

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 30, 2024
3:30 – 4:30 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: M. Abou Alaiwa, A. Achenbach, J. Bunch, M. Carvour, C. Chan, M. Coleman, R. Curto, R. Curtu, E. Destruel, L. Durairaj, A. Estapa, J. Fiegel, C. Fox, S. Ganesan, A. Goedken, B. Greteman, P. Groves, C. Grueter, A. Guernsey, C. Hamann, N. Handoo, A. Jabbari, C. Just, A. Kalnins, J. Kline, J. Koch, M. Landsman, A. Lesch, T. Mangum, M. McQuistan, H. Mehdi, B. Nottingham-Spencer, M. Pizzimenti, T. Rietz, R. Sakoda, M. Schroeder, D. Shane, Y. Shi, F. Solt, M. Swee, E. Thomas, C. Vogel, T. Wadas, M. Wald, E. Welder, K. Whitaker, F. Williams, K. Worthington.
- Officers Present: M. Charlton, E. Gillan, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Sheerin.
- Senators Excused: L. Adams, D. Anderson, B. Ayati, E. Carlisle, A. Farag, N. Greyser, C. Pinnaro, D. Santillan, M. Santillan, A. Shibli-Rahhal.
- Senators Absent: S. Abuhammoud, B. An, D. Axelrod, C. Benson, M. Berg, R. Cox, H. Dybevik, P. Ferguson, P. Gilbert, J. Gutierrez, D. Langbehn, B. Li, V. Lira, S. Martini, C. McMillan, P. Nau, J. Nepola, K. Parker, J. Sa-Aadu, C. Turvey, A. Vikram, S. Young, L. Zingman.
- Guests: S. Ashida (Election Committee); J. Charlson (*Daily Iowan*); D. Cuning (Philosophy); A. Flaming (Center for Teaching); B. Gage (Enrollment Management); T. Marshall (College of Dentistry); A. Messinger (Graduate TA); S. Reddy (*Daily Iowan*); J. Singer (Graduate TA); S. Vigmostad (Election Committee); L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).
- I. Call to Order – President Gillan called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Just moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 26, 2024) – Professor Mangum moved and Professor Pizzimenti seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Ed Gillan) – Professor Fox moved and Professor Koch seconded that the 2024 election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- D. 2024-25 Committee Recommendations (Caroline Sheerin, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Sheerin presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university, and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2024-25 academic year. Professor Just moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the 2024-25 committee appointment recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2022-23 Motion Summary (Caroline Sheerin) – Vice President Sheerin presented the 2022-23 motion summary. This document describes the subsequent impact of substantive motions approved by the Senate. Professor Koch moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the motion summary be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- *Office of the Vice President for Research Review Committee Report (Teresa Marshall, Chair, OVPR Review Committee)*

Professor Marshall began her presentation by noting that the following faculty members had served on the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) review committee: Rodica Curtu (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Amany Farag (Nursing), Waltraud Maierhofer (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Peter Thorne (Public Health), and Sarah Vigmostad (Engineering). The external consultant to the review committee was Steve Ackerman, Former Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, University of Wisconsin. She thanked the committee members for their extensive work on the review.

Professor Marshall went on to indicate that the purpose of central administrative reviews is, as described in the UI [Policy Manual II.28.4](#), to provide an opportunity for central administrative officials to evaluate their programs and to provide a systematic faculty evaluation of the central offices. The desired outcome of the review process is to make recommendations to improve the central office's administrative structure and performance. To carry out their charge, the review committee began by evaluating the self-study documents provided by the OVPR. This evaluation was followed by a discussion of the self-study with Vice President for Research (VPR) Scholtz. The review committee then requested and evaluated additional documentation. The next step in the review process involved interviews of individuals within the OVPR and/or with close working relationships with the Office. For these interviews, which took place October-December 2023, review committee members developed a standard list of questions. The review committee also created a survey to gather anonymous faculty feedback on the OVPR. The survey included both closed and open-ended questions and was administered in October-November 2023. Survey invitations were extended to 2,839 faculty members (on the tenure, clinical, research, and instructional tracks), with 438 faculty members initiating the survey (15% response rate) and 408 faculty members completing the survey.

