

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 26, 2022
3:30 – 4:45 pm
Zoom

MINUTES

- Senators Present: J. Achrazoglou, F. Ahmad, K. Ait-Aissa, D. Andersen, D. Anderson, B. Ayati, M. Bhatti, S. Bodine, C. Bradley, A. Brian, N. Brogden, J. Buckley, C. Campbell, M. Cantrell, J. Carlson, M. Carvour, M. Charlton, M. Coleman, R. Cox, M. Cunningham-Ford, A. Curtius, R. Curto, S. Datchuk, S. Dayal, L. Durairaj, H. Dybevik, S. Elangovan, A. Estapa, A. Farag, S. Ganesan, P. Gilbert, E. Gillan, L. Glass, B. Greteman, A. Grooms, C. Grueter, J. Gutierrez, N. Handoo, K. Hegarty, E. Hill, Y. Imai, B. Janssen, L. Joseph, J. Kayle, A. Kitchen, M. Kivlighan, J. Kline, M. Landsman, D. Langbehn, B. Li, T. Mangum, S. Martini, S. Mason, M. McQuistan, H. Mehdi, A. Merryman, T. Midtrod, J. Murry, N. Nisly, K. Parker, G. Pierce, C. Pinnaro, M. Pizzimenti, G. Russell, J. Sa-Aadu, D. Santillan, M. Santillan, Y. Shi, A. Shibli-Rahhal, S. Sosale, A. Strathman, C. Swanson, C. Turvey, A. Vijh, T. Wadas, E. Welder, D. Wilder, S. Young, L. Zingman.
- Officers Present: M. Lehan Mackin, T. Marshall, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, J. Yockey.
- Senators Excused: C. Brochu, S. Girotra, J. Halekas, S. Harwani, A. Hollingworth, A. Jaynes, D. Meyerholz, A. Panos, A. Prince, M. Zmolek.
- Senators Absent: J. Barker, A. Chauhan, C. Cherwin, B. Dixon, L. Erdahl, D. Jalal, H. Parrish, P. Polgreen, Y. Sato, L. Song, J. Streit, A. Vikram.
- Guests: L. Adams (Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee); A. Byrd (Office of the General Counsel); C. Colvin (Faculty Senate Elections Committee); K. Culp (Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee); B. Ernst (*Daily Iowan*); A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); M. Gardinier (Emeritus Faculty Council); L. Geist (Office of the Provost); C. Kaufman (Pentacrest Museums); K. Kregel (Provost); K. Leary (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee); B. Marcelo (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); K. Messingham (Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee); K. Perez (*Daily Iowan*); R. Rastogi (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee); C. Sheerin (Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee); A. Stapleton (Instructional Faculty

Track Review Committee); D. Witt (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. Call to Order – President Marshall called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
 - A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Gillan moved and Professor Janssen seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 22, 2022) – Professor Jalal moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Teresa Marshall) – Professor Ahmad moved and Professor Janssen seconded that the 2022 election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - D. 2022-23 Committee Recommendations (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Rodríguez-Rodríguez presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university, and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2022-23 academic year. She noted that there are still some vacancies to be filled. These appointments will be approved in the Fall. Professor Glass moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the 2022-23 committee recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - E. 2020-21 Motion Summary (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez) – Vice President Rodríguez-Rodríguez presented the 2020-21 motion summary. Professor Gillan moved and Professor Jalal seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Pentacrest Museums (Carolina Kaufman, Director, Education & Engagement, Pentacrest Museums)*

Ms. Kaufman explained that, in her position, she connects both the university and the larger community with the collections of the Pentacrest Museums, which include the Old Capitol Museum and the Museum of Natural History. A variety of programming takes place within and outside of the museum buildings. The Pentacrest Museums actively seek engagement and partnerships with many UI units and departments, as well as with individual members of the university and larger communities. Several years ago, for example, the Pentacrest Museums developed an initiative to allow community members to share their own collections with the public. Among campus partnerships are those formed with liveWELL and UI Reach. With the former, the Pentacrest Museums have developed nature-based programming in support of employee health and well-being and workplace culture. With the latter, a program that serves students with disabilities, the Pentacrest Museums are creating internships and job opportunities, in support of access and of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Pentacrest Museums also serve as sites for campus and community activities and special events, such as team-building exercises, weddings, and receptions.

