

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 26, 2016
3:30 – 4:45 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: P. Abbas, M. Adamek, F. Ahmad, B. Ayati, R. Balakrishnan, J. Barker, C. Barnhardt, J. Bates, C. Benson, R. Boudreau, C. Brochu, G. Buettner, S. Campo, J. Colgan, K. Culp, R. Curto, S. Daack-Hirsch, P. Dilley, B. Dixon, F. Durham, A. Durnev, B. Eckstein, M. Foley Nicpon, T. Gallanis, R. Ganim, A. Gerke, E. Gillan, I. Grumbach, D. Hall, T. Havens, J. Kolker, A. Kwitek, K. Lamping, G. Lee, M. Lehan Mackin, T. Li, K. Light-McGroary, T. Mabry, D. Macfarlane, T. Marshall, W. Maury, K. Messingham, T. Midtrod, J. Murry, M. Nikolas, R. Oral, J. Paulsen, L. Plakans, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, R. Sah, J. Scott, D. Segaloff, L. Segre, S. Seibert, J. Selby, C. Sponsler, L. Storrs, J. Szot, K. Tachau, J. Taylor, C. Thomas, K. Thomas, T. Treat, H. Udaykumar, S. Vigmostad, M. Voigt, S. Vos, J. Wang, E. Wasserman, J. Welburn, P. Wesely, J. Wilcox, D. Wilder, P. Windschitl, D. Wurster, J. Yockey.
- Officers Present: C. Bohannon, P. Snyder, A. Thomas, T. Vaughn.
- Senators Excused: P. Brophy, D. Caplan, M. Dailey, D. Dawson, C. Fox, Z. Jin, A. Merino, P. Romitti.
- Senators Absent: S. Ali, S. Baker, M. Blumberg, J. Buatti, K. Glenn, J. Klesney-Tait, A. Lee, G. Ryan, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, B. Thompson, T. Yahr.
- Guests: J. Cox (Presidential Committee on Athletics/History), E. Dove (Elections Committee/Biomedical Engineering), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), R. Fumerton (Elections Committee/Philosophy), K. Kregel (Office of the Provost), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Bohannon called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
 - A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Campo moved and Professor Daack-Hirsch seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 22, 2016) (April 11, 2016) – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results – President Bohannon presented the results of the 2016 Faculty Senate and Council elections. Professor Daack-Hirsch

moved and Professor Paulsen seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- D. 2016-17 Committee Recommendations (Tom Vaughn, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Vaughn presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2016-17 academic year. The few remaining vacancies will be approved in the fall. In response to a question, Vice President Vaughn and President Bohannon explained that there are no term limits for the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee (other committees limit consecutive service at two three-year appointments). Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the 2016-17 committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2014-15 Motion Summary – Vice President Vaughn presented the 2014-15 Motion Summary. Professor Campo moved and Professor Seibert seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Presidential Committee on Athletics Update (Jeff Cox, Chair)*

Professor Cox observed that there has long been faculty involvement with athletics at the UI. He noted that both the Big Ten organization and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) were originally created as faculty committees, the former in 1896. The UI Board in Control of Athletics was reorganized as the Presidential Committee on Athletics (PCA) some years ago. The chair of the PCA is a presidential appointment. Professor Cox indicated that he has served on PCA for seven years, with the last two years as chair.

The work of the PCA is focused on three main areas, with subcommittees on academic achievement, student welfare, and equity. The subcommittees work with Athletics Department staff to set rules and to ensure that those rules are followed. The Academic Achievement subcommittee sets requirements that are often higher than those set by many other Big Ten institutions. For example, UI requires 14 semester hours (other institutions require only 12) and limits the number of online classes student athletes can take, as well as how many days of class a student athlete can miss for competition per semester. The subcommittee also interviews students who are in academic difficulty. The Student Welfare subcommittee has recently rewritten the student athlete grievance policy and the pregnancy policy. The Equity subcommittee monitors the measures of racial and gender equity, such as salary and hiring practices, in the Athletics Department; this subcommittee also interviews all coaches regarding equity issues. PCA members participate in interviews with coaching applicants. Professor Cox commented that the coaches of our 24 sports are deeply committed to the welfare of our student athletes, in terms of both academic and athletic achievement.