Moving on to the primary committee recommendations, Professor Marshall noted that the review committee encourages the university administration to identify its vision of university research and how the OVPR fits within this vision. Articulation and communication of the OVPR role to campus constituents will enable realistic expectations by faculty for OVPR services.

Professor Marshall explained that the review committee formulated this recommendation in response to interviewee and survey respondents' perceptions that the OVPR was under-funded and under-resourced in relation to the university administration's stated value of research. Consistent with the university administration's expectations of the OVPR, the review committee encourages the VPR to identify and communicate the OVPR vision and strategic plan to campus constituents, as well as to guide the university's research direction by meaningful engagement with university constituents. This endeavor might also include the VPR building the case for additional resources. This recommendation was formulated in response to constituents' limited awareness of the OVPR vision, along with constituents' desire for the OVPR and VPR to intellectually and materially guide the university's research direction.

Because they heard a consistent message that the OVPR is under-resourced, both in finances and in staff, the review committee encourages the OVPR to conduct benchmarking activities to determine if indeed individual units are under-resourced relative to peer institutions, as well as to make efforts to determine if the right people are in the right positions. Professor Marshall indicated that most of the remaining recommendations are in response to specific needs identified by constituents that would facilitate their research, which would in turn impact faculty recruitment and retention. The OVPR is encouraged to advocate for additional funding for seed grants for pilot projects, for support for faculty teams competing for large extramural grants, and for contributions to start-up packages for potential faculty hires. The OVPR is also encouraged to identify a funding mechanism to maintain or replace equipment in core facilities, to evaluate the relationship between the OVPR and the Office of Innovation to ensure shared goals and effective collaboration, and to provide staff support to aid in the development and submission of interdisciplinary research grant applications. Professor Marshall noted that an external review of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was conducted in 2023. The review committee encourages the OVPR to implement those review recommendations to improve IRB efficiencies. Concluding her presentation, Professor Marshall directed Senators to the [administrative reviews](#) page of the Faculty Senate website, where the review is posted.

Regarding issues related to insufficient staffing, a Senator asked if perhaps benchmarking might reveal that peer institutions find themselves at insufficient levels of staffing, as well. Professor Marshall responded that this may indeed be the case. She noted, however, that some efforts to increase staffing levels, at least for the IRB, have been undertaken recently. In response to a question whether the OVPR has advocated for additional resources, Professor Marshall indicated that the review committee had received mixed messages, reflected in the report. She added that the university's current budget model seems to have compromised resources that may have once been more readily available to the OVPR. Another Senator emphasized the need for crucial pre-award support for faculty members. President Gillan led Senators in a round of applause to thank the OVPR review committee for their work.

- *Enrollment Update and Projections (Brent Gage, Associate Vice President, Enrollment Management and Strategy)*

Dr. Gage indicated that the Division of Enrollment Management includes five offices: Undergraduate Admissions, Student Financial Aid, Enrollment Management Operations, Enrollment Management Communications and Marketing, and Enrollment Management Data

Analytics. He explained that every year he works with each of the collegiate units to review their enrollment targets, strategies, and tactics. The collegiate goals are compiled and reviewed to ensure that they match the institutional goals, in areas such as target enrollment, the mix of resident and non-resident students, and areas of growth. Large fluctuations in enrollment are difficult for the university to handle, Dr. Gage commented. The university currently has a five-year plan that is focused, not on increasing enrollment, but on maintaining consistency at about 33,000 students. This manageable enrollment target allows for successful efforts to improve student access and success.

Enrollment management is a data-driven operation that relies on weekly predictive modeling to build a pool of prospective students that would enable the university to address its many enrollment goals, Dr. Gage continued. Neighborhood core-based statistical area (CBSA) data is used to find students nationwide who have a high likelihood of applying to and then enrolling in the university. Once identified, these students will receive mailings from the university and invitations to visit the campus. The enrollment cycle includes a series of key metrics, Dr. Gage observed. One of these key metrics is *applications*. Dr. Gage pointed out that this year the university has had its largest applicant pool in its history, with 27,589 first-year applications for the fall 2024 semester. There have been 5,646 applications from residents (an increase of 4.1% from last year) and 20,593 applications from non-residents (an 11.3% increase from last year). This is the first time that non-resident applications have exceeded 20,000, he added. Applications have been down 16% from last year for international students, at 1,350; the international student market remains very competitive and rankings-driven.

