

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 30, 2013
3:30 – 5:20 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: F. Abboud, S. Ali, D. Anderson, S. Baker, H. Bartlett, C. Benson, D. Black, C. Bohannon, P. Brophy, J. Brown, A. Budd, K. Chandran, J. Colgan, W. Coryell, D. Cuning, S. Daack-Hirsch, D. Dawson, F. Durham, E. Epping, E. Ernst, R. Ettinger, J. Fiedorowicz, L. Fielding, C. Fox, K. Gerken, E. Gillan, K. Glenn, N. Grosland, T. Havens, W. Haynes, M. Johnson, D. Katz, K. Kreder, A. Kwitek, N. Langguth, G. Lee, S. Levy, V. Magnotta, K. Markon, J. McNamara, D. Murry, J. Niebyl, F. Nothwehr, J. Paulsen, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, L. Ponto, S. Richardson, C. Ringen, R. Rocha, Y. Sato, S. Schultz, D. Segaloff, S. Seibert, J. Solow, L. Storrs, K. Tachau, A. Thomas, B. Thompson, T. Treat, W. Vispoel, M. Voigt, E. Wasserman, D. Wilder, R. Williams, S. Wilson, T. Yahr, E. Ziegler.
- Officers Present: R. Fumerton, E. Lawrence, L. Snetselaar.
- Officer Excused: N. Nisly.
- Senators Excused: C. Getz, D. Jeske, Z. Jin, K. Kieran, G. Lal, B. Levy, B. McMurray, J. Murph, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez.
- Senators Absent: J. Adrain, T. Anthony, L. Ayres, I. Barbuzza, N. Basu, J. Bertolatus, D. Bonthius, S. Clark, M. Finkelstein, S. Gardner, F. Gerr, B. Gollnick, D. Hasan, B. Hoskins, P. Muhly, J. Murry, D. O’Leary, K. Sanders, J. Sessions, J. Wemmie, S. White.
- Guests: G. Allan (Spanish & Portuguese), J. Drews (IT Security Office), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), G. Gussin (Emeritus Faculty Council), S. Hesler (Learning & Development), J. Jorgensen (Office of the General Counsel), K. Messingham (Dermatology), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), E. Rodriguez (Internal Medicine), A. Stapleton (English), J. Torner (Epidemiology), K. Ward (University Human Resources), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

- I. Call to Order – President Snetselaar called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.04.30.13.pdf>
- II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 26, 2013) – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Treat seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results – President Snetselaar presented the results of the 2013 Faculty Senate and Council elections. Professor Tachau moved and Professor Bohannon seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. 2013-2014 Committee Recommendations (Erika Lawrence, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Lawrence presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2013-2014 academic year. Professor Abboud moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the 2013-2014 Committee Recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2011-2012 Motion Summary – Vice President Lawrence presented the 2011-2012 Motion Summary. Professor Abboud moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *My Quick Coach (Sean Hesler, Learning & Development; Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources Administration)*

Sean Hesler, UI Learning & Development, explained that My Quick Coach is the newest e-learning resource, soon to be available, on campus. He expressed the hope that faculty members may find the video-based content useful, for staff they supervise, for their students, or for their own productivity or effectiveness. The program provides an easy way to access learning in short bursts; the average video lesson length is about four minutes. Presenters are subject matter experts from around the world. The user interface is very streamlined and the content can be accessed by the search function or through a list of key topic areas. During presentations, key points are highlighted with bullets alongside the video. Full transcripts of the presentations are available. Links to suggested related topics and presentations will also appear on the screen during videos. The program provides a sharing function, enabling users to send out a link to a video presentation; the link remains live for fourteen days. Users can establish profiles and save video presentations to their profiles.

Professor Tachau asked what types of online training My Quick Coach was intended to replace. Mr. Hesler indicated that this program was replacing the Skillsoft and Books24x7 programs which were discontinued by the university last fall. He also stated that no compliance training would be conducted through My Quick Coach. Commenting that it was unlikely that many faculty members used Skillsoft or Books24x7, Professor Tachau asked if the My Quick Coach program was aimed primarily at staff. Mr. Hesler responded that it was for both faculty and staff. Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration, added that for those faculty members who supervise staff, My Quick Coach provides an opportunity for on-campus staff development. Observing that Books24x7 had included training manuals for technical skills, Professor Pendergast asked if My Quick Coach offered technical training. Mr.

