

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 13, 2022
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: B. An, D. Anderson, B. Ayati, A. Brian, M. Cantrell, J. Carlson, M. Charlton, C. Cherwin, M. Coleman, R. Cox, R. Curto, A. Estapa, A. Farag, S. Ganesan, B. Greteman, N. Greyser, C. Grueter, J. Halekas, B. Janssen, A. Jaynes, L. Joseph, A. Kalnins, J. Kayle, A. Kitchen, J. Kline, M. Landsman, D. Langbehn, A. Lesch, B. Li, V. Lira, T. Mangum, S. Martini, C. McMillan, M. McQuistan, A. Panos, K. Parker, G. Pierce, C. Pinnaro, M. Pizzimenti, A. Prince, J. Sa-Aadu, D. Santillan, Y. Shi, A. Shibli-Rahhal, A. Strathman, C. Swanson, C. Turvey, T. Wadas, E. Welder.
- Officers Present: E. Gillan, T. Marshall, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Sheerin.
- Senators Excused: N. Brogden, M. Carvour, L. Durairaj, E. Hill, D. Macfarlane, M. Santillan, S. Young.
- Senators Absent: M. Abou Alaiwa, J. Achrazoglou, K. Ait-Aissa, M. Bhatti, H. Dybevik, P. Gilbert, J. Gutierrez, N. Handoo, H. Mehdi, J. Murry, P. Nau, P. Polgreen, Y. Sato, A. Vikram, L. Zingman, M. Zmolek.
- Guests: A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); M. Fletcher (University Counseling Service); L. Geist (Office of the Provost); B. Marcelo (Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion); M. Rasmussen (Emeritus Faculty Council); A. Stapleton (Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. She observed that the Faculty Senate had finally returned to meeting in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol after two years of meeting virtually because of the pandemic.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Pizzimenti moved and Professor Panos seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 26, 2022) – Professor Janssen moved and Professor Langbehn seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Committee Appointments (Ed Gillan, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Brian moved and Professor Strathman seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *The full list of appointments is appended to these minutes.*

III. New Business

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

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez explained that an interim version of this report had been presented to the Council and the Senate in the spring by the co-chairs, who had returned today to present the final version of the report. They had presented the final version to the Faculty Council on August 30. She indicated that, following the presentation, the Senate would be asked to vote to acknowledge receipt of the report, thank the review committee members for their extensive work, and allow the Faculty Senate officers to explore potential next steps. She added that this vote would not imply an endorsement of or commitment to the report's recommendations. Secretary Sheerin began the presentation, noting that only minor changes have been made to the report since the spring. She displayed a list of the review committee members, who came from a variety of tracks and colleges, thus contributing a broad range of viewpoints to the committee's deliberations.

The instructional-track faculty policy provided for a review five years after implementation, Secretary Sheerin explained. Three charges to the review committee were embedded in the policy; the review was to examine the *effect of this policy on the number of tenure-track, tenured, clinical, and adjunct faculty relative to instructional-track faculty at the University and in individual colleges; the effect of this policy on the composition of Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, and University committees; and the instructional faculty dispute procedures in Operations Manual III.10.11h*. Additional areas of review were identified by the committee: *titles and ranks, length of term, roles, review and promotion, and morale*.

The first set of report recommendations that Secretary Sheerin presented was concerned with the instructional-track faculty (ITF) policy's dispute resolution procedures. [The instructional track is covered by dispute resolution procedures that are exclusive to its track and are included in the ITF policy; the tenure, clinical, and research track are covered by a separate set of dispute resolution procedures.] The review committee advocated for a longer period of notice for non-renewal of contracts: three months for probationary faculty and six months for all other faculty. Only Associate Professors of Practice/Instruction and Professors of Practice/Instruction have access to a peer review panel; the committee advocated for all ITF, except those in a probationary period, to have access to a peer review panel, rather than the administrative review procedures currently in place. The current timing of the review process allows for a longer initiation and response period for the university than for the grievant. The committee recommended that the initiation and response period for both be equal at 20 days. Lastly, the review committee recommended that the process of forming the peer review panel be clarified and that those appointed to the panel be familiar with ITF.

