

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, February 16, 2016
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Seminar Room (2520D), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Senators Present: P. Abbas, M. Adamek, B. Ayati, C. Benson, G. Buettner, S. Campo, S. Daack-Hirsch, M. Dailey, F. Durham, C. Fox, T. Gallanis, E. Gillan, Z. Jin, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Li, K. Light-McGroary, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, K. Messingham, M. Nikolas, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, P. Romitti, G. Ryan, D. Segaloff, J. Selby, C. Sponsler, K. Tachau, B. Thompson, H. Udaykumar, S. Vigmostad, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wang, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, J. Yockey.

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

Senators Excused: S. Ali, J. Bates, P. Brophy, D. Caplan, J. Colgan, K. Culp, D. Dawson, P. Dilley, M. Foley Nicpon, J. Klesney-Tait, G. Lee, A. Merino, J. Murry, L. Segre, L. Storrs, J. Taylor, C. Thomas, D. Wurster.

Senators Absent: S. Baker, M. Blumberg, J. Buatti, B. Eckstein, A. Gerke, K. Glenn, T. Havens, A. Lee, W. Maury, J. Paulsen, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, S. Seibert, T. Yahr.

Guests: L. Cox (Faculty Policies & Compensation Committee), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), M. Habashi (Lecturers Committee), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), T. Marshall (Faculty Policies & Compensation Committee), J. Menninger (Emeritus Faculty Council), B. Nottingham-Spencer (Lecturers Committee), A. Stapleton (Lecturers Committee), 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 one more item for approval had been added to the agenda since it was distributed. Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (December 8, 2015) –** Professor Wilder moved and Professor Vos seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees)**
 - Janette Taylor (Nursing) to fill the unexpired term of Jan Foote (Nursing) on the Faculty Senate, 2015-17

- Ken Culp (Nursing) to fill the unexpired term of Anne Ersig (Nursing) on the Faculty Senate, 2016-17
 - Paul Dilley (Classics) to replace Jennifer Iverson (Music) on the Faculty Senate, Spring 2016
 - Paul Abbas (Communication Sciences & Disorders) to replace Paul Muhly (Mathematics) on the Faculty Council, Spring 2016
 - Marian Wilson Kimber (Music) to fill the unexpired term of Ramprasad Sripada (Anesthesia) on the Conflict of Interest in Employment Committee, 2016-18
 - Margaret Beck (Anthropology) to fill the unexpired term of Christine Rutledge-Russell (Music) on the Sustainability Charter Committee, Spring 2016
- Professor Campo moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Theme Semesters (Linda Snetselaar, Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement)*

Associate Provost Snetselaar explained that her office is involved in a variety of outreach and engagement programs. ArtsShare is one such program; it involves faculty, staff and students in bringing the arts to schoolchildren in over 80 Iowa counties. The Hawkeye Lunch & Learn Lecture Series brings faculty members to Des Moines to showcase their research to the public. Recently the program was expanded to include the Iowa City area. Professor Covington, from Political Science, has been one of the speakers in this program; he gave presentations on the Iowa Caucuses. The Grant Wood Art Colony has three fellows on campus who also do presentations in schools and museums. The Iowa Initiative for Sustainable Communities is truly an engagement effort, involving faculty, staff and students learning from communities what they need to become more vibrant, vital and economically sound and then working alongside community partners to fulfill those needs.

Another initiative of the Office for Outreach and Engagement is the Theme Semester, which has grown considerably in scope since its inception. The Theme Semester concept was envisioned as a way to bring together both sides of the campus through engagement with a common theme. The first Theme Semester was *Food for Thought*. The Spring 2016 theme is *Just Living*, focusing on social justice. Erika Christiansen, Director of Programming and Events, further explained that there are many different ways for faculty members to become involved in the *Just Living* Theme Semester. She requested that faculty members who are currently teaching classes that touch on social justice inform her office about this. There are already 130 classes this semester with some component related to social justice; these classes are highlighted on the Office's website. Over 250 events related to social justice are listed on the university's calendar of events. More information about these classes and events can be found at <http://justliving.uiowa.edu/>.

Ms. Christiansen highlighted two upcoming events of particular relevance to faculty. The first is an *Ideas and Intersections* dinner, sponsored by the Office for Research & Economic Development, on the topic of *Profiling: Race, Reason, and Reality*. The dinner will take place on March 22 at 5 pm and is limited to faculty. On April 9, the Iowa Human Rights Research Conference will take place and will include a faculty workshop, allowing faculty members the opportunity to present work in progress and receive feedback from colleagues. In conclusion,

Ms. Christiansen urged faculty members to contact her office if they would like to become involved in this or any future theme semester. She also referred senators to the Office's website, <http://outreach.uiowa.edu/>, for information and resources regarding outreach and engagement at the university.

