FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 17, 2024
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Zoom

MINUTES

Senators Present:	M. Abou Alaiwa, A. Achenbach, L. Adams, A. Aron, B. An, B. Ayati, J. Bunch, E. Carlisle, C. Chan, M. Coleman, R. Curto, A. Estapa, A. Farag, J. Fiegel, A. Goedken, C. Grueter, J. Gutierrez, A. Kalnins, J. Kline, J. Koch, M. Landsman, A. Lesch, V. Lira, C. McMillan, H. Mehdi, T. Midtrod, J. Nepola, B. Nottingham-Spencer, A. Panos, C. Pinnaro, T. Rietz, D. Shane, Y. Shi, A. Shibli-Rahhal, J. Simmons, F. Solt, M. Swee, D. Trusty, T. Wadas, E. Welder, K. Whitaker, F. Williams, K. Worthington.
Officers Present:	R. Curtu, E. Gillan, C. Just, C. Sheerin.
Senators Excused:	L. Durairaj, N. Greyser, P. Groves, B. G'Sell, A. Guernsey, M. McQuistan, D. Santillan, M. Schroeder, W. Story, E. Thomas, C. Vogel.
Senators Absent:	S. Abuhammoud, C. Benson, R. Cox, E. Destruel, A. Dupuy, H. Dybevik, S. Ganesan, N. Handoo, D. Langbehn, B. Li, P. Nau, K. Parker, J. Sa-Aadu, M. Santillan, C. Turvey, A. Vikram, M. Wald, L. Zingman.
Guests:	K. Brown (Brody Award Recipient), A. Byrd (Office of the General Counsel), A. Diaz-Arnold (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Finston (Brody Award Artist), A. Flaming (Center for Teaching), R. Fumerton (Committee on Academic Values), N. Grosland (Brody Award Recipient), T. Marshall (Committee on Academic Values), A. Nanavati (Brody Award Artist), A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez (Brody Award Recipient), J. Yockey (Law), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Sheerin called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals
   A. Meeting Agenda –Professor Kline moved and Professor Abou Alaiwa seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 30, 2024) – Professor Rietz moved and Professor Farag seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Committee Appointments (Rodica Curtu, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Koch moved and Professor Farag seconded that the committee appointments be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
   - *The full list of appointments is appended to these minutes.*

III. New Business

- *Understanding Academic Freedom and Free Speech (Ann Byrd, Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel and Joe Yockey, Associate Dean for Research and Professional Development, College of Law)*

President Sheerin reminded Senators that last year at the September Faculty Senate meeting, they had learned about a letter to the faculty signed by then-Senate President Gillan, UI President Wilson, and Provost Kregel. This letter was disseminated to all faculty on campus and expressed the university's commitment to the free speech rights and academic freedom of all UI faculty. President Sheerin received favorable feedback regarding the letter, but Senators nevertheless indicated that it was still somewhat unclear what faculty members' rights and protections were. To address those concerns, President Sheerin had invited two speakers with expertise in the areas of free speech and academic freedom.

Deputy General Counsel Byrd began her presentation on freedom of speech and expression by noting that the Office of the General Counsel provides legal and policy advice to the university through its administrators and *does not* provide personal legal or policy advice to individuals on campus. She then reminded the group that the First Amendment states, *Congress shall make no law…abridging the freedom of speech…or the right of the people peaceably to assemble*. The Fourteenth Amendment, ratified after the Civil War, seeks to protect individual rights from interference by the states and provides that *No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States…* In the UI context, the university is an instrument of the state; thus this provision relates to policies of the institution. Deputy General Counsel Byrd explained that the First Amendment's general rule could be described as *an individual's speech/expression in their individual capacity ("private speech") receives First Amendment protection from state (institutional) adverse action*. This rule applies even if the individual's speech is distasteful, offensive, rude, factually incorrect, etc. There are exceptions, however, such as obscenity, destruction of property/vandalism, true threats of physical violence, incitement to illegal activity, and harassment. Deputy General Counsel Byrd noted that speech on campus can only be considered harassment if it is *so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it can be said to deprive the victims of access to the educational opportunities or benefits provided by the school* (or workplace).