Ward responded that this program was just for soft skills. Training in technical skills could be obtained via Information Technology Services and the Lynda.com programs available to UI employees. A senator asked how video content quality was maintained. Mr. Hesler explained that content quality was continuously monitored by My Quick Coach. Suggestions for presenters can be made to the company. Professor Tachau expressed reservations about the company's role in monitoring quality. In response to several questions, Mr. Ward indicated that the university had committed to use of the program for three years, after which time its usage will be evaluated. The cost of the program is \$99,000 for the first year, \$89,000 for the two subsequent years. Mr. Ward added that the program is available to 16,000 users, but acknowledged that not all users may find it useful. He stressed that the program is a resource and no one will be required to use it. A senator asked if a rating system was available for the video presentations. Mr. Hesler responded that there was a comment function. Professor Tachau asked who would have access to the user profiles. Mr. Hesler indicated that the company would have access to the list of videos a user has watched, but not to any confidential information.

- *Lecturers Committee Report (Anne Stapleton, Lecturer, English)*

Professor Stapleton, a lecturer in English and chair of the Ad Hoc Lecturers Committee, thanked the Faculty Senate for its attention to the work of lecturers at the university and for creating the Ad Hoc Lecturers Committee, which has met four times this semester. Professor Stapleton praised the enthusiasm and dedication of the committee members: lecturers Gay Allan from Spanish & Portuguese, Meara Habashi from Psychology, Richard McCarty from the Tippie College of Business, and Caroline Sheerin from the College of Law. She then read through the committee's charge, which calls for the committee to represent lecturers on issues related to teaching responsibilities, or on any other concerns that pertain to their positions. The committee will also eventually make a recommendation regarding the establishment of a permanent lecturers committee. In order to gather input from the over 230 lecturers on campus, the committee will administer a survey in the fall. The committee also plans to establish an ongoing series of brown bag lunches that provide lecturers an opportunity to discuss issues and strategies that could enhance their professional development, as well as to augment a sense of community among lecturers, who vary in number across departments and colleges from many to only one or two. She welcomed input from senators on any aspect of the committee's work.

- *Research Track Review Committee Report (Erika Lawrence, Co-chair; Frank Abboud, Internal Medicine; Kelly Messingham, Research Assistant Professor, Dermatology; Edgardo Rodriguez, Research Assistant Professor, Internal Medicine)*

President Snetselaar commended the members of the Research Track Review Committee, co-chaired by Faculty Senate Vice President Erika Lawrence and Faculty Senate Secretary Nicole Nisly, for their work. Vice President Lawrence then gave an overview of the research track. She explained that it was established in 2008 for a five-year trial period. The research track policy requires that the track be reviewed by the Faculty Senate at the end of the trial period. The committee's report is a result of that review. Today the Senate will vote whether to retain the research track in its current form; this is also required by the policy. Since 2008, three colleges have adopted the track, the Carver College of Medicine, the College of Public Health, and the College of Pharmacy. There are currently 30 research-track faculty members at the university, all employed by the Carver College of Medicine. The policy limits the number of research-track

faculty at 10% of the number of a college's tenured/tenure-track faculty; Vice President Lawrence expressed the view that, clearly, this is not a track that is quickly expanding at the university. Among the 30 research-track faculty members are 20 assistant research-track professors, 7 associate research-track professors, and 3 full research-track professors. Vice President Lawrence commented that senators may hear the term *research scientist* in the committee's report; she explained that this is a professional & scientific *staff* position, not to be confused with the research-track *faculty* position. She went on to indicate that since January the committee has been conducting online surveys and interviews to gather input from research-track faculty, non-research-track faculty, and administrators across all colleges regarding the track. Results from the survey of research-track faculty indicate a high level of satisfaction within that group with their positions; nevertheless, some indicated that they would like to see changes made to the policy. Administrators were highly supportive of the continued availability of this track. The review committee voted unanimously that the research track be retained, for any colleges that wish to adopt it. Two weeks ago, the Faculty Council voted unanimously to retain the research track in its current form. In conclusion, Vice President Lawrence stressed that retention of the research track allows for colleges to implement the track, but *only* upon a favorable vote of the college's entire tenured/tenure-track faculty. She added that General Education Fund money *cannot* be used to support research-track faculty.