Professor Gallanis asked about topics for future theme semesters. Ms. Christiansen responded that the Spring 2017 Theme Semester will be *Our Lives Online*, focusing on the internet. A call for themes for Spring 2018 will go out soon. Professor Tachau noted that some faculty members must plan their courses a year into the future. It would be helpful if the topics for theme semesters were announced well in advance.

- *Update on Shared Governance and Strategic Planning (Christina Bohannon and Tom Vaughn)*

President Bohannon reminded the group that in November the Faculty Senate had been asked by President Harreld to solicit ideas from the faculty for strategic initiatives to move the university forward for the next five years or so, now that our current strategic plan is coming to an end. Over 60 suggestions were received. The other shared governance groups have also been soliciting ideas from their constituencies. A strategic planning development committee, whose members will include shared governance leaders, will undertake a strategic planning process similar to what we have seen in the past. This process will start soon and run through June. Faculty members of the committee will include Secretary Vaughn, Professor Lena Hill (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), and Past President Thomas. Other faculty members may be added.

Two other groups will work on implementation; this is a change from previous strategic planning processes. In the past, strategic planning committees would develop a plan, but implementation largely fell to administrators. This time, implementation will be carried out by two "Path Forward" teams, made up of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. One group will be the Strategy Implementation team, which will be responsible for initiatives that take a longer time frame (two to five years) to carry out. President Bohannon and Secretary Snyder will serve on this committee. The Operations team will be responsible for initiatives that take a shorter time frame (eighteen months to two years) to carry out. The latter team will also look at resource allocation. President Bohannon noted that resource allocation is an area in which faculty have not typically been involved in the past, so this will be a unique and exciting opportunity. Professor Vigmostad (College of Engineering) and Professor McGuire (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences) will serve on this committee. Information (membership, charge, etc.) about the two committees can be found at <http://president.uiowa.edu/leadership/operations-team>, and at <http://president.uiowa.edu/leadership/strategy-implementation-team>. All three committees will be reviewing the strategic initiative suggestions put forward by faculty, staff and students.

Vice President Vaughn explained that the Senate officers have been categorizing the suggestions received from faculty into four priority areas (similar to the four pillars of the current strategic plan) and nine theme areas. The officers will be sending these suggestions to the strategic planning and implementation committees and also posting them online. Four or five suggestions will ultimately be chosen from all those submitted. However, this will be a

dynamic process, and as progress is accomplished on the first set of suggestions, others will be taken up. President Bohannon encouraged feedback on the suggestions once they are posted. She urged senators to let the officers know how they want to be engaged in this process.

Professor Tachau commented that previous strategic plans may well contain good ideas that never received resources for implementation; she suggested that these ideas be forwarded to the current strategic planning groups for consideration. She added that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) national guidelines have always held that certain campus groups have primacy in specific decision-making areas because those groups have the necessary expertise. Curriculum and other academic matters are areas in which faculty should retain primacy. Professor Tachau then asked how the implementation committees would interact with the Faculty Staff Budget Committee, which is charged with participating in university-wide budgetary matters. President Bohannon responded that it is likely that smaller sub-groups will also be formed to deal with more specific issues. When those issues are of particular importance to faculty, group membership will be made up primarily of faculty. Regarding the Faculty Staff Budget Committee's role in plan implementation, President Bohannon indicated that this was not clear yet, but that she expected some type of interaction among the groups. Traditional shared governance should not be sidelined by the new strategic planning groups.

Professor Gallanis asked if the strategic planning groups were looking for suggestions that could be widely applicable to the university, rather than focused on small areas. Vice President Vaughn responded that both types of suggestions were being sought, as long as they have a big impact on the university. Professor Menninger, of the Emeritus Faculty Council, expressed the opinion that the administration, rather than the faculty, appeared to be driving this strategic planning process. The implementation teams, for example, are chaired by administrators and it seems that faculty do not make up a large percentage of the membership. Vice President Vaughn responded that administrators have reached out to faculty, staff and students for ideas and they wish to work together with these groups to implement the ideas. President Bohannon noted that, while administrators do chair the implementation teams, chairs of the strategic planning development team have not been named yet. She stressed that having faculty involved in implementation is a welcome departure from previous procedure.