Another key metric is *net admits*. The university is required to admit all resident undergraduate students who meet the [Regent Admission Index](#) (RAI) and who apply by March 1, Dr. Gage reminded the group. Thus far this year, the university has admitted a total of 20,446 students, an increase of 10.6% over last year. Of this total, 4,705 students are residents and 15,199 students are non-residents, an increase of 5.8% and 13.3%, respectively, over last year. However, Dr. Gage noted, only about 50% of admitted resident students tend to enroll, while only about 17% of admitted non-resident students tend to enroll. The number of international admitted students is down thus far, as is the net number of admitted transfer students, although the latter number generally rises as the admission cycle extends into the summer. *Deposits* are the next metric in the enrollment cycle. As of today, 5,027 students (2,770 residents, 2,201 non-residents, and 56 international students) have submitted deposits, thereby accepting admission to the university. The university would like to see 363 more students make deposits by the May 15 deadline, because of an anticipated increase in “melt,” due to this year’s uncertainty around financial aid awards. Registrations for orientation and housing number 325 and 168 higher, respectively, than last year.

The federal government’s recent efforts to simplify the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) have been beset by significant problems and delays, Dr. Gage commented. Thus, aid packages that would normally go out in late February, did not go out to students until April 16. Unresolved issues remain involving the data exchange between the FAFSA and the IRS tax transcription retrieval service, further delaying aid offers from UI to about 2,000 prospective first-year students. Families are finding it difficult to make decisions amidst so much financial

uncertainty. Dr. Gage indicated that the UI wants to be flexible, but that we also don't want to over-enroll, which would lead to students being shut out of introductory-level classes. He anticipated a very busy summer as students change their minds about which institution to attend based on financial aid award revisions. Concluding his presentation, Dr. Gage noted that a new record for campus visitors was set this year, at 10,118 2024 high school graduates. He added that campus visits are the single best predictor of enrollment, so the university tries to bring as many students to campus as possible. He thanked faculty members for their willingness to meet with prospective students and to participate in student recruitment-related events.

In response to a question, Dr. Gage clarified that "melt" occurs when a student pays the deposit, but does not ultimately come to campus in the fall (the student goes to another institution). Raising the amount of the deposit would not necessarily discourage this behavior because the students who do this typically come from higher-income families. We also want to keep our deposit amount feasible for students without extensive resources. Vice President Sheerin asked if this year was the most stressful enrollment year that Dr. Gage had ever experienced. He responded that enrollment management during the pandemic also presented numerous challenges, such the move to a test-optional admission policy, while still providing testing opportunities for students who wanted them. He added that the problems this year with the FAFSA were solvable, if sufficient efforts had been made early on at the federal level to address them. Unfortunately, it is financially vulnerable students who are most impacted by this difficult situation.

Professor McQuistan observed that there seemed to be a contradiction between the national skepticism of higher education reported by the media and the record-breaking number of applications that the UI has received this year. Dr. Gage responded that flagship institutions like UI are seeing robust applicant numbers, while some regional institutions are struggling to attract students. He added that we must also prepare for the coming "enrollment cliff" by anticipating where our enrollment losses will occur and seeking to replace those losses elsewhere. Currently, we have full-time recruiters in California, Texas, northern Virginia, Minnesota, Illinois and Missouri (St. Louis). These individuals attend college fairs, visit high schools, and meet with high school counselors.

- *Faculty Policy Revisions (Policy Manual III.10) (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan directed the group's attention to the handout they had received which illustrated changes proposed to faculty policies for the specialized tracks (clinical, research, instructional). He explained that these proposed changes came about as a result of the approval of the revised [Faculty Dispute Procedures](#) at the March 26 Senate meeting and as a response to concerns raised in the [five-year review](#) of the instructional-track faculty policy.