Turning to hate speech, Deputy General Counsel Byrd observed that no federal or Iowa state law defines hate speech. Hate speech is generally considered to be *language intended to vilify, humiliate, or incite hatred against a person or group of people on the basis of a protected class*. The First Amendment protects hate speech unless it rises to the level of a true threat of physical violence, direct incitement of imminent illegal activity, or harassment. Other laws and policies may also impact speech and expression, such as those relating to copyright, privacy, academic freedom, and criminal activity.

On campus, Deputy General Counsel Byrd continued, the university is allowed to impose reasonable restrictions on speech and expressive activities. These restrictions are related to time, place, and manner and serve to ensure health, safety, and welfare, as well as to prevent disruption of university functions in classrooms, research labs, clinics, offices, etc. The restrictions cannot be based on viewpoint or content, and *prior restraint*, which is censorship of speech based on content before it occurs, is not allowed. Some examples of reasonable restrictions on campus are policies relating to chalking, use of amplified sound, and protests outside the hospital. These restrictions apply to everyone, regardless of the content of the speech or expression. Regarding protests, Deputy General Counsel Byrd noted that citizens have the right to peacefully assemble in protest. However, protesters must still comply with laws and university policies and they cannot disrupt or interfere with speakers' presentations ("heckler's veto").

Deputy General Counsel Byrd noted that many UI faculty members are active in political and social issues, as well as in public service. She referred Senators to this Office of the Provost website describing *Guidelines Regarding Political Activity by Faculty of the University of Iowa*. Topics covered here include use of one's title and university email address, and sharing of subject matter expertise. She added that the university cannot take a position on any political matter without prior approval from the Iowa Board of Regents. Turning to social media, Deputy General Counsel Byrd noted that the official university social media accounts are considered a traditional "open forum," meaning that there can be no limitations on comments or engagement in censorship or prior restraint. The establishment of closed forum social media accounts requires prior approval. Individual social media accounts are subject to First Amendment analysis, leading to possible additional considerations for employees.

Considering public employee speech, Deputy General Counsel Byrd commented that employee speech at a public institution may or may not be protected, due to competing legal interests. The employee's interest in free speech and the public's interest in hearing the speech must be balanced against the university's interest in the performance of public services through its employees. To determine if the employee's speech is protected, one must first decide if the speech is official (work-related) or if it is private. The former is not protected, but the latter may be protected. Deputy General Counsel Byrd emphasized that speech in the course of performance of job duties is *not* typically protected from adverse employment action by the First Amendment. However, academic freedom may provide protection for the work-related speech of faculty members. She acknowledged that the distinction between work-related and private speech was often unclear. For example, a calculus instructor speaking about a math problem is clearly engaging in work-related speech. She then cited a Supreme Court ruling in which the Court sided with a public school football coach who prayed on the field following a game, finding that the prayers were private speech. The school had subjected the coach to adverse employment action, arguing that he was engaged in his official duties at the time. Deputy General Counsel Byrd added that university employees should clarify their roles when speaking privately.

Speech not considered work-related is private speech, Deputy General Counsel Byrd continued. To decide if private speech is protected from adverse employment action by the First Amendment, one must determine whether the speech is on a matter of public concern. A matter

of public concern is more than a personal grievance. It is a matter outside of regular employment duties and must be of legitimate news interest to the public. If it is not a matter of public concern, then the private speech is not protected by the First Amendment (although it may be protected by other laws or policies). She then gave an example of a matter of public concern: a public high school science teacher wrote to the local paper criticizing use of school funds to improve athletic fields and was fired by the school district. The Supreme Court ruled, however, that allocation of public money in education is a matter of public concern and that the teacher's speech was protected. Deputy General Counsel Byrd noted that the university could still take adverse employment action as a result of private speech on a matter of public concern if the university reasonably determines that the speech substantially interferes with the speaker's or the university's official responsibilities, because legal or policy considerations other than the First Amendment may be taken into account. She concluded by commenting that the employee's individual right to free speech may or may not outweigh the university's interest in efficient performance of its duties, depending on facts and context. She then referred the group to the Iowa Board of Regents policy on freedom of expression and policy on academic freedom. She also highlighted the UI professional ethics and academic responsibility policy. There are numerous other relevant university, city, and state policies and laws, she added.

