

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, January 24, 2023
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present:	R. Curto, L. Durairaj, C. Fox, N. Greyser, B. Janssen, L. Joseph, M. Kivlighan, A. Shibli-Rahhal, E. Welder.
Officers Present:	E. Gillan, T. Marshall, A. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. Sheerin.
Councilors Excused:	D. Anderson, N. Brogden, J. Gutierrez, M. McQuistan, M. Santillan.
Councilors Absent:	E. Hill, T. Mangum, J. Sa-Aadu.
Guests:	B. Bowers (UI Dance Marathon), L. Croft (Council on Teaching), L. Glass (University Libraries Committee), G. Katzer (<i>Daily Iowan</i>), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I. Call to Order – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm. She welcomed returning Councilor Martin Kivlighan (Education) and new Councilor Claire Fox (Liberal Arts and Sciences).

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Joseph moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (November 15, 2022) – Professor Fox noted that references to the OSC (Office of Strategic Communications) on page 4 of the minutes (in the discussion of the Sustainability Charter Committee) should instead be OSE (Office of Sustainability and the Environment). This correction will be made to the final version of the minutes. Professor Joseph moved and Professor Janssen seconded that the corrected minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (February 7, 2023) – President Rodríguez-Rodríguez noted that President Wilson is scheduled to speak to the Senate at that meeting. She added that there was a slight update to the draft agenda: a presentation on the results of the Campus Climate survey has been added. Professor Janssen moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the revised draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Appointments (Ed Gillan, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Joseph moved and Professor Durairaj seconded that the committee appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
 - Eric Van Otterloo (Dows Institute) to replace Anya Prince (Law) on the Faculty Senate, Spring 2023

III. New Business

- *UI Dance Marathon (Brynn Bowers, Faculty & Staff Chair)*

Ms. Bowers explained that University of Iowa Dance Marathon (UIDM) is the largest student-led philanthropy and student organization on campus. She indicated that UIDM provides financial and emotional support to pediatric cancer patients at the UI Stead Family Children's Hospital. The organization has a year-round commitment to support these children and their families, with family events, dancer events, and fundraising. In February of each year, UIDM hosts a 24-hour event (the Big Event) during which students remain on their feet through dancing, games, and entertainment in celebration of the total amount of money raised that year. At the Big Event, participants are encouraged not to sit, sleep, or consume caffeine for 24 hours to celebrate the children who have beat cancer, support those who are still battling cancer, and remember those who have passed and are now dancing in our hearts. The Big Event is an opportunity to hear from families about their journeys and their stories. Last year, UIDM raised over \$1.36 million despite making last-minute changes to go completely virtual.

This year, UIDM will host its first in-person Big Event since February 2020. It will be held on February 3-4. Ms. Bowers invited Councilors to become involved as volunteers. Councilors could also choose to donate to those student volunteers who have not yet reached their fundraising minimum required to participate in the Big Event. Donations to UIDM also help members to continue supporting families. UIDM provides virtual and in-person programming, including weekly playtimes for children in the hospital and monthly family events. Additionally, UIDM volunteers provide entertainment for children in the hospital. Another component of UIDM is Dance Marathon the Marathon (DMM), a marathon training group that raises awareness about UIDM's mission while training for and completing the Bank of America Chicago Marathon alongside 297 other DMM runners and over 35,000 marathon runners. The next BOA Chicago Marathon will be held on Sunday, October 8 and volunteers are welcome. For those interested in a more consistent involvement in UIDM, the Faculty and Staff Liaison Committee has quarterly Zoom meetings to keep its members informed about volunteer opportunities.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez asked about the impact of involvement in UIDM on the students who participate. Ms. Bowers responded that, although UIDM is best known for its 24-hour Big Event, UIDM involvement is a year-long commitment, with leadership opportunities for students in many different areas, such as public relations and finance, thus assisting in students' professional development. UIDM also involves students in a larger cause, in which they can find a passion and a purpose. In response to another question, Ms. Bowers indicated that UIDM remains the largest student organization on campus, although its membership has declined somewhat following the pandemic. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that she and the Staff Council president have been invited to attend a portion of the Big Event.