President Gillan then described the specific changes that are proposed, beginning with the changes resulting from the revised dispute procedures, with which the faculty policies must now be brought into alignment. First, the structure of the faculty policy section in the Policy Manual has been altered. Currently, each faculty track has its own section in III.10. The proposal calls for a new section, *Specialized Track Faculty*, to be created within III.10, with subsections for the clinical, research, and instructional tracks. This new arrangement would reflect the structure of

the revised dispute procedures, which also group the specialized tracks together. Several changes are proposed within the subsections for consistency across the three tracks. These changes include clarification that in all specialized tracks, the initial appointment is the probationary appointment and that notice of university decisions is delivered by email. Any language in the three specialized track policies referring to five-year reviews has been deleted (because these required reviews have been completed). Turning to proposed dispute-related changes affecting only the instructional track, President Gillan paused to observe that the creation of the instructional track was initiated by faculty members, then known as *lecturers*, who were serving in that role and who brought their concerns to the Faculty Senate. The Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee then developed the instructional-track policy and Senate officers negotiated and compromised with administrators to finalize a policy that was acceptable to both faculty and administrators. The five-year review has provided an opportunity to make substantial improvements to the policy. Today's proposed changes to the instructional track include the deletion of wording that non-renewal cannot be disputed in the first six years, deletion of wording that the dean or DEO can deny a promotion request, and deletion of the section on the track-specific dispute procedures (because the instructional track now shares revised dispute procedures, described in the Faculty Dispute Procedures policy, with the clinical and research tracks).

Moving on to the changes proposed in response to recommendations made in the five-year review report of the instructional-track faculty policy, President Gillan noted that the report had raised a major concern regarding the stated absence of a notification period for non-renewal in the first six years of an assistant professor instructional-track appointment. This wording is being removed from the policy, replaced with proposed language providing probationary instructional-track faculty members with a non-renewal notice period of two months for the academic year and three months for the fiscal year. A six-month non-renewal notice period is proposed for all other faculty on the instructional track. The non-renewal notice period is another area in which consistency is sought across the specialized tracks, President Gillan emphasized. Current non-renewal notice periods for the research track are similar to the proposed notice periods for the instructional track, so no changes are contemplated for the research track. For the clinical track, however, a non-renewal notice period of one year is currently in place for clinical-track faculty who have served for two or more years. This maximum notice period will be reduced to six months, to maintain consistency with the other two tracks. Thus, instructional-track faculty will experience a policy gain as a result of the proposed revisions, while the clinical-track faculty will experience a loss. President Gillan noted that the revised notice periods will provide all specialized-track faculty with time to submit a formal dispute of a non-renewal while still in the contract period. Concluding his presentation, President Gillan indicated that these proposed policy revisions have been reviewed and approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and by the Faculty Council.

Professor Just moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the proposed Faculty Policy revisions be approved.

In response to a question, President Gillan clarified that collegiate policies must remain consistent with the university policy. Thus, if the university policy does not allow for deans or

DEOs to deny a promotion request, then a collegiate policy cannot allow this, either. Professor Welder asked about the rationale behind reducing the maximum clinical-track notification period from one year to six months. President Gillan responded that this was a compromise made in order to implement a notification period for the instructional track in the first six years of the appointment, as well as to maintain consistency among the three tracks.

The motion carried unanimously.

- *College of Engineering Proposed Research Track Policy (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan indicated that the research track was unique among the specialized tracks in requiring the Faculty Senate to approve collegiate proposals to establish the track. Thus far, the Senate has approved research tracks for the Carver College of Medicine (2008), the College of Public Health (2010), and the College of Pharmacy (2011). President Gillan reminded the group that no college is required to implement any of the specialized tracks, but that any college can choose to do so if a particular track is needed for the college's functioning. Recently, the College of Engineering and the College of Education have worked with the Office of the Provost to write collegiate research track policies that are compliant with the university-wide policy. Engineering's proposed policy was formulated by their collegiate executive council with feedback from faculty in several departments and center directors. Education's proposed policy received feedback from various faculty, staff, and graduate student groups. The Faculty Senate Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee has had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on both proposed policies. Faculty Council has approved both proposals.