The Pentacrest Museums also provide services to students, Ms. Kaufman continued. Staff make outreach visits to dormitories and student organization meetings. There is also a Student Advisory Board, composed of about 14 students from across campus, that serves as a bridge between the museums and students. Board members have the opportunity to engage in leadership development, including through planning and hosting museum events such as game nights and open houses. And, the Pentacrest Museums offer a wide range of student employment and internship opportunities. Student employees and interns are involved in tours and public programs, collections conservation, events management, museum retail, communications, and exhibition design.

Ms. Kaufman reminded the group that museums are classrooms, as well. Nearly 30 instructors have taught a class session in a museum space and over 250 students have attended a class taught in a museum gallery. Among the Pentacrest Museums' services to faculty are the opportunity to use the museum, both galleries and behind-the-scenes areas, as classrooms and laboratory spaces. Faculty can also arrange for guided tours of exhibits and for loans of museum objects to their classrooms. Ms. Kaufman noted that the Pentacrest Museums had recently collaborated with International Programs and the Division of World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures to host an [exhibit on Anne Frank](#). Museums are laboratories, as well, she continued. In the past year, 467 students used the museum collections for research and a similar number attended a class in a behind-the-scenes collections space. The Pentacrest Museums welcome the return of more in-person class visits as they return to pre-pandemic operations.

Faculty can be trained in visual thinking strategies at the Pentacrest Museums, Ms. Kaufman noted. This is a form of experiential, active learning that involves close observation of objects and that fosters inquiry and critical thinking. Visual thinking strategies take interpretation and context into account and can be applied in any discipline. The strategies also promote peer-to-peer dialogue, problem solving skills, multi-sensory learning, and meaning-making, all of which lead students to take ownership of their learning.

Ms. Kaufman invited faculty members to suggest exhibition topics and to help design exhibits. Museum staff can assist with the creation of interactive scientific posters, videos, virtual exhibits, displays, audio programs, science communications, and programs and events. Additional information about the Pentacrest Museums can be found [here](#).

- *Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee Interim Report (Caroline Sheerin and Anne Stapleton, Co-chairs)*

President Marshall reminded the group that the Faculty Senate had approved the Instructional Faculty Policy on March 22, 2016. A review of the policy not later than five years following implementation was required by the policy. Therefore, last spring, President Yockey, in coordination with Associate Provost for Faculty Geist, named a committee, composed of faculty members in various tracks, to carry out the review, which was conducted during this academic year. Review committee co-chairs Professors Caroline Sheerin and Anne Stapleton presented the interim report to the Faculty Council two weeks ago and now they will present to the Faculty Senate. President Marshall thanked the co-chairs and the committee members for their outstanding work, adding that the co-chairs' leadership and the committee's engagement

and teamwork have been amazing for her to observe. She noted that the results of this review have implications for administrator-proposed changes to the clinical track, as well.

Professor Sheerin began the presentation by acknowledging the hard work of the Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee members: Lori Adams, Matthew Cantrell, Ken Culp, Brian Hand, Kay Hegarty, Kelly Messingham, and Michael Zmolek. Because committee members came from a range of tracks and of colleges, a wide variety of viewpoints were expressed and considered by the members. Professor Sheerin further thanked Faculty Senate President Teresa Marshall, Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist Laura Zaper, Associate Director for Institutional Data Deb Tiemens, Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee Chair Doris Witt, and Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee member Ed Gillan for their involvement in and support of the review process.

Turning to the committee's charge, Professor Sheerin reiterated that the policy calls for a review at the five-year mark. As part of this review, three aspects of the policy require specific attention: *effect of this policy on the number of tenure-track, tenured, clinical, and adjunct faculty relative to instructional faculty at the University and in individual colleges; effect of this policy on the composition of Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, and University committees; and instructional faculty dispute procedures in III-10.11h*. Regarding the rationale for the first two points, Professor Sheerin explained that, prior to the implementation of the policy, tenured and tenure-track faculty had raised concerns that the instructional track would greatly expand as a result of the new policy, to the detriment of the tenure track. She added that the impact of the instructional track on the number of adjunct faculty was not examined in the report, because adjunct faculty are a distinct group with different needs and concerns from the other tracks. As for the third point, Professor Sheerin noted that the dispute procedures created for the instructional track arose out of a compromise among those involved in drafting the policy. The procedures thus turned out to be significantly less robust than those for the other tracks. The charge to the review committee was not limited to these three issues, however, so the committee members identified additional areas for review: *titles and ranks, length of term, roles, review and promotion, and morale*.