Associate Dean Yockey then spoke about academic freedom. He began by quoting Albert Einstein: *Laws alone cannot secure freedom of expression. In order that everyone present their views without penalty, there must be a spirit of tolerance in the entire population. Such an ideal of external liberty can never be fully attained, but it must be sought intermittently if scientific thought and philosophical and creative thinking in general are to be advanced as far as possible*. Associate Dean Yockey went on to say that *academic freedom* is not a legal concept, but rather a term that captures a set of norms and principles for how a university and its faculty should behave. Academic freedom is a difficult and abstract concept to understand, he continued. At public universities, academic freedom issues are often intertwined with the First Amendment and with freedom of speech more generally. He reminded the group that the First Amendment applies only to state action. Its constitutional protections do not extend to actions taken by faculty at private universities, at least to the extent that teaching and research activities are concerned. Most major private institutions proclaim their strong commitment to academic freedom because of the central role that this concept plays in the scholarly endeavor. Thus, academic freedom covers many more faculty members than the First Amendment does; faculty members who do not enjoy First Amendment protections may nevertheless be covered by academic freedom protections. On the other hand, faculty members at public universities may have some speech protected by the First Amendment, but not by academic freedom.

Academic freedom is traditionally defined as the freedom of faculty to perform their essential function of pursuing knowledge and conveying the results of their expert study to students, colleagues, and society, Associate Dean Yockey explained. The freedom envisioned by this definition relates to freedom from professional discipline when someone disagrees with the faculty member's views or finds them distasteful for some reason. The rationale for the protection is that if a faculty member could be penalized just because someone disagrees with their scholarly views, then the integrity of the entire research and teaching enterprise could be undermined. There are reasonable worries, for example, that faculty members will alter their

findings or their teaching if they fear being fired or punished because a dean, donor, student, or politician disagrees with them. The guiding principles that animate our understanding of modern academic freedom emerged largely in response to donors and trustees pressuring universities to sanction faculty members for teaching subjects such as Darwinian evolution, Marxist economics, human sexuality, climate change, or critical race theory.

Associate Dean Yockey stressed that academic freedom is not absolute. It is not a license for faculty members to say whatever, whenever they want. First, academic freedom does not give faculty members the right to use the classroom as their personal platform for expression of their opinions without regard to professional norms or to deny students a fair opportunity to express their views without fear of being punished. Why is that? In the United States, the concept of the professor is not one that is designed for indoctrination. There is a risk that a faculty member's rhetoric or political preaching could become so excessive as to become interpreted as dogma that bears little to no relationship to the academic or pedagogical justifications for the course. Personal expressions of opinion could also become so distracting that they impair students' ability to learn, as when students might reasonably worry about the faculty member's ability to remain impartial if and when their views are challenged. This does not mean that scholarship cannot communicate definitive viewpoints about controversial issues, Associate Dean Yockey commented. It can and often will. But faculty members must also remember the obligation to protect the right of their students to think freely and exercise independent judgement and to fairly present them with the conflicting ideas of other scholars, so that students can learn to think for themselves. Second, and relatedly, teaching and scholarship must comport with relevant academic norms and standards. In other words, a university can engage in content-based evaluations of faculty members' speech, but only if the evaluation is based on the review and application of relevant professional standards for teaching and scholarship within the discipline. There is no academic freedom, for example, to falsify data or to plagiarize, as both behaviors fall outside the norms of academic professionalism.