- *Charter Committee Updates (Loren Glass, Chair, University Libraries Committee and Laurie Croft, Chair, Council on Teaching)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded the group that the purpose of these informal presentations by the charter committee chairs was to introduce Councilors to the work of this other branch of shared governance, as well as to find out how the Council and Senate could

support the charter committees in their activities. Professor Glass began his remarks by noting that the [University Libraries Committee](#) (ULC) is in the process of revising its [charge](#). The revision process has been lengthy and burdensome because of the need for all four shared governance groups plus the university administration to approve the proposed revisions. He wondered if a more timely process for charter committee charge revision could be established. Professor Glass observed that the current committee charge reflects the entirely advisory nature of the ULC. To the proposed revised charge, however, the committee has added elements of advocacy, precipitated by the UI libraries' struggles in recent decades with obtaining enough resources to fulfill their missions. The proposed revised charge also acknowledges the libraries' ongoing major shift to digital resources. Professor Glass explained that the ULC members have primarily been listening to library administrators to hear what issues the UI libraries, and libraries nationally, currently face and then, ideally, communicating those issues to their faculty, staff, and student constituents, although the latter task has not been as high of a priority as it could be. He expressed willingness to report on library concerns to the Senate on a more regular, formalized basis. Professor Glass noted that there has been concern over the lack of attendance at meetings by the undergraduate student members of the committee. Perhaps a more effective way of gathering feedback on the UI libraries from undergraduate students could be identified.

Professor Joseph, a former ULC member, commented that, during her time on the committee, the libraries had experienced financial cuts, causing prioritization in areas such as the purchase of materials. She asked about the libraries' current financial situation. Professor Glass indicated that philanthropic efforts will likely be necessary to address the libraries' major maintenance and construction needs; the condition of the libraries' physical structure has drawn complaints from patrons. Another ongoing area of challenge is journal subscriptions. It appears that a small handful of powerful publishing conglomerates controls access to and prices for journal subscriptions. Some collective action has been taken against these publishers, however, including efforts underway to form a Big Ten "megacollection," accessible to all of the organization's members. Vice President Gillan observed that the movement toward open access to academic journals began about twenty years ago, allowing scholars to publish their own work for a fee. Professor Glass commented that the UI libraries are facilitating that movement. He added that open access shifts the costs of publishing onto scholars themselves. Scholars in the sciences with access to grant money benefit more from an open access system than do scholars in the humanities with limited access to outside funding for their research. Professor Janssen noted that libraries play an important role in data transparency, by providing access to data repositories.

Professor Croft began her remarks about the [Council on Teaching](#) by observing that the committee's [charge](#) does not entirely reflect the committee's current activities. The charge calls for the committee to advise on all aspects related to teaching and to serve as a forum for discussion on teaching. The committee would willingly do both of these things, Professor Croft commented, but most of the members' time is taken up with choosing recipients for various teaching awards, such as the [President and Provost Award for Teaching Excellence](#), nominees for which the committee has just reviewed. In March, the committee will turn its attention to the selection of recipients for the [Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards](#). Professor Croft urged Councilors to spread the word about a lesser-known award, the [Teaching in Higher Education](#)

[Conference Award](#). Applications are reviewed three times per academic year, for summer, fall, and spring conferences. The newest award for which the Council on Teaching reviews nominations is the [Hubbard-Walder Award for Excellence in Teaching](#).

Professor Janssen asked how the teaching awards are funded. Professor Croft did not know the answer, but indicated that she would find out. Professor Greyser wondered if the Council on Teaching discussed any of the current issues impacting university teaching. Professor Croft responded that determining the recipients of the teaching awards takes up nearly all of the committee's time. However, she commented, in months during which no applications are being reviewed, the committee could possibly engage in such discussions. She added that the teaching statements that are submitted with the award nominations are an extraordinary testament to our faculty members' dedication to the teaching component of their jobs and stand as a rebuke to those who believe that the teaching of undergraduates is not valued at the UI.

Secretary Sheerin commented that compiling nomination packets for the committee's consideration can be burdensome for colleges. She wondered if the nomination process could be streamlined in some way. Professor Croft indicated that she would discuss this with the committee. She speculated that some colleges have established an efficient process for assembling and submitting nominations, which may lead to faculty members in those colleges receiving a greater number of teaching awards. The development of a teaching statement may also not be prioritized in some colleges.