Professor Sheerin indicated that the methodology used by the review committee included a long, detailed survey, with a response rate of 61%, of the approximately 330 UI ITF; interviews with deans or designees of all colleges, even those without an instructional track; a review of peer institution policies; and a review of university data. Professor Sheerin noted that the interim report primarily focuses on the survey results and the university data. Feedback from the dean interviews was incorporated into the background of the interim report, but will only be presented directly in the final version. Information from the review of peer institution policies will also be discussed in the final report.

Addressing the report's findings on the required areas of review, Professor Sheerin focused on the third issue, regarding the faculty dispute procedures. Survey results indicated four issues of primary concern to ITF regarding their dispute procedures. First, the vast majority (83%) of survey respondents disagreed with the policy provision allowing for no notice period for non-renewal in the first six years of employment. Given the constraints of the academic employment

cycle, it is difficult to find another job quickly when there is no notice period. Second, two dispute review procedures for ITF are set out in the policy. The administrative review procedures do not involve faculty in decision-making, while the peer review procedures do. The former apply to the lecturer level and in probationary periods, while the latter apply to all other ITF. This two-tiered approach was unpopular with survey respondents. Third, there is unequal time given for a grievant to initiate a review (10 days) and for the university to respond (15 days). Considering that an ITF may not even be aware of the availability of a grievance procedure, 10 days seems too short of a timeframe to initiate a review. Fourth, 66% of survey respondents found that the policy lacked clarity on the composition of the peer committee appointed to review a grievance. The committee should include at least one ITF, 49% of respondents indicated. Based on these findings, the report recommends the following revisions to the policy: a minimum of three months' notice for probationary ITF and six months' notice for all other ITF; access to a peer review process for all ITF except those in a probationary period; a 20-day time period for both the grievant and the university to initiate and to respond to a grievance; and clarification of the process for forming the peer review committee, ensuring all members are familiar with ITF. The report additionally recommends that all ITF be given a copy of the dispute resolution procedures at the time of hiring and at the start of a grievance process.

Professor Stapleton continued the presentation of the report, pausing first to reiterate thanks to the committee members and all others who contributed to the creation of the report. Displaying a graph of the percentages of types of faculty at UI from 2015 to 2021, she then turned to a discussion of the review's first required issue, the effect, if any, of ITF on the number of tenured and other faculty. Professor Stapleton commented that data suggest that tenure-track faculty hiring and retention do not appear to be negatively affected by the creation of the instructional track in 2016. While the graph showed a surge in the percentage of ITF in the two years following the implementation of the new track, that growth is likely attributable to faculty members moving into the instructional track from [fixed-term appointments](#), which had a corresponding precipitous decline. Data from the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost showed that in Fall 2021, 9.96% of UI faculty were on the instructional track. This figure is analogous to the percentage (9.77%) of fixed-term lecturers in Fall 2016. The percentage of tenure-track faculty members declined overall from 2016 to 2021, but this appears to be a continuation of a trend that began prior to the implementation of the instructional track. In FY 2000, tenured and tenure-track faculty accounted for 68.1% of all UI faculty. In FY 2010, tenured and tenure-track faculty accounted for 59.9% of all UI faculty. In FY 2022, tenured and tenure-track faculty accounted for 43.4% of all UI faculty.

Addressing the review's second required issue, the ITF policy's effect on the composition of Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, and charter and university committees, Professor Stapleton reminded the group that ITF Faculty Senate representation in each college is capped at 10% of the delegation, or one senator, whichever is greater. Only 18.62% of ITF survey respondents found this cap appropriate. One respondent commented that the cap implied that ITF are somehow less invested in the university than tenure-track faculty (TTF). Professor Stapleton noted that, since the creation of the instructional track, the number of TTF in the Faculty Senate and on Faculty Senate committees has remained relatively stable. In the fall of

2017 (the first year that ITF were eligible to serve on Senate), there were 62 TTF on Faculty Senate. In 2021, that number was 63. In both 2017 and 2021, there were 4 ITF on Faculty Senate. In 2017, the composition of Faculty Senate committees consisted of 45 TTF and 0 ITF. This year there are 48 TTF and 4 ITF on Faculty Senate committees. The review report finds that ITF are underrepresented in Faculty Senate. For example, this year the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences employs 202 ITF, 26.5% of regular track faculty, but only two senators from the College serve on the Senate. Of the total 78 Faculty Senators this year, only 4 (5.13%) are on the instructional track. Yet, ITF make up approximately 12% of all regular track faculty. Some colleges with ITF have no ITF representation on Faculty Senate. As for changes in charter and university committee membership, the number of TTF serving on these committees dropped from 88 in 2016 to 74 in 2022, while the number of ITF rose from 2 in 2016 to 13 in 2022.