Professor Just moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the proposed College of Engineering research track policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *College of Education Proposed Research Track Policy (Ed Gillan)*

Professor Koch moved and Professor Just seconded that the proposed College of Education research track policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Ed Gillan)*

President Gillan reported that the search committee membership for the new Vice President for Research has been [announced](#). Secretary Charlton will serve on the search committee. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez is chairing the administrative review of the Office of the President.

As a result of the revision of the Faculty Dispute Procedures, additional members will be added to the [Judicial Commission](#) to ensure adequate representation from specialized track faculty. The Senate officers will continue to work with administrators to ensure that the newly-approved policy updates regarding specialized faculty are clearly communicated to collegiate leadership, following the formal implementation of the revised policies.

The Senate officers will continue to work with administrators and other shared governance leaders to assess impacts of recent state DEI legislation.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Curto moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following resolution in honor of President Gillan:

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

WHEREAS President Ed Gillan has been an exceptional leader, serving with unwavering dedication in his role as Faculty Senate Secretary, Faculty Senate Vice President, and Faculty Senate President and

WHEREAS President Gillan has strengthened ties between the Senate and other campus groups, such as Undergraduate Student Government, and Graduate and Professional Student Government and

WHEREAS President Gillan has dutifully kept Council and Senate apprised of legislative changes related to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion and advocated for the university's efforts to continue to fulfill its mission in this area and

WHEREAS President Gillan has demonstrated a profound mastery of complex policy-related issues and communicated them to Council and Senate with admirable clarity and

WHEREAS President Gillan has successfully collaborated with the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and university central administration to improve the lot of Instructional-Track Faculty by establishing the titles of “Assistant Professor of Instruction” and “Assistant Professor of Practice,” increasing notification periods for non-renewals, and allowing for greater representation in the Senate and

WHEREAS President Gillan has worked tirelessly to establish fair and equitable Faculty Dispute Procedures that promote transparency and protect the rights of faculty of all ranks and tracks and

WHEREAS President Gillan has embodied courage, humility, strength, grace and humor as Faculty Senate President to create a highly inclusive and welcoming environment for all faculty to express their views and actively participate in meaningful shared governance,

BE IT RESOLVED that we the Senate express our most profound gratitude to President Gillan for his exceptional leadership and service to us all.

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

V. Announcements

- Faculty and Staff Institutional Awards Ceremony, Hancher Auditorium (today at 6:00 pm)
- Closing Remarks of the 2023-24 Faculty Senate President Ed Gillan

Prior to beginning his closing remarks, President Gillan thanked those Senators who were completing their terms: Professors Anderson, Guernsey, Carvour, Ferguson, Pizzimenti, Young, Martini, Jabbari, Gilbert, Greteman, Berg, and Mangum.

Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez noted that Professor Teresa Mangum was not just leaving the Senate, but also retiring from the university. She commented that Professor Mangum has had an enormous impact, not only as a scholar, but as a leader, teacher, and friend. She is a model for leadership, vision, and character. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez added

that Professor Mangum has been one of the individuals who has most impacted her career, and she believed that many other faculty members have been similarly impacted by Professor Mangum. She couldn't imagine what her sixteen years at the UI would have been like if she had not crossed paths with this amazing woman and her brilliant work. Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez wished Professor Mangum much joy in her next chapter and thanked her for all she has done for faculty and for the entire university.

President Gillan commented that his closing remarks would take the form of a list of the top five memorable moments of his presidential year. First, he recalled his efforts last summer to put together the annual Faculty Council/Administrative Retreat, which focused on showcasing faculty research from neuroscience to the arts. Making connections throughout the academic year with deans and central administrators, as well as with the leaders of the other shared governance groups, had been another highlight of his presidency. The four shared governance groups had held several joint events over the year and plan to continue doing so in the future. All of these interactions are evidence of the authentic shared governance that exists on campus. Collaborative policy creation and revision, such as for the Faculty Dispute Procedures and for the specialized faculty track policy updates – particular accomplishments of President Gillan's presidency – are one of the results of successful shared governance. The [joint letter](#) on academic freedom sent last fall is another result.

