

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Tuesday, April 12, 2016**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre**

**MINUTES**

Councilors Present: P. Abbas, C. Benson, S. Campo, S. Daack-Hirsch, E. Gillan, J. Kolker, G. Ryan, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wilcox.

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

Councilors Excused: S. Ali, P. Brophy, T. Havens, J. Yockey.

Councilors Absent: S. Seibert, H. Udaykumar.

Guests: D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), 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 – President Bohannon noted that she intended to move the agenda item *Potential Senate Resolution* into executive session. Professor Gillan moved and Professor Abbas seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 8, 2016) – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Abbas seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 26, 2016) – Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Ryan seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Christina Bohannon) – Professor Kolker moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2016-17 Committee Recommendations (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Vaughn noted one additional recommendation – the appointment of Christina Bohannon (Law) to the Judicial Commission. Professor Abbas moved and Professor Kolker seconded that the committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Strategic Plan Development Group (David Cuning and Sarah Hansen, Co-chairs)*  
Professor Cuning explained that Provost Butler had convened the Strategic Plan Development Group. The committee has met twice so far and is currently gathering feedback from many campus groups on different strategic issues. At this time, strategic issues are divided into generic categories of teaching (student success), research (knowledge and practice), and

service (outreach). The committee is divided into three sub-groups based on these categories. A series of forums has been planned to allow faculty, staff and students the opportunity to voice opinions on what should go into the strategic plan. Provost Butler has requested that the committee submit its report to him by June 30. In spite of the accelerated timeframe, the committee hopes to submit a report that is as comprehensive as possible, incorporating faculty, staff, and student feedback to a degree not seen in previous strategic planning processes. The report is projected to be about four or five pages, with only general strategies under each category, along with some details regarding how to reach these goals. This will not mark the end of the process, however, because in the fall there will be opportunities for the campus community to provide additional input on the report. New committees will also be formed later to assist with developing implementation strategies.

Ms. Hansen added that the intention to create a strategic plan that was “crisp and time-sensitive” arose when President Mason was still in office and had requested a faster process for creating a strategic plan. Provost Butler and Vice President Rocklin, who had chaired the committee, decided to maintain that pace. The committee is using a “hub-and-spoke” model, so while the members of the committee are participating in discussions around the table, they are also reaching out to their colleagues for feedback. Still evolving is the connection between this process and the new budgeting process already underway. As part of this budgeting process, President Harreld has formed an operations team and a strategic implementation team at the cabinet level. The strategic plan needs to feed into those existing processes. Although the timeline for the strategic plan does not allow for it to impact the current budgeting process, the operations and strategic implementation teams can use the plan to evaluate additional revenue that may emerge and guide future decision-making. Ms. Hansen further noted that the committee is also reviewing the proposals gathered by the shared governance groups.

Professor Kolker asked where issues of faculty recruitment and retention might fall within the three categories of topics addressed by the strategic plan. Ms. Hansen responded that they would probably fall within the knowledge and practice category. She added that the committee is trying to avoid rigid categorization, especially at this early stage. Professor Wilcox commented that perhaps the categorization image of “buckets” might be more useful than the image of “pillars” from the previous strategic plan. He asked where a concept such as internationalization, frequently talked about on campus in recent years, might fit in. Vice President Vaughn observed that, symbolically, internationalization could serve as one of the stabilizing connective pieces of a three-legged stool (the legs representing teaching, research, and service). President Bohannon questioned why categories were needed at all at this stage. Professor Cuning and Ms. Hansen commented that the categories can serve as general examples of the types of ideas being sought.

President Bohannon noted that some organizations have opted for a one-page strategic plan and wondered if that might be a possibility for the university. Ms. Hansen explained that the committee’s charge had called for the production of a set of strategies, tactics, and metrics in multiple focus areas. Professor Wilcox expressed concern that, while the committee should be commended for soliciting a wide variety of ideas, those ideas will necessarily be prioritized so that only a few will be taken up for serious consideration. He wondered who would be doing that

important work of prioritizing. Professor Cuning responded that the committee would be doing this work initially; however, he stressed that the committee's main task is to find common denominators among the many proposals offered and then write their report in such a way as to capture these commonalities.

Vice President Vaughn urged that a document be made available as soon as possible for the campus community to react to. Ms. Hansen noted that the three sub-groups have begun work on a document, based upon the committee members' viewpoints and the documents they had received. Input obtained from the public forums will eventually be incorporated. She observed that the accelerated timeline of the process doesn't necessarily allow for extensive public commentary on drafts. Vice President Vaughn suggested that the Senate could help publicize opportunities for feedback. Professor Voigt asked if a threat analysis has been done to determine what challenges the university might face in the next five years. Ms. Hansen responded that no formal threat analysis has been done, but that the committee has discussed issues, such as the fiscal landscape, that might impact the strategic plan. Professor Gillan asked if student success referred to graduate students, and not just to undergraduates. Ms. Hansen confirmed that it did. Referring to the discussion earlier on internationalization, Professor Kolker commented that the university's efforts on behalf of the state should also be a focus of the strategic plan. President Bohannon expressed thanks to the committee for their work and their efforts to gather feedback. She invited the group back at a future time to provide an update.

- *Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures (Peter Snyder)*

President Bohannon reminded the group that the Senate had approved the Instructional Faculty Policy at the March 22 meeting. The promotion procedures to be discussed here today are an ancillary document to be housed on the Provost's Office website, not in the Operations Manual. Similar promotion procedure documents exist for the other faculty tracks. These procedures must be in place before the colleges can hire any instructional faculty. Secretary Snyder added that the Instructional Faculty Policy is scheduled to come before the Board of Regents, State of Iowa for approval in June. In response to a question, he indicated that proposed collegiate promotion procedures will not require the approval of the Faculty Senate or the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee.