The review committee makes several recommendations related to the first and second issues. The first of these is to improve ITF representation in the Faculty Senate by eliminating the 10% cap or by revising the policy to allow for Senate ITF representation to reflect the ITF population in the colleges. Second, although the policy currently makes a statement about the integration of ITF into the university mission, the committee recommends strengthening this language in order to integrate ITF more fully into the mission.

As mentioned earlier, the review committee addressed issues in addition to those required by the policy. Regarding titles and ranks, Professor Stapleton indicated that three concerns had been identified by the committee: current titles are not congruent with other tracks; clarity is desired to distinguish between *Associate Professor/Professor of Instruction* and *Associate Professor/Professor of Practice*; and the policy's reference to *established record of excellence beyond teaching in professional productivity and/or service* is unclear in the qualifications for the associate and professor in instruction ranks. The review committee therefore makes recommendations to change the *Lecturer* title to *Assistant Professor of Instruction/Practice* and to clarify the distinction between *Associate Professor/Professor of Instruction* and *Associate Professor/Professor of Practice* in both the *Definitions* and *Qualifications for specific ranks* sections. The committee also advocates for dropping the phrase *beyond teaching* from the qualifications criteria; both ITF survey respondents and interviewed deans expressed confusion about the meaning of this phrase.

Another issue explored by the review committee was length of term, Professor Stapleton continued. The committee found that ITF want more stability congruent with and reflective of their appointments at each level. And, almost a third of respondents disagreed that the current term lengths are appropriate. The ITF policy indicates that if someone is promoted, they could still end up with only a three-year appointment, regardless of rank. The committee recommends lengthening the appointment terms to reflect the title associated with each level of promotion. Thus, assistant professors would be given three-year appointments (currently these appointments are 1-3 years); associate professors, five-year appointments (currently 3-5 years); and professors, five- to seven-year appointments (currently 3-7 years). However, the recommendations do allow flexibility for colleges to give 1-3 year probationary appointments at all ranks at the initial hiring.

Professor Stapleton then turned to roles, noting that the contributions of ITF enhance university programs. ITF roles also complement the other tracks. However, while ITF fulfill an invaluable role as highly qualified and dedicated faculty members, their portfolios and instructional delivery models vary widely across campus and include, for example, developing innovative courses and outreach programs, overseeing labor-intensive laboratories, lecturing hundreds of students and mentoring teaching assistants, teaching intensive writing seminars that require input on multiple drafts, leading seminars, and producing textbooks. Many ITF have heavy teaching loads, up to 8 courses per academic year, and therefore find little time for service or professional productivity, mentioned in the policy. Survey respondents indicated that there is a confusing overlap between these two categories and that they are difficult to access, due to a limitation of opportunities, time, and/or funding. These factors can lead to frustration. The review committee recommends changing the language of the ITF policy preamble to reflect the valuable contributions of ITF, including by eliminating the reference to the primacy of the tenure track. The new language could stress the flexibility of the instructional track to meet the changing needs of the university's educational mission. Other recommendations call for revising the *Definition* and *Role of instructional faculty* sections to recognize different instructional models and to eliminate or revise confusing wording regarding service and research expectations.