Vice President Gillan suggested that the recent shift from paper-based teaching evaluations by students to an entirely online format and the resulting decrease in the number of evaluations submitted could be a topic for the committee to consider. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez observed that research has indicated that students tend to evaluate underrepresented minority and women faculty members more harshly, thus making student evaluations a problematic indicator of teaching competence. Professor Croft reiterated that she would make an effort to discuss these and other important teaching issues with the committee going forward.

- *Instructional Faculty Track Review Committee Report – Discussion of Recommendations (Ana Rodríguez-Rodríguez)*

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reminded the group that the Council had discussed the report recommendations involving Senate representation at the October and November meetings. The Faculty Senate Committee on Rules and Bylaws will now take up that issue and eventually present recommendations to the Council. Today, she would like for the Council to discuss the report's other recommendations. She added that any proposed policy changes called for by the report would be addressed by the Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and by the Office of the Provost. Recommendations relating to review, roles, and morale would be more difficult for the Senate to address directly. These issues mainly fall under the purview of the colleges. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez indicated that she had sent the report to the collegiate deans last week and encouraged them to engage in ongoing conversations with the Senate officers about concerns raised in the report.

Beginning with the recommendations related to *titles and ranks*, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez indicated that the report called for changing the title of the first rank, *lecturer*, of the instructional track to *assistant professor of instruction/practice*. This change would provide congruity with the other tracks, all of which use *assistant professor* for their initial rank, as well as distinguish faculty on the instructional track from faculty members in fixed-term appointments; the latter are also given the title of *lecturer*. When instructional-track faculty (ITF) were surveyed, they indicated that the *lecturer* title made them feel devalued by the university. A second recommendation related to *titles and ranks* called for clarifying the distinction between *professor of practice* and *professor of instruction* in the *Definitions and Qualifications for specific ranks* sections of the ITF policy. The Senate officers observed that *professor of practice* has limited use across the university, occurring primarily in the Tippie College of Business. Past President Marshall explained that individuals who are given this title have typically come to the university after years spent in a career outside of academia. They offer students the valuable perspective and knowledge of a practitioner in a specific field.

Professor Joseph commented that her field, nursing, is a practice discipline and therefore all College of Nursing faculty members are practitioners, to some extent. She cautioned that the *professor of practice* title might be met with skepticism in a practice-oriented college such as hers. Secretary Sheerin, one of the co-chairs of the report, noted that she had practiced in her field, law, for several years, but was hired into her current teaching position because of her commitment to teaching. The *professor of practice* title would typically only be given to a highly-accomplished and well-known practitioner in a particular field. She added that, at the time of promotion, it must be clear that professors of practice are evaluated based on the unique experience they provide to students, while professors of instruction are evaluated on the advancement of their pedagogical goals.

Professor Janssen observed that the *professor of practice* title relates to what an individual has done prior to arriving at the university, rather than to what that individual does after arriving. The instructional track is a teaching-focused position. The way that *practice* is described by the policy seems very similar to expectations of faculty on the clinical track, she continued. Clinical-track faculty are evaluated on both their practice and their teaching skills. Are instructional-track professors of practice still engaged in their professions after they are hired here? Perhaps those given the title of *professor of practice* should not be on the instructional track at all. Secretary Sheerin observed that in the College of Law, clinical-track faculty are practicing lawyers. Faculty hired on the instructional track, however, no longer practice law but only teach. A suggestion was made to edit the policy to say that *Professors of Practice bring distinguished experience to the university from a variety of different professions*. Professor Janssen commented that using *university* instead of *classroom* distances the professor of practice from the teaching mission of the instructional track. Past President Marshall noted that professors of practice bring a unique perspective to their teaching that reflects their recent experience in their field. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez added that another difference between *professors of practice* and *professors of instruction* is that professors of practice are not expected to have terminal degrees in their fields.

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez then moved on to the recommendation regarding *length of term*, which called for lengthening ITF contract terms to reflect the title associated with each level of promotion. Longer terms would provide more job security to ITF, boost ITF morale, permit a higher level of long-term planning and commitment to the college and university, allow ITF greater opportunity to serve in faculty governance bodies, and attract highly qualified candidates interested in the university. Secretary Sheerin indicated that the policy currently provides a range for the length of terms for each rank with the result that each college can determine, within these ranges, its own length of term for each rank. Some colleges have adopted the higher end of this range, while others have adopted the lower end. The report recommends that these ranges be more uniform across the university, with a three-year minimum for the assistant rank, a five-year minimum for the associate rank, and a five- to seven-year minimum for the professor rank. Probationary one- to three-year appointments would be permitted at each rank, however.