Professor Cox stressed that there are several reasons why faculty can be proud of our Athletics Department. He noted that under the current and former athletic directors there have been no NCAA infractions. There have also been no academic scandals, such as have been reported recently at other institutions. The academic achievement record and graduation rate of our student athletes are above the rates of many of our competitors, although the rates for our

African American student athletes are somewhat lower than the overall UI rate. Professor Cox speculated that this is an issue that the PCA will need to take up in the near future. The Athletics Department is self-supporting, i.e., it doesn't draw upon the general education fund. This had long been the goal of UI faculty. Professor Cox recalled that years ago when he was Faculty Senate President, the Athletics Department received \$2.5 million annually from the general education fund. Now the department's funding consists of one-third ticket sales, one-third donations and one-third television and radio revenue. He noted that the PCA's Finance and Facilities subcommittee was abolished several years ago. There had been some disputes in the past regarding types of revenue streams for the Athletics Department. Professor Cox then touched briefly upon some gender equity issues that had been in the news lately regarding the Athletics Department. Currently underway are two lawsuits and an investigation by the Office for Civil Rights of the U. S. Department of Education. This has been a contentious situation for the PCA, as some members believe these are confidential personnel matters that do not concern the committee, while other members have taken a more active interest in these events. Professor Cox holds the view that the PCA is not equipped to deal with particular student or staff grievances. He added that two members of the PCA have recently resigned from the committee because of this internal strife.

In conclusion, Professor Cox thanked former Board in Control of Athletics chair Professor Sam Becker, now deceased, and former PCA chair Professor Bill Hines for their mentoring and wisdom. Professor Hines was instrumental in revising the PCA operations manual, now posted, http://president.uiowa.edu/files/president.uiowa.edu/files/wysiwyg_uploads/PCA_Operations_Manual_1_0.pdf. Professor Cox also thanked the chairs of the three subcommittees, Professor Mike O'Hara (Academic Achievement), Professor John Westefeld (Student Welfare), and Professor Liz Hollingworth (Equity). Professor Hollingworth has been appointed chair of the PCA by President Harreld for the next two years.

Professor Thomas asked if the PCA's gender equity and academic achievement reports were available to the public. Professor Cox responded that these were public documents but were not posted online. He added that each subcommittee submits a yearly report late in the spring semester. The reports can be requested from Professor Cox.

- *Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures (Christina Bohannan)*

President Bohannan reminded the group that at the March 22 Senate meeting, an Instructional Faculty Policy had been approved. The document before the Senate today details the procedures to be followed university-wide regarding instructional faculty promotions. Similar procedure documents exist for every faculty track and this document is closely based on those, especially on the clinical track promotion procedures. The instructional faculty promotion procedures were developed by a committee that included Faculty Senate officers, Provost Office staff, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee members, and Lecturers Committee members.

President Bohannan explained that the procedures begin with the preparation of the dossier. The first stage of the review occurs within the department. A major component of the review is the internal peer review of teaching, because teaching is the primary focus of the track. She

noted that some instructional faculty will be engaged in service and/or professional productivity, as determined by the collegiate instructional faculty policies. The promotion procedures do not take a position on this, but merely provide guidance for evaluating these activities. A vote on the promotion will be taken by the Departmental Consulting Group (DCG); this vote will be advisory to the DEO. A recommendation will then be made to the college. The Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG) will take a vote that is advisory to the dean. The dean then makes a recommendation to the provost, who then makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. At every stage of this process, the candidate has the opportunity to correct errors in the dossier and to respond to negative decisions.

There are several differences between the promotional procedures for instructional faculty and those for the other tracks. For instructional faculty, there is an emphasis on documentation and evaluation of teaching, because, as indicated earlier, teaching is the primary focus of the track. Therefore, no external peer reviews are required, even if a college allows for evaluation of instructional faculty research and scholarship. The composition of the DCG and the CCG is determined by collegiate policy, although the inclusion of instructional faculty on these committees is encouraged. President Bohannon stressed that the document establishes the procedures for promotion, but not the criteria, which are determined by the colleges. This document will not appear in the Operations Manual, but will reside on the website of the Provost's Office.