This raises the question, however, of who decides when the appropriate standards for a professional discipline have been met. In the U.S., Associate Dean Yockey explained, principles of academic freedom hold that only those fellow academics who possess the requisite expertise are permitted to review application of these standards in specific cases. Peer review goes hand-in-hand with academic freedom and is the cornerstone of the practical guarantee of academic freedom that American universities claim to provide. Therefore, it is important to remember that academic freedom contemplates both substantive and procedural protections for its faculty. Substantively, faculty members are free to study and proclaim the findings of their work, but if their teaching or research is ever challenged, the process for upholding that freedom involves a series of procedural protections that centers on a peer assessment of a faculty member's work and its fidelity to the accepted standards and norms of the discipline. Often, there is general broad agreement regarding the outline of academic freedom in the abstract. Things can become more tense when someone's teaching strikes someone else as offensive. One might ask why a faculty member's right to academic freedom is more important than another person's desire not to be offended in regard to religious or political preferences. Put simply, the search for knowledge presumes a continuous process in which existing understandings must be questioned and often revised through the exchange of new and conflicting ideas that may challenge

accepted beliefs. Given this dynamic, it is entirely out of bounds to criticize an instructor or course solely on the grounds of offensiveness. Robust scholarly dialogue can and often is passionate and hurtful to those who care intently about their beliefs and ideas. Yet, within the academic setting, this is precisely why the question in these cases is not whether something is offensive, but whether the teaching or research under scrutiny remains in accord with the relevant professional standards. This is the only way to protect the public's interest in scholarly success and legitimacy and is the necessary framework to ensure that universities can fulfill their function regarding the advancement of knowledge even in the face of ideological, political, or religious pressures from actors outside or within the academy. Associate Dean Yockey expressed the view that Chief Justice Earl Warren summed up the purpose of academic freedom best in the 1957 Supreme Court case of Sweezy v. New Hampshire when he stated that *No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true in the social sciences, where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolute. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to enquire, to study, and to evaluate to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.*

Turning to the institution's responsibilities toward academic freedom, Associate Dean Yockey highlighted the Board of Regents policy on academic freedom. According to that policy, the Regents institutions *shall uphold the principle of academic freedom in their research and creative endeavors and support full freedom, within the law, of expressions in research investigation and dissemination of results through presentation, performance, and publication*. The policy further states that *University teachers shall be entitled to academic freedom in the classroom in discussing the teachers' course subject, but shall not introduce into the teaching controversial matters that have no relation to the subject*. This policy should give us all great comfort, Associate Dean Yockey commented. In closing, he called the group's attention to the Chicago Statement on Free Speech, created by the University of Chicago's Committee on Freedom of Expression in 2014. He expressed the view that this Chicago Statement remains the most elegant and clear statement on the importance of free expression and academic freedom ever produced. It has been adopted by more than 100 universities in the U.S. Our Board of Regents also supports it, giving their formal endorsement in 2019. Associate Dean Yockey read the following quote from the Statement, *the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it…[W]ithout a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university*.

Senators were then presented with various scenarios relating to free speech and academic freedom in the university context. They discussed these scenarios and the accompanying questions in small groups and then reported back to the larger group their responses, along with any questions and comments they had. President Sheerin then indicated that Faculty Senate, in conjunction with the Office of the Provost, would host a series of brown bag lunch sessions in late September and mid-October on this same topic of understanding academic freedom and free speech. Details on dates, times, and locations would be forthcoming.

- *Presentation of 2024 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (Ed Gillan) and Remembrance of Professor Usha Mallik, 2020 Brody Award Recipient (Caroline Sheerin)*

Past President Gillan explained that the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa was established by the Faculty Senate in 1990 to recognize outstanding faculty members for their sustained service contributions. Brody Award recipients receive commemorative prints created by graduate students in the Printmaking Department of the UI School of Art and Art History. This year, for the first time, the prints would be presented to the recipients at a Faculty Senate meeting. Past President Gillan indicated that this year's recipients are Kenneth Brown, Nicole Grosland, and Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez.