Continuing the presentation, Professor Stapleton first thanked last year's Faculty Senate officers, especially current Past President Teresa Marshall, for their encouragement and support. She also thanked Laura Zaper, from the Faculty Senate Office, and Deb Tiemens, from the Office of the Provost, for providing information and data. Turning to the effect of the

establishment of the instructional track on tenured and other faculty, Professor Stapleton indicated that data suggested that the establishment of the instructional track did not negatively impact hiring and retention for the tenure track. She displayed a graph illustrating that most ITF shifted to this track from fixed-term lecturer appointments. Further proof of this change could be found in a chart showing that 9.77% of all faculty were fixed-term lecturers in 2016, while 9.96% of all faculty were ITF in 2021. In 2021, the percentage of faculty who were fixed-term lecturers had fallen to 0.18%. Professor Stapleton noted that while the percentage of faculty on the tenure track did indeed decline between 2016 and 2021, this is the continuation of a downward trend that existed before the creation of the instructional track. Professor Stapleton further explained that the policy currently limits ITF representation in the Faculty Senate to 10% of the collegiate delegation or one senator, whichever is greater. Survey results indicated that the majority of ITF found this cap inappropriate. The current cap has created a situation in which ITF are severely underrepresented in proportion to their percentages in several colleges. Meanwhile, the numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty on the Faculty Senate and on charter, university, and Senate committees has remained stable. Thus, the review committee recommended that the 10% cap be eliminated or that it be adjusted to reflect the percentage of ITF in each college. The review committee also advocated for strengthening policy language to integrate ITF more fully into the university mission. These recommendations would allow for proportionate representation of ITF from different colleges in the Senate and would more broadly support the objective stated in the policy (10.11.j.) *to integrate instructional faculty into faculty governance, to stimulate innovation and collaboration in their teaching and other endeavors, to promote diversity and inclusion among their ranks and to protect their academic freedom.*

Moving on to *titles and ranks*, Professor Stapleton noted that ITF titles are not congruent with titles for other ranks. Also, definitions and qualifications listed in the current policy cause confusion, especially when trying to distinguish between *Professor of Instruction* and *Professor of Practice*. To address these two concerns, the review committee recommended changing the title of *Lecturer* to *Assistant Professor of Instruction/Practice* and to clarify the distinction between *Professor of Instruction* and *Professor of Practice*. Regarding *length of term*, ITF would like to have longer contract term lengths and more stability in their appointments. Currently, an ITF can be promoted to any level yet still receive only a three-year contract. The review committee recommended lengthening contract terms to reflect the title associated with each level of promotion: three-year appointments at the assistant level, five-year appointments at the associate level, and five- to seven-year appointments at the professor level. Exceptions would be allowed for the probationary period.

Continuing on to *roles*, Professor Stapleton noted the report's recognition that, while ITF fill invaluable roles at UI, portfolios and instructional delivery models vary widely across colleges. Additionally, ITF with heavy teaching loads (eight courses per year is not uncommon) find little time for service or professional productivity. Moreover, these two categories overlap and create confusion. Service and professional productivity are also difficult to access because of limitations in opportunity, time, and funding. The committee recommended that the policy preamble's language be changed to reflect the valuable contributions of ITF, that the sections on

Definitions and *Role* be revised to avoid confusion about service expectations, and that policy wording about research expectations be clarified or eliminated to avoid confusion.

Secretary Sheerin addressed the issue of *review and promotion*, explaining that, because ITF promotion policies and procedures vary across colleges, the review committee did not provide recommendations, but urged colleges and departments to examine their policies and procedures to make sure that they are compliant with university requirements. As for *morale*, Secretary Sheerin emphasized that survey responses indicated that ITF are demoralized and had been even before the pandemic. She commented that implementation of the report recommendations would serve to boost morale, as would offering funding opportunities for ITF. Also, the establishment of an advisory board or separate governance body for ITF and other non-tenure-track faculty would give these faculty members a greater opportunity to be heard.

Professor Curto asked how the review committee decided upon a recommended longer time period (three months for probationary faculty and six months for all other faculty) for notice of non-renewal of contracts. Secretary Sheerin explained that the review committee studied survey responses on this topic and then formulated what they believed to be realistic time periods, based on the unique challenges of the academic job market, as well as administrators' need for flexibility. Professor Stapleton added that the review committee also examined what was available to the other tracks, for both notice periods and contract lengths. Professor Mangum thanked the review committee for a very thorough report. She asked if ITF could choose not to go up for promotion. Secretary Sheerin responded that ITF are not required to do so; they can stay in any rank indefinitely. Professor Anderson also commended the review committee for their excellent report. She asked what the next steps would be now that the report has been completed. Secretary Sheerin indicated that the review committee's work is done and that it will be the task of other offices and entities to examine and perhaps implement the recommendations. For example, the Senate could take up the issue of raising the caps on ITF representation. Operations Manual changes, however, would require Senate collaboration with administrators. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez expressed the Senate's appreciation of the review committee's work. She explained that, now, in-depth discussion of the recommendations will take place among the Senate officers and then among the members of the Faculty Council. The process of implementing the recommendations, if the decision is made to do so, would likely extend into next year.