Professor Tachau commented that she had voted against approving the Instructional Faculty Policy at the March 22 meeting because she had concerns that, the way the policy was written, there was still an incentive for deans not to hire instructional faculty members for six years; she hoped that these concerns would eventually be addressed. She then praised the promotions procedure document, but offered several suggestions for revisions. The first suggestion was for I. *Department level procedures H. (4) The summary report will contain a recommendation for or against the granting of promotion based on the written procedures of either the department (or in non-departmentalized colleges, the college), as applicable, stating the criterion vote...* Professor Tachau commented that, as originally written, the language implies that the DCG could suddenly chose to use the collegiate or the departmental written procedures in its evaluation. Secretary Snyder responded that this language mirrors the language in the other three promotion procedures documents. He added that this language could apply at both the departmental level and the collegiate level. Professor Tachau commented that it was a mistake for this passage to be worded this way in any of the procedures documents, adding that the "either...or" construction implied conflict rather than the intended harmony.

Professor Tachau further suggested this additional change to the sentence, *stating the criterion vote voting ratio* or *stating the criterion vote proportion of the vote*. President Bohannon expressed hesitation about changing the language in this passage, because of its similarity to the language in the promotion procedure documents for the other three tracks. She suggested that the document be approved with the original language and then that all the promotion procedure documents be revised at a later date. Professor Tachau disagreed with this approach, noting that we often make improvements to new policy language that is based on pre-existing policy. Professor Seibert observed that the phrase *as applicable* in the original language

could serve the same purpose as the revision suggested by Professor Tachau. Professor Tachau preferred a more explicit statement, however.

Moving on to I. *Department level procedures D. (5) The DEO will add to the appropriate appendix of the Promotion Record any student teaching evaluations which may have been solicited by the department as part of its regular promotion review process*, Professor Tachau suggested that this entire passage be deleted from this location and from other places in the document where it is mentioned. She noted that for instructional faculty that have been on campus for many years, student evaluations could number in the thousands of pages, most of which have been entrusted to the instructor to keep. She wondered why it was necessary to add even more material to the teaching evaluation documentation at this late stage. President Bohannon asked what the harm would be in adding more material. Professor Tachau responded that there shouldn't be any additional evaluations to include because the procedures elsewhere call for all evaluations in the instructor's possession to be included in the dossier to begin with. She also expressed concern about the onerousness of this process both for the instructor and for the department, especially since job security is not one of the benefits of promotion. Professor Tachau added that, upon reading this language, a DEO may assume that s/he needs to collect yet more evaluations, to supplement those that already exist. Promotion decisions may end up being made based upon a few solicited evaluations, rather than the existing large pool, which may contain, in some departments, open-ended responses from hundreds of students. Identifying information of students would need to be redacted on these extra evaluations, causing more work for the department. The candidate may not even know that these extra evaluations exist until a negative decision is handed down. Professor Gillan expressed the opinion that DEO's should not be soliciting new secret teaching evaluations once the promotion review process is underway; the existing body of evaluations should be sufficient. President Bohannon observed that once again, this language was taken from the other three promotion procedures documents. She questioned the need to treat the instructional faculty track increasingly differently from the other tracks, adding that instructional faculty are already treated differently in terms of the criteria required for promotion.

Professor Oral commented that in her college (Medicine) student evaluations were collected during or at the end of the class or rotation through an established departmental procedure; at the time of the promotion process, those evaluations are then retrieved for review. She was unaware of department heads ever reaching out independently to students for additional evaluations at the time of the instructor's promotion process. Secretary Snyder responded that this might be done if a sufficient number of evaluations are not available, perhaps because students have not turned them in. Professor Gallanis asked where in the document DEO's are authorized to collect such additional evaluations. Secretary Snyder cited I. *Department level procedures B. (3) (g) within the appropriate section(s) of the dossier as listed above, other information relevant to the candidate's record in teaching, service, or professional productivity that is deemed to be important in the candidate's judgment or required by the college's written procedures governing promotion decision making*. President Bohannon added that further clarification of this particular procedure could be included in each collegiate promotion procedure document. Vice President Vaughn suggested that teaching evaluations from only a certain number of years preceding the promotion review be examined, in order to

cut down on the work burden. President Bohannon reminded the group that this university-wide procedures document must anticipate and provide guidance for everything that a college might do as part of the promotion review; it does not require a college to do everything listed, as long as the college complies with the basic requirements. Secretary Snyder concurred that the university-wide procedures must be all-encompassing and noted I. *Department level procedures B. (4) Where the volume of material of a particular kind which is required to be included in the dossier is large and potentially unmanageable, a candidate, in consultation with the DEO, may select and identify representative portions of the required material for special attention; this provision could reduce the onerous burden of reviewing vast numbers of student evaluations.*