Many ITF survey respondents had concerns about review and promotion, an issue next addressed by Professor Sheerin. These concerns have arisen primarily at the collegiate and departmental levels, so the review committee urges colleges and departments to review their own promotion policies and procedures. A university-wide procedure document also requires review, but was currently beyond the scope of the review committee's work. The final issue addressed by the review report was morale among ITF. Morale is low, Professor Sheerin indicated, and had been even before the pandemic. Citing responses from the survey, she noted that ITF feel that they are not getting the respect they deserve. A particularly relevant quote from a survey response was "Honor ITF for what they do." Professor Sheerin emphasized that ITF fulfill an important role at the university as professionals who dedicate their careers to teaching, which is a core mission of the university. The review committee is hopeful that the recommendations that they have made overall would help to improve morale among ITF and to recognize them for the important work that they do at UI. Professor Sheerin commented that if the instructional track is treated as "tenure-lite," then morale would remain low. But, if the track is treated as what it was meant to be, a teaching track, this will lead to increased morale. The review committee additionally recommends the establishment of an advisory board, a standing or ad hoc Faculty Senate committee, or a separate body of governance for ITF and other non-tenure-track faculty, to provide a forum for these faculty members' voices to be heard at the university and collegiate levels. Professor Sheerin expressed the review committee's view that investing in the careers of ITF would ensure a committed faculty, which in turn would build a stronger institution and further raise the quality of teaching at UI. In conclusion, she noted the review committee's acknowledgment that UI has been a leader in terms of creating a career path for ITF.

Professor Curto asked how difficult it might be to implement the recommendations in the report. President Marshall indicated that this would depend on the content of individual

recommendations. For example, changes to the Operations Manual could not be carried out by Faculty Senate alone. The process would involve the Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) working with members of the central administration on proposed policy revisions that could then be approved by the Senate and by administrators. The Faculty Senate could make changes to its own constitution and bylaws regarding faculty track representation, however. Professor Gillan added that, although the policy does not specify to whom the five-year report should be delivered, the University President should receive it, because the approval of the University President and of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa, would be required in order to make changes to the Operations Manual. He reiterated that, before getting to that stage, collaboration between the Faculty Senate, through the FPCC, and the Office of the Provost would be needed to develop policy revisions acceptable to both faculty and administrators.

Professor Carlson emphasized that the Faculty Senate can certainly make suggestions for and draft changes to the Operations Manual. He also commented that he did not feel prepared to vote on any of the report's recommendations today; he would need considerable time to review the report. Professor Carlson noted that the report had several times cited instances when the committee had found passages in the policy to be unclear. He wondered if policy language had deliberately been made ambiguous so that individual colleges could formulate collegiate policy as appropriate for their own circumstances. Therefore, he expressed wariness of revising the language to be more explicit. Perhaps clearer guidance could be found in collegiate policies. President Marshall concurred that the Faculty Senate has the ability to make recommendations for Operations Manual changes to administrators; she clarified that initial work on policy creation and revision would be carried out by the Senate's FPCC. Regarding a possible vote by the Senate on the report's recommendations, President Marshall reminded the group that the report presented today is still in an interim stage. A vote on recommendations in the final version of the report would likely take place in the fall. With respect to the confusion issue, Professor Sheerin responded that it was not just ITF who had found the policy language unclear, but deans, as well. While flexibility within the policy is indeed important in order for the policy to apply to all colleges, a greater degree of clarity is also necessary. There is a danger that a lack of clarity, for example surrounding the duties that ITF carry out "beyond teaching," could lead to the transformation of the instructional track into a "tenure-lite" track, which it is *not* supposed to be. Professor Stapleton agreed that flexibility is important for the instructional faculty track policy, but that greater clarity is still needed at several points in the policy. She noted that another point of confusion occurred in the policy's preamble, which emphasizes the central role of the tenure track at the university.

Professor Nisly commented that the creation of the clinical track about 20 years ago had been precipitated by new federal rules limiting the hours worked by medical residents, who until then had provided most patient care at the hospital. Faculty on the tenure track spent most of their time engaged in research, for which granting agencies required an 80% time commitment. Clinical-track faculty filled the need for physicians on-site to provide patient care. These clinician-educators have since become an integral part of the Carver College of Medicine. Like ITF, clinical-track faculty are capped in the Faculty Senate. Professor Nisly advocated for this cap to be reconsidered. President Marshall thanked senators for their feedback, which the committee can incorporate into the final report.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Sparkshop: Survey (Anna Flaming, Director, Center for Teaching and Bria Marcelo, Director, Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)*

Ms. Marcelo reminded the group that throughout the year, the Faculty Senate had participated in several Sparkshops. Topics had included alternative text, support for students under stress, resilience, and mentoring. For those new to the Senate, she indicated that the goal of the brief Sparkshops is to focus on application or action, as well as to connect Senators with resources. Dr. Flaming then requested that Senators respond to the following prompt: *Thinking about my individual DEI efforts and engagement with Sparkshops, I have _____*. After Senators submitted their responses, she requested that they respond to the next prompt: *In future Sparkshops, I would like to learn about _____*. Dr. Flaming thanked Senators for their responses. She and Ms. Marcelo planned to develop programming for next year based on the feedback gathered here today. President Marshall thanked Ms. Marcelo and Dr. Flaming for conducting this year's series of Sparkshops.