Professor Abboud, a member of the research-track review committee, then presented the findings of the report. He began his remarks by stating that he loved the University of Iowa, among other reasons, because the university had been the first to accept creative work on an equal basis with traditional academic research. This appreciation of creativity and a spirit of cross-campus collegiality distinguish our university from many others. As part of that spirit, no college should benefit at the expense of another college. He also expressed confidence in the university's strong support for the tenure system, noting that when the research-track policy was approved in 2008, there were concerns that its implementation would undermine the tenure system. In Professor Abboud's view, the existence of the research track strengthens the tenure system, as well as the university overall.

Turning to the evolution of the research track nationwide, Professor Abboud explained that in the last decade or so, medical research has become increasingly complex and is conducted now by large teams of individuals with different specializations. Funding agencies in the health sciences increasingly favor and encourage team research, or "big science." Within these teams, there is an important role for research-track faculty, who typically possess expertise in an area crucial for the team. Health science research on university campuses is now largely dependent on the national funding agencies. General education funds, therefore, would not be used to support research-track faculty who will be pursuing grant funding. In differentiating the research scientist staff position from the research-track faculty position, Professor Abboud explained that research-track faculty have the potential to move beyond the requirements of the research scientist position. Research-track faculty are expected to become independent thinkers, generating new ideas for research, and they would become leaders of a component of a research team. Research-track faculty members are characterized by expectations of leadership, individual creativity, and an ability to compete for national grants, thus enhancing the research mission of the university. Research-track faculty differ from tenured/tenure-track faculty in that

this leadership is manifested only in research, while for the tenured/tenure-track faculty, leadership expectations are much broader, encompassing teaching and service. Professor Abboud recognized that the research track would not necessarily be appropriate for every college, but the policy allows for colleges to choose whether to implement the policy.

Reviewing the statistics on the research track and the potential impact on tenure, Professor Abboud reiterated that there are only 30 research-track faculty members at this time, all in the Carver College of Medicine. Eleven of those are in the Department of Internal Medicine, five in the Department of Obstetrics/Gynecology, with the remaining research-track faculty members distributed among a handful of other departments. The research-track policy would allow for a maximum of 52 research-track faculty members in the Carver College of Medicine and 163 in the university overall (10% of the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty members in each entity). Professor Abboud observed that, given the relatively small number of research-track faculty members actually hired in the past five years, it would appear that the impact of this track on the tenure system is minimal. In concluding his remarks, he noted that the committee learned that \$11,000 was mistakenly used from the general education fund to support the research track, but this was subsequently corrected.

Research-track assistant professor Edgardo Rodriguez then spoke about his experiences on the research track. He indicated that he had been recruited about three years ago from the University of Michigan by a UI tenured faculty member in the Department of Internal Medicine. Professor Rodriguez conducts research on understanding mechanisms that underlie neurological age-related disorders and developing new therapies to treat them, a “high-risk, high-reward” type of research. At the time of his recruitment, he was attracted by the large amount of research independence he would gain in the research track, while still having the opportunity to work on a research team led by a tenured pioneer researcher in his field. Professor Rodriguez also felt that obtaining the rank of faculty would open new doors for his career. Since coming to the UI, he has competed for and secured multiple federal grants, as a principal or co-principal investigator, and has established an independent research program within his mentor’s team, thus enhancing the team’s success and contributing to the university’s research mission. Professor Rodriguez also attributed his ability to establish national and international research collaborations to his rank as faculty.

In commenting on the difference between the research scientist and research-track faculty positions, Professor Rodriguez explained that research scientists may be given the responsibility to oversee projects within the research effort. They carry out experiments that support or counter the hypotheses proposed and they also participate in the preparation of manuscripts or grant applications. However, they are *not expected* to pursue independent areas of research or to generate new hypotheses, although they are not prohibited from doing so. Research-track faculty, on the other hand, have the demonstrated potential for autonomy. They *are expected* to generate novel hypotheses, design experiments to test those hypotheses, and obtain funding to support those experiments. Research-track faculty also participate in interdisciplinary collaborations with tenured/tenure-track faculty. Professor Rodriguez concluded his remarks by expressing the view that the research track is intimately linked to a strong tenure-track program, which in turn is necessary in the current funding environment. He stated that the research track

provides benefits for the university, as well as to the members of the track themselves, who thrive on independence, academic stature, and leadership. Following Professor Rodriguez' presentation, Vice President Lawrence opened the floor for questions.