Professor Langbehn moved and Professor Panos seconded that the Faculty Senate acknowledge receipt of the report of the Instructional Faculty Policy Review Committee, thank the review committee members for their extensive work, and allow the Faculty Senate officers to explore potential next steps. The motion carried unanimously.

Senators gave the review committee members a round of applause in recognition of their work.

- *Presentation on Faculty Council and Faculty Senate (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez gave a brief overview of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council, for the benefit of the numerous new Senators. She explained that the approximately 80 members of the Faculty Senate are elected from all of the colleges. The Senate is the

representative and deliberative organization of the UI faculty and serves as the principal channel of communication between the faculty and the central administration. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez continued, explaining that the Faculty Council, comprised of approximately 20 members elected from the Senate, is the administrative agency of the Senate. Council meetings are in addition to the Senate meetings and usually take place 2-3 weeks before Senate meetings. Because of its smaller size, the Council is a good venue for more in-depth discussions of current issues. During the week prior to the start of classes, the Council hosts a retreat with central administrators and deans to discuss issues of mutual importance.

Aside from running the Council and Senate meetings, the Faculty Senate President, along with the other officers, participates in numerous meetings with central administrators and with other shared governance leaders. The officers also attend the meetings of several Senate committees as ex-officio members. The Faculty Senate President and Vice President are invited to attend meetings of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Other invitations to the officers often arise, such as to meet with candidates for central administrative positions, to participate in conversations about a variety of current university issues, and to speak with faculty members who wish to raise concerns. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez then displayed lists of Faculty Senate, Charter, and Non-Charter Committees. The activities of all these committees [are described](#) on the Faculty Senate website. An online committee membership recruitment drive takes place early in the spring semester. Other committees arise on an ad hoc basis. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez encouraged Senators to increase their involvement in shared governance through participation in any of these committees.

- *Michael Fletcher, Director, University Counseling Service*

Prior to introducing Dr. Fletcher, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez noted that the focus of this year's Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat was *Academic Emergence and Growth From a Time of Crisis*. After a keynote speech from President Wilson, five panel discussions took place on the themes of *Promotion, Tenure, Retention; Students' Experiences and Thoughts Moving Forward; Mental Health; Reducing Inequities As We Move Forward: Women, Faculty of Color, International Issues*; and *The Future of Online Instruction at the University of Iowa*. The panels brought forward new concerns and made existing concerns more visible. The retreat offered an opportunity to reflect on the past two years and generate ideas for success as we move forward after the pandemic. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez would like for the Council and Senate to maintain a focus on the concerns addressed at the retreat, beginning with mental health. She noted that holistic well-being and success for all members of the university community was also a goal of the new strategic plan. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez then introduced Dr. Michael Fletcher, who was appointed Director of the University Counseling Service on July 11.

Dr. Fletcher began his presentation by displaying a list of resources for faculty to help students manage their mental health. Although the mental health services available at the University Counseling Service (UCS) are confidential, Dr. Fletcher explained, it is still possible for faculty to contact the UCS for consultation in dealing with student mental health issues. UCS staff can discuss in general terms resources available for a student about whom a faculty member has a mental health-related concern. Students also benefit from seeing faculty

members who are concerned enough about them to reach out to UCS. Training is another resource that UCS can provide to faculty and staff. Faculty and staff are not expected to become mental health counselors, Dr. Fletcher pointed out, but they can learn some basic approaches, such as learning to recognize students in distress. They are also encouraged to personally escort to UCS a student who may be hesitant or fearful to go alone. Dr. Fletcher indicated that UCS can partner with campus units to host workshops, conduct needs assessments, and provide support space and programming. UCS also offers resources for responding after a tragedy. UCS supports and collaborates with the Employee Assistance Program, as well. Dr. Fletcher urged faculty members to be more mindful of potential student mental health issues when preparing for the classroom and for office hours. He noted, for example, that some faculty members have begun including information about campus mental health resources on their syllabi.

Dr. Fletcher then discussed strategies for managing one's own mental health. He observed that we cannot hire our way out of mental health challenges; there will never be enough campus counselors to address all of the mental health needs on campus. Instead, UCS can partner with other units on campus to increase access to a variety of resources and training. Among strategies for managing one's mental health, Dr. Fletcher highlighted *self-compassion*. One component of self-compassion is being kind to oneself. Often, we are just too busy to be kind to ourselves. Another component is recognizing our common humanity, which causes us to offer grace to ourselves and to other people. This leads to moments of connection with others, blunting the feelings of isolation that can contribute to mental health issues. The third component, mindfulness, allows us to live in the moment, recognizing and acknowledging what we are feeling, without becoming self-critical. Dr. Fletcher emphasized that we must be well ourselves in order to help others; therefore, we must take care of ourselves first. Self-compassion will make us happier, less stressed and more resilient.