IV. From the Floor – On behalf of Professor Glass, President of the UI Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), President Marshall announced that the UI Chapter of the AAUP has invited Henry Reichman, author of *The Future of Academic Freedom* and *Understanding Academic Freedom*, to speak on *Academic Freedom and the First Amendment* on campus on April 30. The Faculty Senate officers are co-sponsoring the talk. President Wilson has agreed to offer comments at this event, as well.

Professor Joseph moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Marshall:

WHEREAS the University of Iowa faculty are members of a community that values and benefits from dedicated, skillful, and collaborative leadership; and

WHEREAS President Teresa Marshall has been an exceptional leader, serving tirelessly and with unwavering commitment in her role as Faculty Senate Secretary, Vice President, and President; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has led the Faculty Senate during a year of continuing challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic, working to ensure that faculty concerns about campus health and safety protocols were shared with the university's central administration; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has successfully collaborated with the committee charged with conducting the five-year review of the university's Instructional Track Faculty Policy; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has advocated carefully, thoughtfully, and strongly for faculty rights and values when the university's central administration has proposed changes to policies affecting faculty; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has championed adequate faculty representation on all executive search committees, including in the searches for University General Counsel, Vice President for Medical Affairs, and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has brought constant positive energy and an optimistic attitude to the Faculty Senate's activities; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has been a role model in setting a tone of civility and inclusivity while also showing courage and tenacity in offering different perspectives and ensuring that all sides of every issue are considered; and

WHEREAS President Marshall has dedicated her energy, skill, and expertise to protecting shared governance, which sustains the lifeblood of the university;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that We the Senate express our most profound gratitude to President Marshall for her honorable and collaborative leadership and service to us all.

Secretary Lehan Mackin seconded that the resolution be approved. The resolution was unanimously approved via applause.

V. Announcements

- Recognition of Positive Student Participation on Shared Governance Committees (Teresa Marshall)

President Marshall thanked the presidents of the Undergraduate Student Government (Regan Smock) and of the Graduate and Professional Student Government (Moala Bannavti) as well as the president of Staff Council, Kevin Zihlman, for their collaborative engagement this year. The leadership of the four shared governance groups met monthly throughout the academic year.

- Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence (Teresa Marshall)

President Marshall announced the recipients of the 2022 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Benjamin Coelho (Music), Russell Ganim (French and Italian), and Katherine Imborek (Family Medicine).

- Concluding Remarks of the 2021-22 Faculty Senate President Teresa Marshall

President Marshall began her remarks by thanking ‘her’ Councilors and ‘her’ Senators – those who had navigated the past year’s shared governance journey with her and her fellow officers. She commented that she had fully appreciated the frank conversations Councilors and Senators had engaged in and their support in the face of multiple challenges including: in-person teaching without mask or vaccine mandates and continued healthcare challenges in the midst of the Delta and Omicron Covid waves; discussion of proposed changes to the Operations Manual impacting faculty dispute and track policies; external and internal questioning of the necessity and value of academic freedom and free speech; and the report of the Instructional Track Review Committee.

Secondly, President Marshall thanked faculty members who have served on Senate, Charter, non-Charter, and ad-hoc committees on behalf of Faculty Senate. These Committee members lend a faculty perspective to numerous campus initiatives, she noted. Third, she thanked her fellow Faculty Senate officers for their wisdom and individual perspectives. Vice President Rodríguez-Rodríguez’s humanities, Secretary Lehan Mackin’s health care, and Past President Yockey’s legal voices have enriched our conversations resulting in deeper thinking to inform our arguments when advocating for faculty. She also thanked Laura Zaper, the Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist, for her organizational skills and institutional memory. During the past two years, she has acquired pandemic and Zoom skillsets to extend that institutional memory.