Professor Pendergast asked if today's vote by the Senate would include the changes to the research track suggested by the review committee in their report. Vice President Lawrence clarified that today's vote would decide whether to retain the research track *as it currently exists*. The recommendations for changes to the track presented in the report would be taken up in the fall, when the Senate would decide whether to adopt any of those changes. A senator commented that, in his experience in the Carver College of Medicine, it is not difficult to hire and promote tenure-track faculty. Why, therefore, is the research track necessary? Professor Abboud responded that the number of people with the expertise and independence needed to do research in today's funding environment is much larger than the number of possible tenure-track positions. Professor Treat expressed concern about voting to permanently retain the track before knowing what kind of modifications may eventually be made to it. She suggested perhaps voting to retain the track for two years while modifications are considered and voting on its permanent status then. Professor Abboud commented that the review committee found nearly uniform support for the track from both research-track faculty members and administrators. Research-track faculty members were permitted to suggest improvements to the track in their survey, and some of the review committee's suggestions for changes grew out of those comments. Some of the suggested improvements involved privileges for the research-track faculty members; these issues may be best addressed at the collegiate or departmental level. Professor Abboud reminded the group, however, that the review committee's charge had been to make a recommendation on whether to retain the track permanently as it currently exists. Professor Treat expressed concern about not knowing more fully what views non-research-track faculty hold of the research track. Professor Pendergast pointed out that any changes made to the track would be voted on by tenured/tenure-track faculty and clinical-track faculty (not by research-track faculty) in the Senate and only after extensive discussion.

Professor Ziegler asked what happens to research-track faculty members when their grant money runs out. Professor Rodriguez stressed that the research-track policy prohibits general education funds from being used to support research-track faculty. He was aware of situations in which research-track faculty members have lost their funding; those individuals were usually given extra time to find new funding. If they were not successful, then they needed to move on to other positions. He added that the research track can be challenging, but some individuals thrive in that environment. Professor Ringen, referring to the survey results, commented on the surprisingly low, in her view, percentage of time spent by research-track faculty members on obtaining and working on grants, along with a surprisingly high percentage of time spent on departmental service and other such activities. Professor Rodriguez responded that the question had asked for an estimate of time spent on planning and executing research and preparing manuscripts and grant applications. He added that research-track faculty also engage in activities such as serving on research-related committees (e.g., animal protocols), training other individuals, and sharing expertise with colleagues, and the survey responses reflected research-track faculty members' efforts to provide as extensive a picture as possible of their work. He

stressed that research-track faculty members spend the vast majority of their time on research-related activity.

A senator asked how long most research-track faculty members plan to remain in their positions. Vice President Lawrence responded that most research-track faculty members sought this track because they intended to remain in it for a long period of time, not use it as an entry into a tenure-track position. Research-track assistant professor Kelly Messingham, also a member of the review committee, explained that she had switched to a research-track faculty position from a UI research scientist position. She had also recently changed areas of specialization and therefore thought it unlikely that she would soon be competitive for National Institutes of Health grants, as she would need to be for a tenure-track position. She has a successful partnership with a tenured faculty member in the Department of Dermatology and believes that the research track is the most rewarding track for her, in spite of the risks involved. Professor Steven Levy, referring to comments earlier about temporary funding available to research-track faculty when they have lost their primary funding, asked where this other funding might come from, if general education funds are not available for support of research-track faculty. Professor Pendergast, speaking from her experience as a research-track faculty member at another institution, noted that in such situations, research-track faculty members could temporarily join another funded faculty member's team. Occasional teaching was also an option at her former institution.

Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Black seconded that the research track as it currently exists be retained permanently. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Revised Conflicts of Commitment and Interest Policy (Richard Fumerton)*

Past President Fumerton explained that revisions to this policy were precipitated by an internal audit, which found that the policy was difficult to understand and, therefore, to implement. The Faculty Senate officers, the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, and various administrators, including Associate Provost for Faculty Tom Rice and Diane Finnerty, Director of Faculty Human Resources and Development, participated in the revision work over many months. A portion of the policy, 18.6 *Conflicts of Interest in Research*, had previously been revised in response to changing federal regulations. Those revisions were approved by the Faculty Senate last spring. Under discussion today were sections 18.1-18.5 only.