Secretary Snyder explained that the Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures were created by a committee with representation from the Faculty Senate leadership, the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, the Lecturers Committee, and the Provost's Office. The procedures were modelled after the procedures for the clinical track. He directed the group to a chart giving an overview of the promotion process. He explained that the process begins with the preparation of the dossier. The document describes what should be included in the dossier. The first stage of the review occurs at the departmental level, with an internal peer review of teaching, as well as of service and professional productivity (if those activities are required for promotion). The Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) conducts the initial review and takes a vote that is advisory to the DEO. The DEO then forwards a recommendation to the college. The Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG) does the collegiate-level review; this group takes a vote that is advisory to the Dean. The Dean then forwards a recommendation to the Provost, who forwards a recommendation to the Board of Regents. This is a similar process to the promotion

processes for the other tracks. At each stage, the candidate will have the opportunity to correct errors in the dossier as well as to respond to any negative decisions. The emphasis in this process will be on the documentation and evaluation of teaching, since that is the emphasis of this track. Therefore, there is no requirement for external peer review. The composition of the DCG and CCG are determined by collegiate policy, but colleges are encouraged to include instructional faculty members on these committees. The criteria for promotion are listed in the Instructional Faculty Policy (and will also be listed in the future collegiate policies), not in this document.

Secretary Snyder noted several changes from the draft version circulated to Councilors. The first of these is in section III. *Other Considerations*, in which the first paragraph was modified to read *Criteria used for promotion evaluation shall be consistent with the candidate's effort ~~allocation~~ workload allocation (the percentage of time the candidate devotes to teaching, service, and/or professional productivity), as specified in the candidate's individual employment contract(s) for the time period under review.* This statement reinforces that expectations for promotion must be consistent with candidates' contracts. The second change is in section I. *Department level procedures B. The Dossier* (3) (d) (iii), *a list of students supervised on individual projects (e.g., honors thesis or independent study students), graduate students, fellows, or other postdoctoral students supervised, if any, including each student's name, degree objective, and first post-graduate position.* It is unlikely that many instructional faculty members will be working with graduate students or fellows, but they do often work with students on individual projects.

Acknowledging the appropriate emphasis on evaluation of teaching for the instructional faculty promotion process, Professor Wilcox nevertheless wondered if it was necessary for all teaching evaluation documentation to be reviewed at each stage of the process. In tenure-track promotion processes, for example, much of this documentation remains with the DEO. Secretary Snyder responded that the intention was to keep the promotion processes as similar as possible across tracks. Since most documentation is now stored electronically, it would be readily available as needed at any point in the process. Professor Wilcox then drew the group's attention to II. *The Basis for Evaluation: The Promotion Record* (x) (c) *documentation of research, scholarship, or artistic creation, where applicable.* He found it unusual that apparently only a citation of a book, article, etc. was requested, rather than the book or article itself, as would be done in a tenure-track process. Secretary Snyder noted that others had remarked upon this as well, and in fact that clause will be removed from future drafts. Any actual research or creative products will be included in the following clause, *all other materials related to the candidate's professional productivity...*

Professor Gillan moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures be approved with the changes indicated. The motion carried with one abstention.

- *Academic Values Committee (Christina Bohannon)*

President Bohannon reminded the group that the Senate had raised various issues at the March 22 meeting regarding the proposed formation of this committee. The Senate officers had then revised the description and composition of the committee in response to these concerns. President Bohannon asked for Councilors' feedback on these revisions. She also noted that some

of the officers had met with members of the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and discussed the proposed committee (some senators had called for the mandatory inclusion of an AAUP member on the committee). The revised proposal no longer calls for reserved committee seats (the earlier draft had reserved one seat for a College of Law faculty member because of the many issues touching on the First Amendment that the committee would no doubt consider; some senators had called for a reserved seat for a College of Education faculty member who specialized in higher education issues). Appointments will now be left to the discretion of the Faculty Senate President, with the understanding that members will be sought based on their relevant expertise. Professor Daack-Hirsch noted that expertise in law and higher education may be found in colleges other than Law and Education, so she praised this less prescriptive language. At the prior suggestion of Professor Gillan, the proposal was revised to indicate that members will now serve one-year terms renewable for five years, rather than three-year terms. Professor Daack-Hirsch asked if new members could be brought onto the committee as needed mid-year, if an urgent campus situation arises. President Bohannon responded that the membership rules were flexible enough to allow for this.

In response to a question about the committee's charge, President Bohannon commented that there may be isolated instances when the committee meets with administrators or other campus groups directly, rather than filtering their advice through the Faculty Senate officers, but that the usual procedure will be for the committee to advise the Senate officers and then for the officers to advise others. Following up on her earlier comments about the AAUP, President Bohannon indicated that she had proposed to the AAUP local chapter that the Faculty Senate officers, the Academic Values Committee, and the local AAUP Executive Committee meet at least once per semester, in order to foster ongoing communication.

Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Ryan seconded that the revised proposal for an Academic Values Committee be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 26, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.

VI. Executive Session – Professor Campo moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the Council move into Executive Session. The motion carried unanimously.

President Bohannon announced the winners of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and the Michael J. Brody Award for Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa.

The Council also discussed a potential resolution by the Faculty Senate.

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

VII. Adjournment – Professor Ryan moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.