President Gillan recalled, as another highlight, the interactive, lively Council and Senate meetings when feedback on a range of topics was solicited through small group discussions and roundtables. He was grateful to have met and interacted with Councilors and Senators from across campus. Finally, he was thankful for the advice and feedback from the "Basta group," his fellow officers Vice President Sheerin, Secretary Charlton, and Past President Rodríguez-Rodríguez, along with Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist Laura Zaper.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Koch moved and Professor Kalnins seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Gillan adjourned the meeting at 4:35 pm.

FACULTY SENATE
2024-25 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 30, 2024
4:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – President Sheerin called the meeting to order at 4:35 pm.

II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (Election Committee)

President Sheerin 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.

President Sheerin invited Election Committee members Professor Sarah Vigmostad and Professor Sato Ashida to come forward to conduct the officer elections.

Professor Vigmostad announced that the candidates for Vice President were David Cuning (Philosophy) and Rodica Curtu (Mathematics and Iowa Neuroscience Institute). She then announced that the candidates for Secretary were Craig Just (Civil and Environmental Engineering) and Marc Pizzimenti (Anatomy and Cell Biology). Professor Vigmostad asked if there were any nominations from the floor for Faculty Senate Vice President or Faculty Senate Secretary. No nominations were made from the floor.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

III. Opening Remarks of the 2024-25 Faculty Senate President Caroline Sheerin

President Sheerin greeted Senators and welcomed them to the first meeting of the 2024-25 Faculty Senate. She thanked new Senators for agreeing to serve as representatives of their colleagues in shared governance. She also expressed gratitude to Senators who are continuing in their role. They have already done critical work on behalf of the faculty, and she looked forward to working with all of them as we move forward.

President Sheerin commented that she has been honored to serve as an officer for the past two years, first as the Secretary and then as the Vice President of Faculty Senate. In that time, she has gotten to know many Senators, but she felt that it might be helpful for them to know a bit about her background as she moves into her new role. Now that she was safely occupying the seat of the President, she felt comfortable telling them that she was born and raised in...New Jersey. She asked that Senators not hold it against her. Becoming serious again, she commented that she thought that her deep respect for the pursuit of learning took root in her hometown of Princeton, New Jersey. She was born into a family of teachers, going back to her great-grandmother, and, living as she did so close to the elms and Gothic buildings of one of the oldest

universities in the country, the message was hard to miss: higher education was and is the key not just to success but also to personal satisfaction.

Of course, she attended college—she wasn't sure her parents even gave her a choice—and she went on to get a Masters degree in East Asian studies and then a law degree. She never actually intended to end up teaching on a college campus, but apparently the pull was strong. In 2006, after 6 years of practicing law, she joined the UI College of Law as a lecturer teaching Legal Analysis, Writing, and Research. Her dad always joked that she seemed to end up on a college campus one way or another.

At the time President Sheerin joined this campus, she had no idea that lecturers were in such a precarious position. As she stayed at the university, she came to learn that not being in the Policy Manual (which was then called the Operations Manual), was a bit of a liability. Not only did she not have parking, she wasn't allowed to participate in university governance, nor did she have access to a grievance procedure. In 2011, then Faculty Senate President Richard Fumerton asked if she would serve on a committee to look into the working conditions for lecturers. Banding together with fellow lecturers, she worked for five years to provide input on the creation of a new track of faculty: what is now known as the Instructional Track. During that time, then Associate Provost Kregel met with the committee to hear their concerns, and the committee worked with the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC) to hammer out the language of the policy. Since they weren't actually allowed to serve on Senate and Council, they were invited to present their report to both bodies. President Sheerin distinctly remembered literally sitting on the sidelines of a Council meeting hoping fervently that one day she too could sit at that table.

Of course, the policy passed. It wasn't perfect, but it was a huge improvement (she got parking! And then a place on Senate and Council). Five years passed, and the policy came up for review. At that point, then Faculty Senate President Joe Yockey asked her to co-chair the review committee with the amazing Professor Anne Stapleton. How could she say no? She worked with another incredible team to produce the Instructional-Track Faculty (ITF) Report, which laid out recommendations for ways to improve the lot of ITF on campus, including a stronger grievance procedure. When she was asked to serve as an officer, she was...really and truly at the table. She was proud to say that many of the recommendations have been adopted, in no small part because of the efforts of her fellow officers, members of FPCC, the administration, and, of course, those who were Senators and Councilors this past year.