Professor Coryell observed that reporting of external activity appears to hinge on a determination whether an external activity requires a *substantial* time commitment (line 141). Ms. Finnerty responded that the determination whether a commitment is substantial would be made by the faculty member and his/her departmental executive officer (DEO) prior to the undertaking of the activity. The policy provides some questions for consideration when making this determination (lines 155-169). Professor Bohannon took issue with including *miss[ing]...scheduled office hours* as an example of assigned duties that an academic activity might interfere with, thus requiring an advance disclosure to the DEO (lines 136-138). She noted that faculty members frequently move office hours for legitimate reasons and this disclosure requirement was unduly burdensome. Professor Solow concurred. Alternative language, *regular office hours*, was suggested to adequately convey the reminder of the importance of

holding office hours while allowing faculty members to make adjustments to them independently when necessary.

Professor Bohannon then commented on the difference between disclosure requirements for *outside professional activities* (lines 133-135) and *external activities* (lines 139-144). In her view, outside professional activities may be just as likely to compromise a faculty member's professional judgment as external activities would be. She suggested that those two activities be subject to the same standard. Past President Fumerton responded that the category *external activities* is very broad, and that the passage indicates that disclosure of such activities is required only if there is a substantial commitment of time involved, so that faculty members are not obligated to disclose occasional outside activities such as coaching children's soccer games. Professor Bohannon noted that *external activities* by definition (lines 116-119) are activities that require a substantial time commitment, whether related to professional expertise or not, and that the definition of *outside professional activities* indicates that they are a subset of external activities, automatically implying that they require a substantial time commitment. As this was not the intent of the policy, it was suggested that the sentence *These activities are a subset...before engaging in the activity* (lines 122-124) be stricken from the definition of *outside professional activities*.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Ziegler seconded that the revised Conflicts of Commitment and Interest policy be approved with the suggested modifications. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Revised Acceptable Use of Technology Resources Policy (Jane Drews, ITS Security Office; James Jorgensen, Office of the General Counsel; Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration)*

Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration, indicated that this policy was last reviewed in 2002. The primary reason for revising the policy at this time was to clarify the expectations of privacy that are implied in the policy. Given the public records laws that now apply throughout the state and that indicate that all public records are subject to disclosure unless specifically exempted by the law, the policy language could mislead employees about their expectations of privacy when using the university's technology resources. Other revisions include encouraging employees to report violations of the policy, updating the policy to encompass current technology, and incorporating the requirements of new federal laws such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. Mr. Ward explained that the policy revision had been reviewed by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, the Faculty Council, and Staff Council. Suggestions made by those groups were incorporated into the revision.

A senator asked if the policy applied to external vendors and campus visitors. Mr. Ward indicated that the policy does cover visitors, although their interaction with the university's information technology resources may be limited to wireless technologies. Regarding vendors, Jane Drews, ITS Security Office, stressed that anyone using the university's information technology resources would be subject to this policy. The senator asked what the consequences

would be to an outside vendor for violation of the policy; Mr. Ward commented that such issues would most likely be addressed in the contract between the university and the vendor.

Professor Ziegler moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the revised Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Honorary Degrees (Jim Torner, Chair, Honorary Degree Selection Committee)*

Professor Torner, Chair of the Honorary Degree Selection Committee, distributed this year's call for nominations for the University of Iowa honorary degree. He explained that the university, with the approval of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, confers honorary degrees on "individuals who have demonstrated extraordinary achievements in such areas as research, scholarship, education, artistic creation, social activism, human rights, innovation or invention beneficial to society, and humanitarian outreach." Professor Torner thanked the committee for their hard work and also thanked Evalyn Van Allen-Shalash for the administrative support that she provides to the committee. At the Graduate College commencement ceremony on May 17, two distinguished UI alumni, John W. Colloton and Mary Louise Petersen, will receive honorary degrees.

Professor Torner commented that the selection committee has noticed a declining number of nominees over the years. The majority of nominations recently have come from administrators. Professor Torner urged his faculty colleagues to nominate individuals for honorary degrees. The selection committee is seeking nominees who are prominent, have an affiliation with the university (although this isn't mandatory), and are willing and able to come to the ceremony. Nominees should also be willing to spend time with students while they are on campus. Professor Tachau, also a member of the selection committee, added that the committee is seeking nominees who would be superb role models for students. Professor Solow commented that in the past he was a strong supporter of honorary degrees because of the visibility they bring to the university. He expressed the opinion, however, that the types of individuals that undergraduates are most likely to find inspiring are not necessarily the same types of individuals who would be selected for honorary degrees. Professor Torner responded that the selection committee was interested in expanding the pool of nominees and was open to suggestions.