Professor Voigt commented that it would be helpful, as we embark on a strategic planning process, to analyze the threats and opportunities that may confront us. For example, we know that state appropriations to the university will likely continue to dwindle and that students will take on greater financial responsibility for their educations. He suggested a mini-conference to help us decide upon the directions in which we would like to move. President Bohannon took this opportunity to remind the group that senior administrators, including President Harreld, would be holding a town hall meeting on Tuesday, February 23. Part of the purpose of this event is to describe the current state of the university, in terms of finances, student numbers, etc. and to begin discussing future directions. The Senate could engage in such discussions, as well. Professor Tachau added that it is important for the colleges to learn from each other about their various visions for the future. She also noted that it is important for the university to develop a strategic plan that reflects its own institutional identity, regardless of the vision that others might have for it.

Following up on Professor Tachau's earlier point, Professor Macfarland commented that the colleges at least have the common purposes of teaching and creating new knowledge. It is important to show through data what value our teaching brings to our students and what value our research brings to society. We must come up with a statement of purpose indicating that we want to make our students' lives better and then develop a way of measuring that goal. Faculty must play an important role in measuring this value. Professor Tachau cautioned against using data alone to measure value. President Bohannon observed that there is a need these days to articulate the value of a liberal arts education and there is an inclination to want to measure educational value in a way that can be readily comprehensible to the general population. This is, of course, difficult to do in a meaningful way. Professor Prussing expressed concern about measuring and comparing vastly different things, such as graduate programs, and making erroneous conclusions based on this data. Concluding the discussion, President Bohannon requested that senators contact the officers with any additional strategic priority suggestions or thoughts on the strategic planning process.

- *Instructional Faculty Policy (Christina Bohannon)*

President Bohannon thanked the members of the Faculty Senate's Lecturers Committee for their four years of work, first preparing a report on the working conditions of lecturers and presenting recommendations for the improvement of those conditions, and then providing feedback while an instructional faculty policy was developed. President Bohannon clarified that instructional faculty are non-tenure-track, non-clinical-track, non-research-track faculty who teach. They are mostly full time employees, but can be part time, as well. Among the recommendations in the report were establishment of a pathway to promotion, access to grievance procedures, and representation on Faculty Senate, as well as some issues related to compensation that fall outside the Senate's purview. The Senate officers worked closely with the Office of the Provost to develop a draft policy covering the first three issues. President Bohannon thanked Assistant Provost Diane Finnerty and Associate Provost for Faculty Kevin Kregel for their supportive partnership with the officers during the creation of the draft policy. She also thanked Maria Lukas from the Office of the General Counsel for working with the officers to refine portions of the draft policy. The Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, chaired by Professor Lois Cox, engaged in extensive review and discussion of the draft policy over a period of six months.

Turning to the draft Instructional Faculty policy itself, President Bohannon noted that the policy grants lecturers representation on Faculty Senate, creates a two-tiered grievance process (one for entry-level lecturers and one for the higher two ranks), and establishes a path for promotion with three ranks: lecturer, associate professor of instruction or associate professor of practice, and professor of instruction or professor of practice. This promotion pathway satisfies the lecturers' recommendation while also fulfilling a request of the deans, who sought an instructional faculty track that would be appealing to people outside the university. For example, the Tippie College of Business could recruit a noted businessperson to a professor of practice position. President Bohannon stressed that this draft university-wide policy provides the base level structure for an instructional faculty track. Many important decisions concerning instructional faculty will be made at the collegiate or departmental level.

Professor Wilder asked how well the draft policy harmonizes with existing collegiate policies regarding instructional faculty. President Bohannon responded that the draft policy is generally consistent with the College of Law's instructional faculty policy. The senior lecturer policy in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is still relatively new and there will need to be a transition phase. The university-wide policy should bring more clarity to the CLAS policy. Each collegiate instructional faculty policy will need to be voted on by the college's faculty and then approved by the Provost. Professor Gallanis commented that he did not see much difference in criteria between the associate and professor ranks other than the length of time spent performing those activities (*established record* for associates and *sustained record* for professors). In the tenure stream, however, one usually looks for an enhancement or improvement to the record. President Bohannon responded that the criteria differences in the draft policy between associate professors and professors were similar both to the UI clinical-track policy, as well as to instructional track policies at peer institutions. The enhanced reputation of a faculty member usually comes about through scholarship, so while it is appropriate criteria for the tenure track, it is not so for instructional faculty, some of whom do not engage in scholarship. It is extremely difficult to establish a national reputation through teaching alone. The policy does take into account teaching reputation in the college or department. Instructional faculty can do scholarship, but that is usually considered professional productivity.