President Marshall continued, noting that in July, we had welcomed the 22nd President of the University of Iowa, Barbara Wilson, and in February we had celebrated the 175th anniversary of the University of Iowa. As a communications scholar and experienced higher education administrator, President Wilson is well prepared to lead the University as we embark on the next 175 years. We – as Faculty Senators – have a responsibility to engage with President Wilson and her full administrative team to inform decisions impacting faculty and supporting the mission of the University of Iowa...that is the expectation of shared governance. During the past two years, the University of Iowa as well as other institutions of higher education, have been challenged by the pandemic, racial unrest, political polarization, and more recently the war in Ukraine, all of which have the potential to undermine higher education and the University of Iowa. The acceptance of ‘alternative facts,’ disregard for critical thinking, and devaluation of expertise are threats to the mission of the University of Iowa, that is, threats to our ability to educate our students, to create and translate knowledge, and to serve our communities.

Academic tenure – the granting of appointment security to enable expression of divergent viewpoints or new ideas and enable the exploration of novel and/or cutting-edge science – is essential for faculty to advance the university’s mission and must be protected from those seeking to undermine higher education, President Marshall declared. Tenured faculty have significant freedom to voice concerns and inform decisions. This freedom carries a responsibility to support our non-tenured faculty peers – the clinical, instructional and research track faculty, particularly those who are more junior and from under-represented minorities. Faculty within all tracks have similar training and hold terminal degrees in their respective fields. How we choose to use our training to research, provide patient care, or teach might differ. Regardless, the different faculty tracks complement each other, and all are necessary to support the mission of the university. For students to receive an equitable education and patients to receive equitable care, all faculty must have the academic freedom to present their discipline content in a contextually relevant setting to support critical thinking and informed consent. As Senators engaged in shared governance, we must continue to advocate for tenure, academic freedom and free speech, fair and equitable faculty policies, and living salaries for faculty in all tracks. Much work lies ahead.

President Marshall thanked the 35 outgoing Senators for their service. She welcomed the incoming Senators and wished Vice President Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez the best as she begins her term as President of the University of Iowa’s Faculty Senate. We are in good hands, she concluded.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Kitchen moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Marshall adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.

FACULTY SENATE
2022-23 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 26, 2022
4:45 – 5:15 pm
Zoom

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez called the meeting to order at 4:55 pm.

II. Opening Remarks of the 2022-23 Faculty Senate President Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez
President Rodríguez-Rodríguez welcomed Senators to the opening meeting of the 2022-23 Faculty Senate. She extended a special welcome to the new Senators, with all her gratitude for willing to be part of this important shared governance body.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that she is honored and humbled to be Faculty Senate President this year, and that she looks forward to helping faculty and the University in their teaching and research mission. Hopefully this will be the year that the Covid pandemic will finally be behind us, and we will be able to focus fully on getting back to work without all the extra worries that have been with us for the last two years. She noted, however, that she cannot help but remember all the sacrifices we have made, all the loss we have experienced, the fear, the incredible stress, the feeling of despair that so many times have made faculty work so hard for months and months. Some of us have even lost people dear to us and have not been able to travel and say goodbye to them. Even if the worst is over, we need to remember that it will take some time to feel at ease again and to fully repair the damage the pandemic has caused on campus, in our wider communities, and in the world at large. But we are in the best place to do it, a university, where knowledge and education are promoted, celebrated and disseminated.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez continued, recalling that more than 30 years ago in Spain, a teacher in high school told her something that would change her life and that now almost sounds like a prophecy. The teacher told her that education could open all doors, smash all obstacles, it would take her to places she didn't even know existed, would allow her to talk to people whose languages were still mysterious to her at the time, people with careers and lives she had never heard of. She was 15 years old at the time, her parents had never even finished elementary school, and college was a dream that seemed almost impossible with her family's very limited resources. But her teacher was right, education opened the doors to many scholarships throughout the years, including the one that brought her to the US to pursue her graduate education right after finishing college at 22 years old. It allowed her to meet wonderful people who helped her advance her career, it provided an opportunity for her to learn English, and it paved the way for her to become the mom of her two US-born children. In sum, education certainly opened the door to many wonderful things that were not in the original plans life seemed to have for her. That is why she is and would always be a passionate defender of education, of learning, of the ability to change your life, to re-invent yourself and move forward with the help of new knowledge and amazing mentors who guide and inspire you.