Professor Tachau resisted the notion that promotion procedures for all the tracks should be as similar as possible, because the duties of the tracks, and therefore the promotion dossiers, vary greatly. Since instructional faculty spend most of their time teaching, they have an abundance of student evaluations; it does not make sense to provide for additional evaluation collection at the time of promotion review. Professor Havens agreed that faulty language in a pre-existing policy could be corrected in a new policy. However, he found the phrase *...solicited by the department as part of its **regular** promotion review process*, to be reassuring. It would be irregular for a DEO to independently solicit additional evaluations. A regular review process would be described in written documents within the department and the college. There may be departments that do require the use of extra teaching evaluations, but these requirements would be part of a written promotion review process and therefore not a surprise to anyone.

President Bohannon informed the group that the promotion procedures must be approved by the Senate before the colleges can move ahead with implementing the Instructional Faculty Policy. She asked how senators wished to proceed. Professor Murry suggested that the Senate vote on a series of motions regarding revisions. Professor Macfarland suggested voting on the policy as a whole first before voting on the revisions.

Professor Macfarland moved and Professor Gallanis seconded that the Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures be approved as written.

Professor Tachau offered a friendly amendment that I. Department level procedures H. (4) be revised to read *The summary report will contain a recommendation for or against the granting of promotion based on the written procedures of either the department (or in non-departmentalized colleges, the college), as applicable, stating the criterion ~~vote~~ the proportion of the vote, ...*

In a hand vote, the friendly amendment to the motion passed.

It was noted that *Appendix A – Points to be Determined by Collegiate Procedures I.H.(4)* would also need to be revised with similar language.

Professor Tachau offered a second friendly amendment that I. *Department level procedures D. (5)* be removed from the document here and everywhere in the document that this language appears.

In a hand vote, the friendly amendment to the motion failed.

Professor Campo moved and Professor Lehan Mackin seconded that the *Instructional Faculty Promotion Procedures* be approved with only the first friendly amendment proposed by Professor Tachau. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Academic Values Committee (Christina Bohannon)*

President Bohannon explained that the formation of an Academic Values Committee was proposed at the March 22 Senate meeting, but because of some concerns over the composition of the committee the proposal was tabled with the understanding that the Senate officers would revise the proposal. She reminded the group that the charge of this Senate committee would be to develop expertise, through study and consultation, on important university values such as tenure, shared governance, and academic freedom and to advise the Faculty Senate officers and occasionally others on issues that relate to these values. The proposal originally called for one seat on the committee to be reserved for a faculty member from the College of Law, because this committee would likely address issues that touch on the First Amendment. During discussion, it emerged that senators would prefer that this committee be more consultative, interacting with other informed groups such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and College of Education faculty members who specialize in higher education. Following the Senate meeting, the officers met with AAUP members and determined that the two groups would set up a regular schedule of meetings, which would also include the Academic Values Committee members. Instead of reserving seats on the committee for particular groups, the proposal now calls for the membership to include *expertise in law and higher education*.

At the prior suggestion of Professor Gillan, committee members would now be given *one-year renewable terms up to a maximum length of five years*, in order to provide a high degree of flexibility in membership. Professor Lehan Mackin questioned the need for a maximum length of service. President Bohannon responded that most committees have some type of term limit, in order to ensure that new people are regularly brought onto the committee. Professor Macfarland commented that service on this committee would require deep expertise and experience. Since the committee members would be advising others, rather than setting policy, he argued against the term limit. Professor Wilder compared this committee to the Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee, which also requires extensive expertise and experience and does not have term limits.

Professor Macfarland moved and Professor Murry seconded that the five-year term limit be eliminated from the proposal. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Gallanis moved and Professor Seibert seconded that the proposal to create an Academic Values Committee be approved as amended. The motion carried with one abstention.

IV. From the Floor –

Professor Wilcox moved that the Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Bohannon:

WHEREAS President Christina Bohannon has served effectively and with dedication as Senate Vice President and President; and

WHEREAS President Bohannon has worked tirelessly and thoughtfully to represent the interests of shared governance in challenging times, through controversies and difficulties; and

WHEREAS President Bohannon has demonstrated supple leadership, level-headed guidance, and indefatigable good cheer throughout the process of selecting a new university president; and

WHEREAS President Bohannon has reached out to constituents of all kinds, including initiatives to engage Iowa legislators, to strengthen respect for the University in the state; and

WHEREAS President Bohannon has energetically engaged with exploring intersections of free speech, academic freedom, inclusivity, and respect for diversity on campus; and

WHEREAS President Bohannon has skillfully guided us in university-wide discussions about the roles of faculty in an outstanding public institution, working collaboratively to clarify and codify best practices for instructional faculty;

BE IT RESOLVED that We the Senate express our most profound gratitude to President Bohannon for her dedicated leadership and service to us all.