Professor Gallanis followed up by asking if promotion would therefore be automatic, if the faculty member has continuously performed his/her job well. Professor Cox commented that it is up to the colleges to develop their promotion criteria. She added that collegiate policies must comply with the university policy, but that the latter does not cover every eventuality. Professor Gallanis then asked if a collegiate policy could require something in addition to the university policy's criteria for promotion to professor. Professor Cox responded that it would depend on what specifically the college was asking for. For example, the university policy prohibits requiring scholarship for promotion. Professor Gallanis questioned if colleges could, for example, require a national reputation for pedagogy as criteria for promotion to professor; would this be inconsistent with the university policy? Professor Cox responded that it would not be illegitimate. Professor Macfarland commented that promotion to a higher rank should require some evidence of exceptional teaching skills.

Professor Voigt asked about the construction of the titles (professor of instruction, professor of practice). Since we say *clinical professor of biochemistry*, why would we not also say *instructional professor of biochemistry*, for example? President Bohannon observed that the clinical-track policy only requires that the modifier *clinical* be used in the title; it does not specify where. She added that the titles *professor of instruction* and *professor of practice* have become the standard among our peer institutions. The deans had suggested that our titles remain consistent with those of other schools, to facilitate recruitment. Professor Vos asked why the titles *assistant professor of instruction* and *assistant professor of practice* were not used for the entry-level rank, rather than *lecturer*. President Bohannon responded that this had been considered. Some peer institutions do use such titles. However, she explained, there is a huge variation in that first category, ranging from individuals without terminal degrees to individuals

who come here for a year and then leave. Those who progress to the higher two ranks will likely see themselves as long-term members of the community.

After commending all those who had participated in the creation of this draft policy, for which he expressed strong support, Professor Wilcox commented upon several concerns. He noted that the policy indicates that review for promotion into the rank of professor *typically would occur during the fifth year of service at the rank of Associate Professor of Instruction or Associate Professor of Practice*. He expressed surprise at this because he had recently heard that the typical length of time for an associate professor on the tenure track to move to the rank of professor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is 9.6 years. He asked why the university policy needed to be so specific when colleges and departments are better situated to determine appropriate timeframes for promotion in their disciplines. Professor Gillan advocated for not mentioning a timeline in the university policy for promotion at this level. He also wondered whether the clinical and research tracks have specific timelines.

Professor Tachau commented that, from the lecturers' point of view, in the absence of tenure, longer contracts at the higher ranks provide for more stability. Professor Havens, a member of the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, commented that this timeline arose out of a concern that some instructional faculty members might never be considered for promotion unless the university policy made such a statement. Professor Wilcox wondered why then the contract length for the highest rank was not at least five years. President Bohannon responded that, in order to retain some similarity to the clinical track, which has contract lengths of one to seven years, even at the highest level, the FPCC decided on three to seven years for the highest rank of instructional faculty.

Commenting that academic freedom is certainly an issue for instructional faculty, who do not have the protection of tenure, Professor Menninger asked if there were any provision in the Operations Manual or in AAUP guidelines to guarantee academic freedom to this group. President Bohannon pointed out an explicit statement in section *j. Integration of Instructional Faculty into University Mission* (lines 462-3), indicating that the university, along with individual colleges and departments, should strive to protect the academic freedom of instructional faculty. In addition, the policy provides for administrative review and grievance processes in section *h. Instructional Faculty Disputes*. These procedures apply to any employment-related action or non-action that affect instructional faculty, who have appeal rights up to the Provost's Office. The two higher ranks also have the right to a peer review. Professor Menninger questioned the phrasing in the opening paragraph of the policy (line 5), *colleges **must have** the option to employ non-tenured faculty who are primarily engaged in the teaching mission*. He asked whether it might be preferable to say *colleges **may need** the option*. Professor Tachau concurred that this language might be misread as a requirement. President Bohannon stressed that this language does not *compel* colleges to adopt an instructional faculty track, it merely guarantees them the *choice*. The policy provides that an *initial proposal to create an instructional faculty track in a college must obtain the approval of a majority of the voting faculty within the college*. A suggestion was also made to change *cornerstone* to *foundation* in the opening paragraph.

In response to a question, President Bohannon commented that, under this university-wide policy, colleges would not have the option of opting out of the policy. She added that deans have been included in discussions throughout the drafting of the policy and that they are supportive of this final version. Following up on this point, Professor Ponto asked if all current lecturers must be put into one of the proposed three ranks once the policy is adopted. President Bohannon responded that yes, this must eventually occur. Not all instructional faculty would automatically be placed in the lowest rank, but rather in the most appropriate rank for each person's circumstances.

