

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 14, 2015
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: S. Ali, S. Campo, S. Daack-Hirsch, E. Gillan, J. Kolker, U. Mallik, P. Muhly, S. Seibert, P. Snyder, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wilcox.

Officers Present: C. Bohannan, R. Fumerton, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.

Councilors Excused: F. Abboud, P. Brophy, K. Kieran, H. Udaykumar.

Councilors Absent: None.

Guests: D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), M. Habashi (Lecturers Committee), B. Nottingham-Spencer (Lecturers Committee), C. Sheerin (Lecturers Committee), A. Stapleton (Lecturers Committee), J. Sulentic (Lecturers Committee), L. Zaper (Office of the Provost).

I. Call to Order – President Thomas called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Campo moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 3, 2015) – Professor Muhly moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 28, 2015) – Professor Muhly moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Alexandra Thomas) – Professor Vos moved and Professor Campo seconded that the Senate and Council election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas thanked departing councilors Professor Abboud and Professor Mallik for their service.
- E. 2015-16 Committee Recommendations (Christina Bohannan, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Muhly moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the 2015-16 committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Research Council Charter Revisions (Edward Gillan, Chair, Research Council)*
Professor Gillan explained that his predecessor as chair of the Research Council had received a request from the then Faculty Senate President to review the committee's long-established faculty membership guidelines to determine if these guidelines were still relevant. [The current

requirements call for two faculty members each to be appointed from the physical sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, humanities, and at large. Research Council is one of the few charter committees with such explicit requirements.] While undertaking this effort, the Research Council members also took the opportunity to review membership criteria for staff and students, as well as the committee's charge. Regarding the latter, the committee decided to add *economic development* to the areas about which the committee offers advice, reflecting the new title of the Office of Research and Economic Development, the office with which the committee primarily interacts. Changes to membership guidelines for students and staff include specifying that one of the student members be a graduate or professional student, adding a postdoctoral researcher member, and including the director of the Iowa Center for Research by Undergraduates as a non-voting ex-officio member. In response to a question, Professor Gillan explained that the task of appointing a postdoctoral researcher was somewhat problematic, because these individuals are not represented by one of the shared governance bodies, through which charter committee members are selected. The undergraduate and graduate student government Joint Nominations Committee will appoint the postdoctoral researcher in consultation with the UI Postdoctoral Association and the Graduate College.

Returning to the revised guidelines for the faculty membership of the Research Council, Professor Gillan explained that the specific discipline requirements had been replaced with more general language, allowing and encouraging the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees to fill seats with faculty members representing a broad range of disciplines and funding sources. Professor Gillan added that the proposed language had been reviewed by the Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) and revised a second time by the Research Council, before receiving the FPCC's approval. Vice President Bohannon, the current chair of the Committee on Committees, praised the revisions for offering the Committee on Committees the widest possible flexibility each year in selecting faculty members for service on the Research Council.

Professor Mallik moved and Professor Muhly seconded that the revised Research Council Charter be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Proposed Revision (Alexandra Thomas)*
President Thomas explained that when the call for nominations for the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence came out earlier this year, she was approached by several clinical-track faculty members who wondered why the award was limited to tenured faculty members. President Thomas and the other Faculty Senate officers decided to look into this issue. They discovered that when the award was originally proposed in 1990, there was no specification of the type of faculty who would be eligible (although there were no doubt fewer types of faculty at that time). It was unclear when or why the award eventually became limited to tenured faculty, although this wording has appeared in the call for many years now. The Faculty Senate's Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa, established around the same time, is now open to faculty on both the tenure and clinical tracks. It appears that the decision to grant eligibility for the Brody to clinical-track faculty members was made by one of the former Senate presidents, several years after the establishment of the

clinical track in the late 1990's. President Thomas noted that the Board of Regents, State of Iowa allows each of the three Regents institutions to define its own criteria for the Regents Award.

While open to simply stating that faculty members on both the tenure and clinical tracks are now eligible for the Regents Award, thus mirroring the Brody Award language, the Faculty Senate officers have proposed returning to the original language of the Regents Award proposal, *This recognition will be given to individuals who are deemed to have a sustained record of excellence across the spectrum of faculty endeavors (teaching, scholarship, service) or such outstanding accomplishments in one or more of the areas as to justify their selection.* Those who meet this stringent criteria, no matter their rank or faculty type, will certainly rise to the top of an expanded nominee pool. Clinical-track faculty have now been at the university for over fifteen years and have amassed considerable accomplishments that could make them contenders for the Regents Award. The selection committee has been and will continue to be relied upon to make wise choices for recipients of this award.

