faculty Council, suggested that the Ombudsperson, as someone with extensive local knowledge, could be a useful participant on this committee. He also asked if academic integrity would be among the issues considered by the committee, since it did not appear in the proposal. President Bohannon indicated that the list of issues in the proposal was not meant to be exhaustive, and that academic integrity issues, such as plagiarism, could well be considered by the committee at some point, along with additional issues not mentioned here. Professor Ali asked if the student shared governance groups have similar committees; she commented that the representation of student voices seemed to be lacking when, for example, the Pentacrest statue incident erupted. President Bohannon responded that she was not aware of any student committee. However, she noted that some members of the student government leadership are planning to host a forum on free speech on campus and were seeking a faculty representative to speak at this event. She added that during the Pentacrest statue incident, there was no group presenting the faculty perspective. Professor Yockey suggested that this committee eventually forge a relationship with student leadership and hold periodic meetings with them. President Bohannon speculated that in the future the committee could evolve into a charter committee with student representation. Professor Wilcox observed that the committee could play a role in matters of shared governance.

Vice President Vaughn advocated for the committee's role in exploring relevant events and issues at other campuses and reporting back to the officers. President Bohannon noted that the Office of the Provost is developing a series of workshops on faculty development. The committee could consult on workshop topics such as tenure. The proposal calls for the Faculty Senate President to appoint the committee members. President Bohannon explained that one reason for this was that the committee recruitment deadline has already passed for this year, but that the officers were eager to get the committee formed. In the future, member selection may be handled by the Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees. Another reason, however, would be to give the Faculty Senate President the discretion to select members on an accelerated timeline to deal with specific types of issues that suddenly confront the university. Either way, the committee membership would be approved by the Senate. Professor Daack-Hirsch noted that the committee recruitment drive could introduce the officers to qualified potential members that the officers may not have been aware of previously. President Bohannon concurred and added that the officers typically consult widely anyway when filling seats on ad hoc university committees. Councilors noted the need for flexibility in committee member appointment. Professor Ryan commented that the chair of the committee, if s/he is expected to make public comments, should be a good spokesperson for the group. Professor Benson suggested that the committee members could be chosen through a combination of presidential appointment and Committee on Committees selection.

Professor Yockey moved and Professor Benson seconded that the creation of an Academic Values Committee be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Executive Session: Strategic Planning and Communication (Christina Bohannon)*

Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Council move into closed session. The motion carried unanimously.

The Council discussed the university's strategic planning process now underway.

Professor Wilcox moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the Council move out of closed session. The motion carried unanimously.

V. Announcements

- 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 11.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 22, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, April 12, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Ryan moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.