Professor Greyser pointed out the extra departmental and collegiate labor involved when ITF on shorter contracts need to be continuously reviewed for reappointments that in many cases could just be automatic. Professor Shibli-Rahhal wondered why the ITF length of term ranges couldn't correspond to those for the clinical track, which are more favorable. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez observed that the ITF policy was written several years ago, when there was some concern about its creation. Many of the policy's provisions, such as those regarding length of term, reflect a desire to give colleges a wide latitude in implementing the policy. The purpose of the policy's five-year review is to determine how to revise the policy based on our experiences with implementation. Councilors speculated on the feasibility of setting strict minimums, including seven-year minimums for the professor rank, but realized that collegiate budget constraints may not permit this. The clinical track may provide ranges rather than strict minimums, as well. The stability of longer length of term ranges is a potent recruiting tool, as well as an incentive to seek promotion, Councilors agreed.

Turning to *review and promotion*, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez recognized that the Faculty Senate has limited ability to act here because colleges and departments are permitted to set their own criteria for review and promotion, using the university policy as a baseline. The report's survey results revealed concerns about collegiate policies regarding promotion and review, however, so the review committee urged colleges to ensure that their policies are consistent with the requirements of the university policy. Consistency between the colleges and their departments is also necessary. This five-year review of the instructional track can be an opportunity for colleges to assess their review and promotion criteria and policies for coherency and fairness. Past President Marshall expressed the view that all the faculty tracks might benefit from this type of collegiate reassessment. Councilors observed that some colleges have committees set up to review their internal policies and procedures. Secretary Sheerin noted that the Office of the Provost has the responsibility to oversee implementation of collegiate policies and ensure that they are in compliance with university policy. Professor Janssen voiced support for more stringent university policies that would eliminate the ambiguity often encountered in collegiate and departmental policies. She added that clarification of the expectations for each level of each track is an essential first step. Also, promotion committees should include at least one faculty member from the track of the person undergoing review. Several Councilors took

issue with the collegiate practice of permitting tenure-track faculty to participate in promotion review for clinical-track faculty, but not allowing clinical-track faculty to participate in such review for tenure-track faculty. This practice has the effect of lowering morale for clinical-track faculty.

Morale was the next recommendation that President Rodríguez-Rodríguez addressed, particularly the suggestion made by the review committee to establish an ITF advisory board or a standing ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to address the issues affecting ITF. Secretary Sheerin speculated that separating out the ITF from the main Senate may imply that the instructional track is not equal to the other tracks; on the other hand, including ITF in the main Senate may serve to dilute the ITF voice. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez commented that a separate ad hoc committee could be effective if good communication among the committee, the officers and the Council is established. Past President Marshall advocated for a united Senate, in which faculty on all tracks are represented and support each other. Professor Kivlighan added that restructuring track representation within the Senate could further this vision of a united and fully representative Senate. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reiterated that the Senate's Rules and Bylaws Committee will soon be considering potential changes to the Senate structure.

In concluding this discussion of the report recommendations, President Rodríguez-Rodríguez acknowledged that overall change would likely not come quickly, but that the Senate does have power to act on some of the recommendations. For other recommendations, the Senate can continually bring these issues to the attention of administrators.

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

President Rodríguez-Rodríguez reported that a new national search for the Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Carver College of Medicine has been announced. The co-chairs for the [new search committee](#) are Professor Matthew Howard, chair and department executive officer of the Department of Neurosurgery, and Dean Edith Parker, from the College of Public Health. The Senate officers had been asked to submit names for consideration as search committee members; one of these individuals was appointed to the committee. The officers invited Councilors to contact them with any questions, comments, or concerns about the search process.

On March 3, the Office of the Provost will host the [15th Annual Women Faculty Development Conference](#). The conference will focus on personal wellness, professional development, and networking.

The review of the Office of the Vice President for Research that was postponed because of the pandemic will now take place this semester.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, February 7, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Joseph moved and Professor Shibli-Rahhal seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Rodríguez-Rodríguez adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.