Professor Gillan spoke in favor mirroring the Brody Award language, with the option of widening the eligibility pool later on. Professor Campo observed that the President and Provost Teaching Award is not limited to the tenure and clinical tracks. Professor Snyder asked about research-track faculty members' eligibility, but it was noted that since the research track was only implemented in 2008, it is unlikely that research-track faculty members will have accumulated the necessary accomplishments to win the award in the near future. Past President Fumerton and Professor Mallik spoke in favor of returning to the original language of the award proposal. Professor Vos stressed that the deans must be made aware of this change in the criteria.

Professor Mallik moved and Professor Vos seconded that the proposed revision to the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (a return to the original 1990 language regarding eligibility for nomination) be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Lecturers Committee Report (Anne Stapleton, Chair, Lecturers Committee)*

The current members of the Lecturers Committee introduced themselves: Anne Stapleton (English), Meara Habashi (Psychology), Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (German), Caroline Sheerin (Law), and Joseph Sulentic (Business). Professor Stapleton, chair of the committee, thanked the group for the opportunity to present the report. She indicated that the report was still in draft stage, but that a final version would be sent to the Faculty Senate prior to the April 28 meeting. Professor Stapleton then referred the group to the report's executive summary. The summary indicated that "lecturers are not consistently defined as faculty in University policies and programs," in spite of their provision of instruction throughout campus and commitment to the University's mission. This has led to a situation in which lecturers "are not involved in shared governance, have limited opportunities for professional development, and often do not receive recognition or awards for their professional contributions." Lecturers in different colleges and departments have widely varying employment experiences. The report noted that "many Lecturers feel disenfranchised and undervalued." To improve lecturers' experiences overall, the report proposed recommendations in the areas of representation; hiring, retention, and promotion; compensation; workload; access to professional development opportunities; and grievances.

Professor Stapleton directed the group's attention to a description of a survey of lecturers that was carried out in March 2013. There was a 66% response rate (158 responses) to the survey, with many text responses to various questions about employment conditions. The majority of respondents indicated that they had been working as lecturers for four or more years. Additional feedback from lecturers was obtained from a series of brown-bag luncheons during which lecturers described many positive experiences working at the university, along with concerns and challenges. The Lecturers Committee members also conducted an investigation of lecturer policies at CIC and Regents institutions and best practice recommendations from organizations such as the American Association of University Professors. The report's recommendations were based on all of these sources, as well as on data obtained from the Provost's Office.

Reporting on the findings of the 2013 survey, Professor Stapleton indicated that 54% of lecturers were satisfied with their position, while 67% felt that the challenges of their position need to be addressed. While most felt respected within their departments, fewer felt respected by university administration. Other findings from the survey indicated a strong belief that lecturers should be represented on Faculty Senate, and a widespread concern with low compensation, career instability, lack of support for scholarly activity, and no access to formal grievance procedures. Low salaries and heavy teaching loads frequently characterize the work experiences of lecturers. Professor Stapleton touched briefly on the status of lecturers as faculty. The Operations Manual defines lecturers as fixed-term faculty, within a section on faculty classifications. Data from the Provost's Office categorizes lecturers as either temporary or regular, terms that are often applied to staff. Those with temporary status do not receive university benefits. Professor Stapleton noted that some temporary lecturers have been employed at the UI for many years.

Professor Campo commented that in her experience, when temporary *staff* members are hired for grant-funded projects, they must receive university benefits if their employment status lasts over a certain period of time. Past President Fumerton asked if, going forward, the committee envisioned any distinctions among lecturers, such as those on a career path, who would likely be at the university for years, and those who work on a short-term basis without expectation of a renewal of contract. These distinctions could impact the report's recommendations. Representation on the Faculty Senate, for example, could be granted to the career-path lecturers but not to the short-term lecturers. Professor Stapleton responded that currently many lecturers have appointments that are renewable annually; they have difficulty envisioning career paths for themselves in this tenuous situation. Some colleges are moving toward establishing a senior lecturer promotional opportunity, which includes a longer term of appointment. In general, Professor Stapleton observed, lecturers want clarity and uniformity in appointment guidelines. She then referred the group to a section of the report giving an overview of lecturer appointments, which include the statuses of *adjunct*, *renewable-term*, and *visiting*. Renewable-term lecturers, a more stable status, have been the subject of this report, not adjuncts or visitors.

Vice President Bohannon thanked the Lecturers Committee for their work and praised the report. She observed that some of the recommendations were more relevant for Faculty Senate, while others pertained more to the university administration. Representation, of course, is an issue for the Senate to consider. Following up on Past President Fumerton's comment, she noted the great variation among lecturers, years of employment being one example, illustrated by the data in the report and wondered what criteria lecturers should meet to become eligible for service on the Senate. Senators are elected to three-year terms and are established members of the university community. Lecturers on short-term appointments may not be suited for this role.