Concluding his remarks, Dr. Fletcher displayed a slide illustrating the structure of UCS. He noted that, in addition to the main UCS locations in Westlawn and the University Capitol Centre, there are UCS locations embedded in the colleges of Business, Dentistry, and Law, along with University Housing and Dining. Professor Joseph praised Dr. Fletcher's presentation on self-compassion as useful and practical. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez asked for more information about training available to faculty. Dr. Fletcher indicated that units could reach out to UCS for workshops on a topic of their choice. A senator asked what lingering issues from the pandemic that he had observed. He commented that everyone has responded to the pandemic in their own ways. If you suspect that someone is struggling, it is best to ask that person what kind of help, if any, that they need.

- *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Short Presentation: General Introduction (Anna Flaming, Director, Center for Teaching and Brianna Marcelo, Director, Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives, Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez explained that a few years ago, the Senate had begun hosting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) short presentations to enhance our understanding of this topic and to learn DEI strategies to implement in our classrooms. She quoted Executive Officer and Associate Vice President of the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Liz Tovar, writing in the September 2022 Division newsletter: "Our university is a community of diverse

perspectives, and these perspectives are what make us strong. Meeting new people can be reinvigorating but can also lead to challenging conversations. These conversations are what make us better people. Respecting our differences is how we grow. These differences help us understand issues from another viewpoint and expand our thinking.” President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that she couldn’t agree more with this statement. By hosting these DEI short presentations, the Faculty Senate is participating in the university’s efforts to promote learning about DEI issues and to participate in DEI-related conversations, even if those conversations are sometimes difficult.

Dr. Flaming began the presentation by indicating that the Sparkshop series has several goals: exploring quick skills and techniques around relevant DEI-related topics, increasing connection and exposure to larger initiatives across campus, and building confidence around inclusive and equitable practices. The presentations are structured around a *what/so what/now what* framework. The *what* asks *what is the issue, challenge, or need to explore?* The *so what* asks *what could be some pitfalls, unintended consequences or impacts if not addressed?* The *now what* asks *what is the first step? What resources or skills do I need to address this issue, challenge, or need?* Ms. Marcelo presented an example of the use of this framework in a Sparkshop session. Last year, *Practicing Pronouns* was the topic of a session. The *what* was *misgendering of students and colleagues*. The *so what*, or the consequences of this action on the person(s) involved, was *lack of a sense of belonging, a negative learning environment, isolation, and misrepresentation of your values*. The *now what* consisted of thinking about the classroom environment you wished to create and suggesting changes such as inserting a statement about pronouns in the syllabus or including pronouns in your email signature. Or, on a more personal level, suggestions were made regarding what to do if you have misgendered someone.

The purpose of today’s presentation, Ms. Marcelo indicated, was to gather feedback from this year’s Senators about topics they would like to see addressed in future Sparkshop presentations. Senators were given a form to fill out, listing a variety of potential topics. Senators were encouraged to add a topic in which they were interested if it was not listed.

Dr. Flaming then briefly described some upcoming DEI-related offerings from the Center for Teaching. There will be a campus-wide twenty-minute Sparkshop on the topic of *Fostering a Sense of Belonging in Your Class*. Two lunchtime sessions on *Building an Inclusive and Effective Teaching Team* and *Mentoring for Teaching Across Difference* are scheduled. An asynchronous workshop on *Transparent Course Design – Fostering Students’ Belonging* is under development. An inclusive teaching reading group will be focusing on the book, [What Inclusive Instructors Do](#). And, free, voluntary, and confidential one-on-one consultations on any teaching-related topic are always available. Information about all of these events can be found [here](#).

Ms. Marcelo indicated that the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and the Center for Teaching are hosting a social justice reading group comprised of faculty members and graduate students. The group meets virtually on the second Thursday of the month, 12:00-1:00 pm. This semester they are reading a series of publications focused on accessibility and

accommodations. In the spring they will focus on free speech. Next week, the two units will present a course on *Equitable and Inclusive Pedagogy in the Classroom*, as part of the BUILD series (*Building University of Iowa Leadership for Diversity*). Ms. Marcelo then mentioned selected events and opportunities for the fall semester presented by the Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion's [Inclusive Education and Strategic Initiatives office](#). These included the BUILD Certificate Program, the LGBTQ Safe Zone Project, and the National Coalition Building Institute. The office sponsors the Diversity Seed Grant and Diversity Catalyst awards. Training on search practices to advance DEI is also available, as are one-on-one coaching sessions on various aspects of DEI.