Returning to the topic of academic freedom, Professor Macfarland emphasized the connection between research and academic freedom. He commented that this connection allows researchers to publish on controversial or perhaps reprehensible topics. However, it does not protect those who engage in bad teaching, such as teaching falsehoods. He questioned the need for academic freedom protection for instructional faculty, who primarily teach and are not required to engage in research. Professor Tachau observed that academic freedom protection does not permit any type of faculty member to teach falsehoods that the faculty member knows are falsehoods. President Bohannon commented that the principles of academic freedom apply to teaching just as they do to research and each case would need to be reviewed on an individual basis. Professor Macfarland responded that academic freedom was meant to protect faculty in the creation of new knowledge, not in teaching. Professor Tachau noted that there are long-standing national norms regarding what academic freedom applies to. Professor Habashi, a member of the Lecturers Committee, shared an experience in which she presented to her class a theory from the field of psychology that her teaching assistant found offensive. She argued that instructional faculty members *do* need the protection of academic freedom, because of situations like these. Professor Macfarland commented that instructional faculty members could find support within the collegiate or university hierarchy in such cases. President Bohannon stressed that academic freedom is not being invoked in the policy to protect bad teaching, but to protect the teaching of controversial topics. Professor Udaykumar concurred that, based on his experiences, academic freedom certainly does apply to teaching.

Professor Cox noted that, if this policy is adopted, it will create a new faculty track just a short time after the creation of yet another new faculty track (the research track). She expressed the opinion that there may be many faculty on campus who are unaware that this draft policy is under consideration. She urged senators to inform their colleagues about the proposed policy prior to the Senate's likely vote on the policy in March. President Bohannon reminded the group that the draft policy has been approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and is supported by the Lecturers Committee and the Office of the Provost. The Council of Deans are scheduled to discuss the draft policy tomorrow and it is anticipated that the deans will be supportive, as well. The Senate officers have discussed the draft policy with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Executive Committee. That group was supportive of and enthusiastic about the key provisions of the policy. President Bohannon also urged that senators make their colleagues aware of the policy.

Professor Vigmostad pointed out a discrepancy in the draft policy. She noted that in section *a. Definitions* (lines 20-1), the policy states that associate professors and professors of

instruction should hold terminal academic degrees, while in section *d. Qualifications for specific ranks*, that language is expanded to include *or other educational qualifications appropriate to the position*. President Bohannon responded that this was an oversight and that the language in section *a. Definitions* would be corrected, because educational qualification determinations will be made by the colleges. Professor Gillan noted several passages in the draft policy that he found problematic. Regarding the faculty dispute procedures, he expressed the opinion that all three ranks should follow the same process (the process created for lecturers), rather than having the two higher ranks begin the process with a faculty review panel. The faculty review panel should be part of an appeal process that the two higher ranks would have access to if their needs were not addressed in the initial procedure.

In section *i. Collegiate policies and guidelines (3)* (lines 451-2), Professor Gillan expressed concern about requiring a majority of the collegiate instructional track faculty to approve changes made to the collegiate policy. If this stipulation does not occur in other faculty track policies, then it likely should not be in this policy. Finally, he found the description of the committee to review the policy, in section *l. Review of this policy*, to be unnecessarily prescriptive. The research track policy, for example, did not specify the composition of that review committee. Professor Tachau and President Bohannon advocated for including instructional faculty on the review committee, to ensure that their voices are heard. Professor Gillan concurred that inclusion of instructional faculty was important, but that the policy could be more flexible in the committee membership requirements and that it should ensure that Faculty Senate retains a prominent role in the review process.

Professor Gallanis observed that the policy would seem to require that the abolishment of a collegiate instructional faculty track could not occur unless a majority of the college's instructional faculty voted for this. Past President Thomas observed that a college could still gradually abolish the track by not hiring any new instructional faculty. Professor Wilder asked if contract lengths would be monitored once the policy is implemented. President Bohannon responded that this would be one of many aspects examined during the five-year review. Professor Gillan noted that the policy requires that colleges report annually to the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost with data on their instructional track faculty. President Bohannon thanked the group for their suggestions. A revised version of the policy will be sent to the Senate prior to the March 22 meeting, when a vote on the policy is expected to take place.

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

V. Announcements

- The online committee recruitment drive will end Friday, March 4. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- 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.

- An extra Faculty Senate meeting will be held on Friday, February 19, 3:00-5:00 pm, 2520D University Capitol Centre to discuss the 2016 legislative session with members of our local legislative delegation. This will be a closed meeting.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 8, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
- The next regular Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 22, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Campo moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.