Professor Mallik observed that the report did not prioritize recommendations. In her view, the primary concerns of lecturers should relate to establishing clarity and uniformity in the terms of their employment, as well as obtaining access to the grievance process. Salary and benefit issues would follow, with representation on the Senate of lesser concern initially. Professor Sheerin responded that the committee did prioritize their recommendations, with representation at the top of the list. She commented that representation on the Faculty Senate is a major issue for lecturers because inclusion on the Senate would indicate that lecturers are a recognized part of the University community. Grievances appear last on the list because the committee assumed that lecturers' lack of access to grievance procedures is merely an oversight that can easily be corrected. Professor Stapleton stressed that all of the recommendations are important to the committee and many of them are interrelated. Returning to the issue of how to establish eligibility for Senate service for lecturers, she commented that the committee's review of other institutions' policies revealed that in many places lecturers could become eligible for election to shared governance bodies after only one year of employment.

Professor Daack-Hirsch pointed out that the Faculty Senate had charged the Lecturers Committee with compiling this important report. She urged that, now that the Lecturers Committee has fulfilled its duty, the Faculty Council and Senate should embrace the findings of the report and move it forward on behalf of the faculty. Observing the wide variance in length of service for lecturers, Professor Voigt suggested different terminology to cover individuals in these different circumstances. Professor Campo advocated for pointing out in the report that lecturers are the only campus group left out of grievance procedures and representation. Secretary Vaughn raised the wider question of next steps. Now that the report has been produced, how should we proceed towards accomplishing the goals indicated in the recommendations? Past President Fumerton suggested that the individual recommendations could be voted upon separately in the Faculty Senate. He observed that some items may be easier to approve than others; for example, access to grievance procedures should be acceptable to nearly everyone.

Professor Wilcox expressed concern that, while the working conditions of lecturers may improve as a result of the report recommendations, adjuncts and visiting faculty may be relegated to third-class status. He urged that the Senate not forget about these individuals. Professor Wilcox and Professor Seibert both pointed out that the Senate could not do much on issues of salary, workload, etc. Lecturers Committee members indicated that they understood this, but that their charge was to bring to light all matters of concern to lecturers. Professor

Seibert also commented that the notion of permanent fixed-term faculty was problematic. It would appear that what is being advocated for is a new class of permanent faculty who are not evaluated on scholarly output. This would entail a shift in the university's strategic direction. Professor Muhly expressed the view that there were two issues to consider here. The first issue is that we must treat people well at the university and therefore we must establish clear cut procedures for hiring, promotion, etc., for lecturers, as well as for adjuncts and visiting faculty. The other issue is the role research plays in the university. He noted that he is aware of situations in which lecturers with heavy teaching loads are told that they will be evaluated on research output, as well as teaching. He has also been told by administrators that it can be cheaper to hire a lecturer than a teaching assistant, although the latter are necessary to guarantee the strength of graduate programs. Professor Muhly added that his department formerly had 49 faculty members on the tenure track, while now they only have 32. About 40 courses are now taught by faculty members off the tenure track. While these strategies may save money, they are running down our research university.

Regarding research expectations of lecturers, Professor Stapleton observed that the qualifications for promotion to some of the new senior lecturer paths coming available in the various colleges call for professional productivity beyond teaching, as well as for a record of service. High teaching loads, which are common for lecturers, however, may preclude extensive scholarly output. She noted that improved working conditions for lecturers at the university may lead to the recruitment of additional highly-qualified lecturers. In response to a question, committee members indicated that not all lecturers have terminal degrees. Such individuals would likely not be eligible for promotion. Professor Mallik praised the report and suggested that recommendations be voted on separately by the Senate. President Thomas indicated that initially, the only vote to be taken by the Senate will be merely whether to accept the report. Work on presenting specific recommendations will take place next year. Vice President Bohannon suggested that the Lecturers Committee be retained for a year to work on the report's issues along with the Senate, as well as to show the Senate's support for lecturers. Professor Wilcox praised the Senate for establishing the Lecturers Committee three years ago to take on these important issues. Past President Fumerton reassured the committee members that the Senate would work diligently to consider and implement the recommendations to the extent possible.

Professor Mallik moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the Council accept this draft report of the Lecturers Committee in anticipation of the final report to be submitted to the Senate and that the Council retain the Lecturers Committee for another year so that final recommendations can be made. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Stapleton expressed thanks to Professor Campo, chair of the Council on Teaching, for leading the effort to add a lecturer to the Council on Teaching earlier this year. Vice President Bohannon commented that the recommendations would be one of the major focus areas for her presidency.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 28, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.

VI. Executive Session - Professor Wilcox moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the Faculty Council move to Executive Session. The motion carried unanimously.

President Thomas 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.

Professor Vos moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the Faculty Council move to open session. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Adjournment – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Mallik seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Thomas adjourned the meeting at 5:16 pm.