A senator commented that, at his college, there has been some focused and pointed pushback against DEI initiatives. He asked if this had happened at other units within the university and if there were suggestions regarding how to deal with this. Ms. Marcelo responded that, if the pushback is coming from a fundamental disagreement with the goals of DEI efforts, then there are resources available to counter it. She added that it is possible that the pushback is not intentional, but simply a response to increased workload. Another senator thanked Dr. Flaming and Ms. Marcelo for their work.

- *President's Report (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez indicated that she and other representatives from the shared governance groups participated in the interviews of the candidates for the position of Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine.

After a long pause due to the pandemic, the [central administrative reviews](#) required by the Operations Manual will resume, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez indicated. The first to take place will be the review of the Office of the Vice President for Research. Past President Marshall will chair the review committee. These reviews serve two purposes, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez explained, quoting the Operations Manual: *1) to provide an occasion for central administration officers to evaluate their programs and sub-units and, in return, to explain the roles, functions, procedures, and activities of their offices and officers to the faculty; and 2) to permit a systematic faculty evaluation of these offices and officers aimed at making recommendations for improvements in administrative structure and/or performance.*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded the group that last spring the Senate had approved the proposed tracked and conceptual changes to the charge of the University Libraries Committee, with the understanding that a final version of the charge would be shared with the Senate in the fall. That final version was included in the packet of today's meeting materials. The revised charge will now be sent to the Provost and President for approval.

The final item of the President's Report was an announcement that Faculty Senate and Staff Council were collaborating on a Fall Candidate Forum for contested state races in Johnson County. The forum is scheduled for Thursday, October 6, at 6:00 pm in the Iowa Theatre in the Iowa Memorial Union. More information will be provided as we get closer to the date.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 11, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 25, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

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

Appendix

Committee Appointments

Faculty Senate Committees

Carolyn Colvin (Teaching & Learning) to fill a vacancy on the Committee on Elections, 2022-23

Anita Jung (Art & Art History) to fill a vacancy on the Committee on Elections, 2022-25

Lori Adams (Biology) to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, 2022-25

Kay Hegarty (Accounting) to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, 2022-25

Umang Gupta (Pediatrics) to the Governmental Relations Committee, 2022-25

Marcelo Correia (Internal Medicine) to the Governmental Relations Committee, 2022-25

Caroline Sheerin (Law) to fill a vacancy on the Rules and Bylaws Committee, 2022-25

Richard Fumerton (Philosophy) to fill a vacancy on the Rules and Bylaws Committee, 2022-25

Brandi Janssen (Occupational & Environmental Health) to fill a vacancy on the Rules and Bylaws Committee, 2022-25

Charter Committees

Scott Spak (School of Planning & Public Affairs) to fill the unexpired term of Leonel Vasquez (Radiology) on the Campus Planning Committee, 2022-24

Theresa Bechtel (Nursing) to fill a vacancy on the Sustainability Charter Committee, 2022-25

Damani Phillips (Music) to fill the unexpired term of Leonel Vasquez (Radiology) on the Hancher Auditorium Advisory Committee, 2022-23

Micah Bateman (School of Library and Information Science) to fill the unexpired term of Fatima Toor (Electrical & Computer Engineering) on the Information Technology Advisory Committee, 2022-25

Non-Charter and University Committees

Todd Pettys (Law) to fill the unexpired term of Ain Grooms (Educational Policy & Leadership Studies) on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2022-26

Meenakshi Sambharia (Internal Medicine) to fill the unexpired term of Sohit Kanotra (Otolaryngology) on the Conflict of Interest in Employment Committee, 2022-23

Erin Nelson (Management & Entrepreneurship) to fill the unexpired term of Aisha David (Family Medicine) on the Non-Resident Classification Review Committee, 2022-23

Faculty Council

Amber Brian (Spanish & Portuguese) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2022

Faculty Senate

Emilie Destruel (French & Italian) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2022

Vitor Lira (Health & Human Physiology) to fill the unexpired term of Sara Mason (Chemistry) on the Faculty Senate, 2022-25

Donald Macfarlane (Internal Medicine) to fill a vacancy on the Faculty Senate, 2022-25

Amy Lesch (Pediatric Dentistry) to fill the unexpired term of Ain Grooms (Educational Policy & Leadership Studies) on the Faculty Senate, 2022-23