Professor Campo seconded that the resolution be approved. The resolution was unanimously approved via applause.

V. Announcements

- Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (Christina Bohannon)

President Bohannon announced the winners of the 2016 Regents Award for Faculty Excellence: Ruth Bentler (Communication Sciences & Disorders), Colin Gordon (History), Paul McCray (Pediatrics), Keith Mueller (Health Management & Policy), Jodie Plumert (Psychological & Brain Sciences), and George Weiner (Internal Medicine).

- Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (Christina Bohannon)

President Bohannon announced the winners of the 2016 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Richard Fumerton (Philosophy), John Westefeld (Psychological & Quantitative Foundations), and Alexandra Thomas (Internal Medicine).

- Concluding Remarks of the 2015-16 Faculty Senate President Christina Bohannon

President Bohannon began her remarks by thanking the outgoing Councilors and Senators for their service, noting that this had been a particularly challenging year to serve on Council and Senate and that she appreciated their extra efforts. Observing that, while the year had not turned out as she had initially planned, she stated that working with the Council and Senate had been an absolute privilege and joy, and she thanked Councilors and Senators for this opportunity and for their support. She also thanked Faculty Senate Administrative Services

Coordinator Laura Zaper for her work. Turning to her fellow officers, President Bohannon noted that she and Past President Thomas had traveled a long and occasionally treacherous journey together. She has been inspired by Past President Thomas' optimism and pride in representing the faculty and said that Past President Thomas has her sincere love and gratitude. Secretary Snyder has been absolutely outstanding in his role, going above and beyond his duties as secretary and rising to the occasion at all times. He has been a great partner in the policy work that the officers have done this year, but more importantly has manifested astute judgment and real strength in difficult times, knowing when to collaborate and when to hold the line. President Bohannon stated that she has been very fortunate to have had him as an advisor this year. Vice President Vaughn has been thoughtful and steadfast. He has tremendous capacity to maintain his equanimity and sense of humor at all times, which is a great strength. President Bohannon believes that he will be an important and calming influence on campus as Faculty Senate President.

Encouraging those assembled to take on faculty leadership roles and to work together to move the institution forward, President Bohannon summarized the work the Senate accomplished this year. The Senate stood up for important academic values and shared governance against the Regents' conduct of a presidential search process with which we strongly disagreed. We lifted up lecturers on this campus with a policy that gives them greater job security, a pathway to promotion, grievance rights and representation on the Senate. We held the Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat, as well as a Teach-In, on diversity, inclusion and free speech on campus. We advocated for and received significant faculty participation in a new budgeting and strategic planning process. We represented faculty work to both federal and state legislators and engaged with state legislators on the importance of supporting the UI, and with city councilors on improving the relationship between town and gown. We collaborated with Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa in proposing to the Regents a shared governance orientation and a faculty shadowing program in which they have agreed to participate. President Bohannon recently presented to the Regents on the importance of recruiting and retaining excellent faculty and emphasized to them the critical role that faculty research plays in student success. Today we created an Academic Values Committee to protect the values on which all of our core missions depend.

President Bohannon went on to observe that around the country we are seeing changes in the landscape of higher education that threaten faculty work and fundamental academic values. The next few years are likely to bring great change to our beloved university, as well. Faculty leadership and the ability to collaborate will be critical to ensuring that faculty work and faculty values are protected and championed as times change. To be sure, taking on faculty leadership roles can take a lot of precious time. Faculty work hard already. And faculty leadership can sometimes feel like a thankless job. But President Bohannon stated that she has learned that leadership can mean trying to bring people together but not always succeeding. It means accepting your share of criticism, and maybe sometimes a little more than your share. She noted that she has gained some good friends this year but has also lost one or two. She has also learned what it means to care about something more than you care about yourself. And she knows what it means to have the courage of your convictions and to keep going no matter what.