Ken Brown is the Tippie Children Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship in the Tippie College of Business and Interim DEO of Educational Policy and Leadership Studies in the College of Education. His pedagogical research, extensive service record, publications, and editorial projects have illuminated the potential for business and business education to support communities. Past President Gillan requested that Professor Brown stand up and acknowledge a round of applause. He then indicated that Professor Brown would receive the print "Gawkers" by Anne Klein. The print is a line etching with soft ground and aquatint.

Nicole Grosland is the Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Distinguished Professor in the College of Engineering. She has committed to numerous service opportunities that have contributed to the enhancement of student learning and success at the departmental, collegiate, and university levels. Past President Gillan requested that Associate Dean Grosland stand up and acknowledge a round of applause. He then indicated that Associate Dean Grosland would receive the print "For Protection" by Lya Finston. The print was created by stone lithography, etching, and screen printing. He requested that Lya, who was in the audience, also stand up and acknowledge a round of applause.

Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez is Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Graduate Student Success in the Graduate College and Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. She has served in an impressive number of leadership roles at the university—perhaps most visibly as vice president, president, and past president of Faculty Senate. Past President Gillan requested that Associate Dean Rodríguez-Rodríguez stand up and acknowledge a round of applause. He then indicated that Associate Dean Rodríguez-Rodríguez would receive the print "A Different Direction" by Al-Qawi Nanavati. The print was created on self-made paper using Kozo fiber, watercolor, and screen printing. He requested that Al-Qawi, who was in the audience, also stand up and acknowledge a round of applause.

President Sheerin then read a brief personal remembrance statement about Professor Usha Mallik, a recipient of the Brody Award in 2020:

"Congratulations again to this year's Brody winners. As is true every year, I am truly humbled by your many accomplishments and so grateful for your service to the University. I'd like to take a minute to remember another Brody winner, Usha Mallik, who tragically died this past August in a car accident. Usha, who won the Brody award in 2020, was a member of the

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty in the department of Physics and Astronomy. She excelled in the areas of teaching, research, and service. While there is much to say regarding her teaching and research, in the context of this Brody award celebration, I'd like to focus on remembering her many service contributions to the institution. Though I only knew Usha a bit—more on that in a minute—I was able to learn about her service from the Brody application that Professor and former Faculty Senate President Richard Fumerton prepared. Reading this packet, I learned that Usha was committed to service because she wanted to give back to the University. And give back she did, serving in shared governance in a variety of ways, including Faculty Senate, Faculty Council, and myriad committees. She was—in the words of her nominators—"selfless," "practical," and "fair." She was also plainspoken—some might even say blunt—but always with the good of the institution, and especially her faculty peers, in mind.

Remember how I said I only interacted with Usha briefly? I do think that interaction illustrates these points nicely. Back in 2015, I had been working on a committee of lecturers, as we were known at the time, to provide input in the process of creating what would become the Instructional Track Policy. After literally years of intensive work, the committee had produced a report, which it then proudly brought to the Faculty Council to present. Usha was on Council at the time. She and her fellow councilors listened to the report, which highlighted the things we believed would improve the lot of lecturers, such as increased compensation, a vote in faculty governance, and longer term contracts. When we were finished, hers was the first hand in the air. She said, "This is all very well and good, but if you don't have access to a grievance procedure, it is all meaningless." I was completely taken aback by the abruptness of her comment. My sensitive soul wanted a bit of praise for all the hard work we had done before being chastised for the obvious flaw in our report. I left the meeting stung and annoyed.

I did not, however, ever forget what she said. Indeed, when the time came to re-visit the policy five years later, I put my hand up to volunteer for the job of analyzing the grievance procedure for ITF and crafting recommendations to put in the report. I had come to realize how important those grievance procedures were. The report recommendations would serve as the basis for many of the changes that the Senate voted on last year. While I worked, it was Usha's words I heard in my head. She may not have made a friend that day, but she did make a difference. We remember her fondly."