IV. From the Floor –

Professor Tachau moved that the Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Snetselaar:

WHEREAS the University of Iowa Faculty are members of a University Community that requires dedicated leadership; and

WHEREAS President Linda Snetselaar has served effectively and with dedication as Senate Vice President and President, working assiduously on behalf of the Senate and the entire University community; and

WHEREAS President Snetselaar has worked consultatively both with members of the administration and with faculty colleagues on the Senate to reinforce the University of Iowa faculty's multi-faceted engagement with our fellow citizens in the State of Iowa;

WHEREAS President Snetselaar has continued diplomatically to nourish fruitful relationships between the Regents and the University of Iowa faculty, thereby fortifying our mutually respectful communication;

WHEREAS President Snetselaar has advocated carefully, thoughtfully, and ceaselessly for the values of the faculty's expertise and academic freedom, and of tenure as an essential foundation for both; and

WHEREAS President Snetselaar has dedicated constant energy to strengthening the tree of truly shared governance at the roots and at the branches;

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

Past President Fumerton seconded that the resolution be approved. The resolution was unanimously approved via applause.

V. Announcements

- **Office of the Provost Review Committee Membership (Richard Fumerton)**
Past President Fumerton explained that the Operations Manual mandates that the Faculty Senate work with the central administration to review the university's central administrative offices at regular intervals. A review of the Office of the Provost is currently being undertaken. The first step in this process was for the Office of the Provost to complete a self-study, http://provost.uiowa.edu/files/provost.uiowa.edu/files/Self_Study_2013.pdf. Past President Fumerton and Professor Victoria Sharp will co-chair the review committee; they are still working on forming the committee and developing the timetable for the review.
- **Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence (Linda Snetselaar)**
President Snetselaar announced the winners of the 2013 Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence: Michael Flatté (Physics & Astronomy); Sarah Larsen (Chemistry); Ann Marie McCarthy (Nursing); Gary Rosenthal (Internal Medicine); Sara Rynes-Weller (Management & Organizations); and Curt Sigmund (Pharmacology).
- **Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (Linda Snetselaar)**
President Snetselaar announced the winners of the 2013 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Edwin Dove (Biomedical Engineering) and Susan Johnson (Obstetrics & Gynecology).
- **Concluding Remarks of the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate President**
President Snetselaar stated that it was her honor to have represented the devoted faculty at the University of Iowa for the past year. Many faculty on this campus model shared governance and make it work in a stellar fashion. She expressed her heartfelt thanks to the members of her team of Faculty Senate officers. Past President Richard Fumerton was a "wonderful philosopher," who taught her the power of argument and was always willing to discuss pressing topics. Their conversations combined the philosophical and the pragmatic and in spite of their very different collegiate worlds, they usually reached the same conclusions about how to deal

with the issues confronting them. Vice President Erika Lawrence showed President Snetselaar the importance of looking at issues from a psychological reference. They did not know each other well at the beginning of year, but eventually became great friends and President Snetselaar could not have asked for a more wonderful vice president. She expressed much gratitude for Vice President Lawrence's advice throughout the year. President Snetselaar had immense respect for Secretary Nicole Nisly, whom she has known for many years, but got to know her at an even deeper level as the officers worked through various issues regarding faculty. Vice President Lawrence and Secretary Nisly co-chaired the research-track review committee and President Snetselaar reiterated her praise for their stellar efforts as co-chairs and for the outstanding work of that committee as a whole. President Snetselaar also thanked Faculty Senate Administrative Services Coordinator Laura Zaper for her work.

President Snetselaar noted that a number of policies were reviewed and approved by the Senate this past year and she thanked the senators for their work on them, including those senators who had met with her over lunch to discuss their concerns. She added that the Faculty Senate officers had met individually with members of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa and with the governor, stressing the value and importance of shared governance at each meeting. President Snetselaar then read a list of faculty members rotating off the Faculty Council those rotating off the Faculty Senate and thanked them for their years of service.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Ziegler seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snetselaar adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.

**FACULTY SENATE
2013-2014 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 30, 2013
5:20 – 5:30 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – President Lawrence called the meeting to order at 5:20 pm.