Her main goal this year, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez indicated, would be to help us overcome all the loss, the damage, the frustrations and the disappointments we have all recently experienced. She is especially concerned about the decrease in morale among faculty, and one of her priorities this year would be finding ways to change this situation and work with administration to develop solutions to improve morale. It has not been easy for our students either, and we need to pay attention to how they are doing, she added. Mental health issues have exponentially increased during this time among our students, and that is something we cannot ignore or dismiss. It is her strong belief that student issues and faculty issues cannot be addressed separately because our work as faculty is mainly and mostly helping undergraduate and graduate students find their own path towards a successful life. The skills and the knowledge they gain at the University of Iowa will be tools that will assist them when they work, travel, create families and communities, and become relevant members of our global society. She indicated that she would be in permanent conversation with our graduate and undergraduate shared governance leaders, who would help us understand their challenges while we work on our own. Working as a team would be beneficial to all of us.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez would also strive to defend the relevance of all the disciplines at the University – the sciences, the humanities, the arts, as well as our professional schools. And she would always defend the pivotal role of policies that promote diversity, equity and inclusion on campus. She understands diversity as something that is embedded in everything we do, not as an add on to our mission. Diversity work should guide everything we do, and should be everyone's shared responsibility. Her own work revolves around these issues, and she would advocate for expanding cultural competence and multiculturalism, strengthening connections across diverse cultures throughout our campus, our state, our nation and the world. We need to promote policies that encourage participation in cross-cultural projects and experiences, the study of world cultures, and exposure to diverse cultural perspectives, both domestic and international.

Indicating that she is convinced that next year will be a paradigm-changer for the university in a variety of ways, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that next year would put us in the position to reflect on the role of faculty in creating a new reality that right now we cannot even fully imagine. Soon we will have a new Strategic Plan, and it will be exciting to have the opportunity to collaborate with President Wilson, Provost Kregel and the rest of the administrative team in the development of ideas and programs that spring from the Strategic Plan. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez is a big believer in the power of dialogue, collaboration and conversation even when it seems almost impossible to come to an agreement and work as a team. Dialogue, flexibility, collaboration, transparency and lots of forward-looking thinking would be essential as we navigate the months and years ahead of us. As Senate President, she would work to respond to these challenges with professionalism, always defending the indispensable role of shared governance at the University of Iowa.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez thanked last year's Faculty Senate officers for everything they have done for our faculty, and for everything she has personally learned from them. Joe Yockey is one of the smartest people she has known and his wisdom, wit, and kindness will be hugely missed. He has been a powerful influence in her growth as a faculty member and as a person, and she feels honored to have had the opportunity to work with him. She considers him

a very dear friend. Teresa Marshall has navigated very difficult situations this past year and she has done so tirelessly and with great patience and grace. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez has learned a lot from Teresa, and she is extremely thankful for all of Teresa's tremendous support at all levels. She looks forward to continuing to work with Teresa one more year. Her advice will be extremely helpful, as always. Melissa Lehan Mackin's passion and strong voice have been truly inspirational. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez hopes that their paths cross again because it has been a pleasure working with her this past year. Finally, she cannot emphasize enough the essential work that Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist Laura Zaper does every single day. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that she does not exaggerate when she says that Laura's deep knowledge of Faculty Senate, and of the university in general, is what really keeps the officers going and they would be lost without her.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez looks forward to the coming year and to the opportunity to keep advancing our great institution, the University of Iowa, with the help of this year's Faculty Senate officers and all Senators. She told Senators not to hesitate to communicate with her about any issues that they or their colleagues feel are worthy of attention. And she told them not to be surprised if she contacts them directly to learn about their college, their department, or their take on relevant issues on campus. She cannot wait to work together and she thanks Senators in advance for their confidence.

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

IV. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Officer elections were held online prior to the meeting, because the virtual format would not allow for the paper ballots traditionally used at Senate meetings. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez thanked Professor Colvin, chair of the Faculty Senate Election Committee, for the committee's work this year. As a former Faculty Senate President, Professor Colvin thanked all Senators for their commitment to faculty governance. It is as important now more than ever before, she commented. She then announced that the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Ed Gillan and that the new Secretary is Caroline Sheerin. She asked Senators to join her in thanking them for their service on our behalf. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2022-23 Meeting Schedule – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded Senators that the meeting schedule for 2022-23 was sent to them earlier. Next month, they will receive Outlook invitations to the meetings.

V. Adjournment – Professor Kitchen moved and Professor Sosale seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.