Taking on faculty service and leadership roles is not easy but it is very, very worth it, President Bohannon continued. It is also her fervent hope that we will unite as faculty for the common good. This has been a traumatic year for our academic community. It is not unusual in stressful times for emotions to run high and for people to disagree. But after seventeen years at this university, several years on the Senate, and three years as an officer, President Bohannon knows one thing for sure. If we do not try to work together as faculty, and as faculty with the administration, we will forfeit the precious opportunities that shared governance provides us. We cannot afford to let that happen. The debates we have had in this chamber tell her that the members of this body are thoughtful, passionate and absolutely dedicated to this institution. She hopes that we all agree that it is time to pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and work together to move this university forward. In conclusion, President Bohannon thanked everyone for an amazing experience this past year.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Thomas moved and Professor Wilcox seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Bohannon adjourned the meeting at 4:48 pm.

**FACULTY SENATE
2016-17 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 26, 2016
4:45 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order – President Vaughn called the meeting to order at 4:48 pm.
- II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (Edwin Dove and Richard Fumerton, Elections Committee)

President Vaughn directed the new and continuing senators to move into the center seating area of the Senate Chamber. Although outgoing senators were free to leave, they were invited to remain, if they wished, but to be seated in the side areas.

Professor Dove indicated that the chair of the Elections Committee, Professor Victoria Sharp, was unable to be at today's meeting. He then listed the other members of the committee: David Cunning (Philosophy), Sandra Daack-Hirsch (Nursing), Ed Dove (Biomedical Engineering), Richard Fumerton (Philosophy), and Nicole Nisly (Internal Medicine). Tom Vaughn (Health Management and Policy) attended the meetings as an ex-officio member. Professor Dove explained that in proposing the slate of candidates, the Elections Committee considered many factors, such as temperament, commitment, and willingness to serve.

The slate of candidates offered by the Elections Committee for Faculty Senate Secretary were Edward Gillan (Chemistry) and Susan Vos (Pharmacy). Professor Dove asked if there were nominations from the floor for Faculty Senate Secretary. No nominations were made from the floor for Faculty Senate Secretary.

The slate of candidates offered by the Elections Committee for Faculty Senate Vice President were Justine Kolker (Operative Dentistry) and Peter Snyder (Internal Medicine). Professor Dove asked if there were nominations from the floor for Faculty Senate Vice President. After thanking the Elections Committee for their work in putting forward a slate of two candidates, Professor Scott offered the nomination of Russell Ganim (World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures). Noting that a candidate statement had been sent out for Professor Ganim several days ago, Professor Scott reiterated that Professor Ganim has extensive experience working with university administration. He has been on the Provost's Student Success Task Force, the Strategic Plan Development Group, and the Graduate Council, and he is currently chair of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly. As chair of the Faculty Assembly, he guided that group to support of the Faculty Senate's vote of no confidence in the Board of Regents last fall. Professor Scott added that Professor Ganim was a highly qualified candidate because of his work with the university administration and he will bring that experience to the Faculty Senate leadership. He added that Professor Ganim's work would be valuable to the Faculty Senate as a whole, while also bringing the perspective of a full professor in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Professor Scott concluded by saying that Professor Ganim was a good fellow, hard-working, and easy to work with. No additional nominations were offered from the floor for Faculty Senate Vice President.

Vice Presidential candidate Professor Kolker requested the opportunity to make a comment. She indicated that upon reading the candidate statement of one of her opponents, Professor Snyder, she was greatly impressed by his experience and qualifications. She requested that the Elections Committee accept her withdrawal from consideration as Faculty Senate Vice President. On behalf of the Elections Committee, Professor Dove accepted Professor Kolker's withdrawal.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

III. Opening Remarks of the 2016-17 Faculty Senate President Tom Vaughn

President Vaughn began his remarks by stating that it was a great honor to serve as Faculty Senate President, adding that it was humbling to be in a leadership role among so many smart, talented, and dedicated individuals. He thanked all the senators who served during the past year. To those ending their terms, he indicated that their contributions had been very important. To those continuing their terms into next year, he looked forward to working with them. To newly-elected senators, President Vaughn offered a welcome and urged them to reach out to the continuing senators and to learn more about how they can contribute to the important work of the Senate. He also invited them to contact him if he could help in any way as they settle into their new roles. He thanked all the Senators assembled for their willingness to commit the time and work it takes to support fellow faculty members and the university in this capacity.