II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (David Stern, Elections Committee and Scott Wilson)

President Lawrence 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 Stern indicated that the candidates for Faculty Senate Vice President were Jody Murph, Pediatrics, and Alexandra Thomas, Internal Medicine. The candidates for Faculty Senate Secretary were K. B. Chandran, Biomedical Engineering, and David Cunning, Philosophy.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

III. Opening Remarks of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate President Erika Lawrence

President Lawrence thanked and congratulated the newly-elected senators and councilors as they began their service. She also thanked the continuing senators and councilors, as well as those serving on Faculty Senate committees. She expressed gratitude to these faculty members for their willingness to give their time to serve the faculty and the university. President Lawrence said that she was humbled and privileged to be entrusted with the position of President of the Faculty Senate. She commented that she has benefitted greatly by being a member of the UI faculty, and has long wished to give back to the university in a meaningful and substantive way. She believed that this position would give her the opportunity to do so.

President Lawrence continued, noting that serving as Vice President has given her the chance to observe effective shared faculty governance. She has been impressed by her fellow officers and other faculty with whom she has worked this past year – all of whom have been generous with their time, wisdom and passion for faculty governance. In speaking of her fellow officers, President Lawrence commented that former Past President Fumerton approached every issue thoughtfully, weighing things from every possible angle. His arguments were always well thought-out and convincing. She considered it not at all surprising that everyone has such high regard for him. President Lawrence observed that Past President Snetselaar has a seemingly quiet manner, but is passionate about many issues, determined and persistent, and an expert at working behind the scenes. Past President Snetselaar shepherded several policies through the Council and Senate this past year with such apparent ease that the work, time and energy she put into these efforts might go unnoticed. President Lawrence commented that former Secretary Nicole Nisly is passionate about the rights and opportunities of faculty, both as individuals and as a group. Her persistence in the face of barriers is a trait worthy of emulation. President Lawrence also thanked Administrative Services Coordinator Laura Zaper for her efforts to keep the Faculty Senate running smoothly. President Lawrence said that she was humbled and grateful to have had the opportunity to work with last year's group of officers and to follow in their footsteps.

Turning to her plans for the coming year, President Lawrence commented that although she had always valued shared governance, it wasn't until she became a Faculty Senate officer that she truly came to appreciate the importance of shared governance for the faculty and for the university. She looked forward to getting to know senators and councilors and to developing strong relationships with them. She urged them to contact her with any questions or concerns. President Lawrence considered the most important aspect of her position to be serving the faculty and representing their interests. In order to do this, she would strive to understand the structures and perspectives that exist among faculty across the campus. This would be a challenging but critical task. President Lawrence considered her secondary task to be serving as a liaison between the faculty and the administration. She believed the most effective officers to be those who were also the most effective communicators. During the past year, she developed good working relationships with administrators and will continue the practice of meeting

regularly with them, to be better positioned to deal with any serious issues that may arise. She also hoped to meet with the president of the Board of Regents, as well as with legislators, in order to work with them for the good of the faculty, staff, and students and of Iowans across the state.

Thirdly, President Lawrence will highlight the accomplishments of our faculty to the Board of Regents, to legislators, and to Iowans. She commented that UI faculty are among the most talented teachers, researchers, and service providers in the country. There are many individual faculty members and departments that have won prestigious awards and that have made discoveries that have changed the world. UI faculty are educators, scientists, lawyers, doctors, economists, historians, engineers, pharmacists, and public health advocates, to name just a few of the roles that faculty play in the university and across the state. She observed that faculty members were taught to work hard in their teaching and research, but not to “toot their own horns.” However, the world has changed, and faculty need to make sure that their hard work and accomplishments are recognized and valued. In conclusion, President Lawrence expected there to be many challenges and issues confronting the Senate in the coming year. She looked forward to facing them with her colleagues in the Senate. She thanked senators for their faith in her and she stated that she would serve them to the best of her ability.

President Lawrence presented a gift to former Past President Fumerton. Past President Snetselaar planned to present former Secretary Nisly with a gift after the meeting.

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

V. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Professor Stern announced that the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Alexandra Thomas and the new Faculty Senate Secretary is David Cunning. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2013-2014 Meeting Schedule – President Lawrence reminded senators that the meeting schedule for 2013-2014 could be found in their meeting packets.

VI. Adjournment – Past President Snetselaar moved and Professor Bohannon seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Lawrence adjourned the meeting at 5:35 pm.