President Sheerin explained that she told this story because she thought it illustrated a few principles that she hoped to use to guide her time as President. First, change can be slow, but sometimes you need to take a breath and see how far you've come up the mountain rather than just complaining about how far you need to go. Second, shared governance—a phrase she had barely heard before coming to Iowa-- is critical to the success of this institution. Shared governance does not mean pitting constituencies against one another. Shared governance means that the relevant stakeholders should have a voice that is proportionate to the issue being discussed. Do faculty need to weigh in on every decision about staffing at the university? No. But if the staffing issue directly impacts the viability of a lab or a department's ability to teach

required classes, then, yes, the faculty should be consulted. Doing so is important for two main reasons. One, working together leads to better decisions. If stakeholders are informed and allowed to provide feedback, decision-makers can act in a way that is rational and efficient. Second, we are all modeling leadership and governance for our students. By watching administration, staff, faculty, and students work together to tackle problems, our students are watching democracy in action. It isn't always pretty, but when done right, it works.

Commenting that, as Senators might have guessed, it is President Sheerin's goal in the coming year to continue to strengthen shared governance. Indeed, she would like to build on the successes of shared governance at the university level and work to encourage colleges and departments to make their own efforts to improve faculty participation in governance at the local level. To this end, she will try to find ways to help Senators communicate our messages back to their constituents and to have more communication back to Faculty Senate.

Another priority is ensuring that faculty have a clear sense of the protections that are afforded to them and to our students by both academic freedom and the First Amendment. The fall semester will bring a national election, which may bring a passionate response from portions of the campus community. No matter what the outcome, it is important that we are educated on what is permissible speech and what is not. She has already asked presenters to come to the September Faculty Senate meeting to talk about the definitions and boundaries of academic freedom and free speech.

President Sheerin was sure the new academic year would bring new challenges that she did not yet know, and she looked forward to meeting them with all Senators. Before signing off, she thanked those who have helped her get to this podium. First, she thanked former Faculty Senate President Teresa Marshall, whom she has known for years and who has been an unflinching supporter of hers from the very beginning. Professor Marshall was particularly instrumental in helping with the drafting of the ITF Report, and President Sheerin was so grateful to her. Next, she thanked outgoing Secretary Mary Charlton, who has also been a friend for years. She is an amazing woman who does so much good with her work on the Cancer Registry. When Secretary Charlton told her that she couldn't run for vice president because of her work on the Registry, President Sheerin said, well, as a cancer survivor, that was probably the one excuse she couldn't argue with. Another person she thanked was former Faculty Senate President Ana Rodriguez-Rodriguez, who has served as her mentor in faculty governance and in life. Though Professor Rodriguez-Rodriguez is technically younger than she is, she has wisdom beyond her years, which she has graciously shared with President Sheerin. Of course, President Sheerin added, she must also thank Past President Ed Gillan. Although Past President Gillan drove her bonkers sometimes (those slides! Those arrows! Those bubbles!), no one, and she really meant no one, on the faculty of this university has done more work to help shape university policy in a way that is fair and meaningful. She was grateful to him. President Sheerin also thanked Faculty Senate Administrative Services Specialist Laura Zaper, who in some ways IS Faculty Senate, adding that she is the keeper of the secrets, the all-knowing sphinx of the Senate. She keeps the Senate going, and she would be lost without her. President Sheerin was so grateful to all of these people for making the past couple of years the most rewarding of her career here at the university. She

concluded by saying that she was proud to be a Hawkeye, and that she was proud to have the chance to sit at the table with all of the Senators this year. Thank you.

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

V. Announcements

- Officer Election Results – Professor Vigmostad announced that the new Faculty Senate Vice President is Rodica Curtu and that the new Faculty Senate Secretary is Craig Just. All candidates were given a round of applause.
- 2024-25 Meeting Schedule – President Sheerin reminded Senators that the Outlook meeting invitations for the 2024-25 Council and Senate meetings have been sent to their calendars.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Koch moved and Professor McQuistan seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 4:55 pm.