- *Dissolution of University Safety and Security Charter Committee (Caroline Sheerin)*

President Sheerin indicated that today she was requesting that the Faculty Senate vote on the proposed dissolution of the University Safety and Security Charter Committee. She reminded the group that the charter committees are another branch of university-wide shared governance. Charter committees average about 11 members and are comprised of varying combinations of faculty, staff, and students. They focus on issues of concern to the entire campus (e.g., benefits, parking, research). Faculty Senate has responsibility for appointing the faculty members of the charter committees.

In 2020, President Sheerin explained, national events had precipitated the university's efforts to reexamine how campus safety and security practices were carried out. As part of these efforts, the Reimagining Campus Safety Action Committee was formed and the committee eventually issued a report. One of the report's recommendations was to call for the

establishment of a presidential board focused on campus safety and accountability. This Campus Safety Improvement Board (CSIB) has now been established. It is not a charter committee, but the membership of the CSIB is far broader and more representative of the campus than the charter committee was. With the creation of the more expansive CSIB, the University Safety and Security Charter Committee no longer has a role to play on campus. The general charter for the charter committees provides for the establishment of new charter committees, when needed, and also for the modification (including disestablishment) of existing charter committees, if circumstances warrant such an action. Dissolution of a charter committee requires the approval of the shared governance bodies representing faculty, staff, and students.

Professor Koch moved and Professor Farag seconded that the University Safety and Security Charter Committee be dissolved. The motion carried unanimously.

- *President's Report (Caroline Sheerin)*

President Sheerin reported that an article about Faculty Senate had appeared in the September 12 edition of *Iowa Now*. The Senate has also created a short video about the structure and work of the Senate.

A joint shared governance event is planned for September 24. Topics for table discussions will include diversity, mental health, and academic freedom. Representatives from the undergraduate student, graduate student, staff, and faculty shared governance bodies will all be present.

President Sheerin urged Senators to watch their email inboxes for the first Faculty Senate newsletter, to be sent out tomorrow. The newsletter would include information about the events mentioned here today, as well as an overview of today's Senate meeting. President Sheerin suggested that Senators forward the newsletter to their faculty colleagues.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 8, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 29, 3:30-5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Kline moved and Past President Gillan seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Sheerin adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.

Appendix

Committee Appointments

Charter Committees

Rebecca Clark (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to fill the unexpired term of Alicia Ambler (ESL) on the Access, Opportunity, & Diversity Charter Committee, 2024-26

Carissa Vogel (Law) to fill the unexpired term of Erin Litton (Health & Human Physiology) on the Campus Planning Charter Committee, 2024-25

Mark Bruckner (Theatre Arts) to fill the unexpired term of Blaine Greteman (English) on the Hancher Auditorium Advisory Charter Committee, 2024-26

Faculty Senate Committees

Kay Hegarty (Accounting) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Chris Liebig (Law) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Dan Matheson (Health & Human Physiology) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Bruce Nottingham-Spencer (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Newell Ann Van Auken (Division of World Languages, Literatures, & Cultures) to the Judicial Commission, 2024-27

Faculty Council

Bruce Ayati (Mathematics) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Council, Fall 2024

Christopher-Rasheem McMillan (Dance) to fill the unexpired term of Teresa Mangum (Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies) on the Faculty Council, 2024-25

Faculty Senate

Aron Aji (World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures) to replace Claire Fox (English) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2024

Alison Guernsey (Law) to replace Ryan Sakoda (Law) on the Faculty Senate, Fall 2024

Debra Trusty (Classics) to fill the unexpired term of Blaine Greteman (English) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25

Tom Arne Midtrød (History) to fill the unexpired term of Teresa Mangum (Gender, Women's, and Sexuality Studies) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25

Adam Dupuy (Anatomy and Cell Biology) to fill the unexpired term of David Axelrod (Surgery) on the Faculty Senate, 2024-25