President Vaughn then took a moment to thank former fellow officers Alexandra Thomas, Christina Bohannon, and Peter Snyder for their work and for the example they have set for him in how to comport himself as an officer, but most of all for the friendship they have shown him over the past year. President Vaughn noted that he had served as Faculty Senate Secretary immediately before serving as Vice President, so that he had worked with Professor Thomas and Professor Bohannon for two very interesting years. He reminded the group that during President Thomas' term, the Board of Regents had proposed a performance-based funding model. The transition of Faculty Senate leadership from President Thomas to President Bohannon coincided with the search for a new university president. Although he hesitated to bring up memories of the presidential search at this time meant to recognize and celebrate all that Professor Thomas and Professor Bohannon had accomplished during their presidential terms, he felt that these events had highlighted for him their core characters. He noted that during the performance-based funding controversy, President Thomas showed incredible professionalism, political acumen, and strength of character, continually reaching out and seeking ways to work with the Regents in an attempt to convince them of the short-sightedness of such a program. Despite those travails, she managed to keep her ability to reach out to people across campus with a smile, a gracious comment, and an optimistic demeanor in a most impressive way.

During the presidential search both Professor Thomas and Professor Bohannon worked tirelessly to reach out to constituents across campus to gain consensus on the type of person we wanted to lead the university. Unfortunately, the process did not produce the results we had hoped for. Having said that, President Vaughn noted that Professor Bohannon's behavior since the appointment of President Harreld is a tribute to her strength of character, to her consummate professionalism in addressing the negative feelings that were generated by that experience and especially to her ability to take a broad, long-term view of the university and its potential. One concrete example of that is her work on the Instructional Faculty Policy. She reached out to the administration, the Lecturers Committee, and the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee to shepherd through the policy that we recently passed. President Vaughn had difficulty imagining anyone who could have more effectively navigated the past nine months and stayed focused on the greater good of the university and its faculty than Professor Bohannon. He also could not imagine anyone who could more thoroughly lay out all sides of a given issue, complete with the rationale for every perspective, and not lose track of the question that prompted the recitation. She is able to provide an overview of an issue without developing a particularistic focus. President Vaughn has come to know Past President Bohannon as a generous, thoughtful, and supportive colleague and friend. Turning to former Secretary Snyder, President Vaughn noted that Professor Snyder had caught him a little by surprise. Upon becoming an officer, Professor Snyder would ask a few questions, but mostly just listen. Before long, however, the questions became more pointed and in-depth, and he became an active participant in discussions. During these discussions he would often challenge the others to reconsider assumptions on how to proceed on issues and what was in the best interests of the faculty. As a result, President Vaughn has come to highly value former Secretary Snyder's insights. He has worked very hard during his tenure as Secretary, especially on the Instructional Faculty Policy and the related promotion procedures. On a personal note, over the last several months, President Vaughn has come to appreciate him as thoughtful, caring and a true

gentleman. He also expressed thanks to Administrative Services Coordinator Laura Zaper for her work.

President Vaughn noted that last year President Bohannon had predicted that this year would be transformative, and it has been. The coming year looks to be even more transformative. The university has embarked on creating a new strategic plan with broad input from faculty, staff, and students. Shared governance has been asked to be instrumentally involved in developing this plan. And we have been invited to participate in its implementation. Only time will tell the extent to which we as faculty are successful in shaping and implementing the plan in a way that advances faculty academic and artistic freedom, provides an excellent educational experience for our students, and builds an inclusive culture among all members of the university community. We must be vigilant in ensuring that we maintain an appropriate role in this process. At the same time, President Vaughn believes in the talent, commitment and wisdom of this body and the faculty we represent. He remains optimistic that together with administration, staff and students we can succeed beyond anyone's expectations. The University of Iowa is a special place for him, no doubt as well as for the assembled senators. We have tremendously talented faculty and students, along with excellent programs in the arts, sciences, engineering, and health. Soon we will have some beautiful new facilities for art and music, and a venue for the performing arts. In conclusion, President Vaughn is excited to join with everyone in the necessary work to make this university an even more wonderful and special place to be.

President Vaughn presented a gift to former Past President Thomas. Past President Bohannon presented a gift to former Secretary Snyder.

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

V. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Professor Fumerton announced that the new Faculty Senate Secretary is Edward Gillan and the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Peter Snyder. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2016-17 Meeting Schedule – President Vaughn reminded senators that the meeting schedule for 2016-17 could be found in their meeting packets.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Daack-Hirsch moved and Professor Benson seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Vaughn adjourned the meeting at 5:12 pm.