

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Tuesday, 16 February 1999

Room 335, IMU

Members Present: A. Bhattacharjee, S. Bishara, J. Carlson, K. Clark, C. Colvin, J. Cox, R. Curto, J. Jew, J. Kline, J. Menninger, G. Milavetz, M. Pincus, M. Stone, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman, R. Wiley

Members Absent (excused): C. Lynch

Members Absent: L. Burmeister

Guests: L. Muller, C. Drum, J. Knight, L. Clark, J. Folkins

I. The meeting was called to order by President Wiley at 3:34 PM

II. Prof. Tachau moved, seconded by Prof. Bishara to approve the agenda for the meeting. The agenda was approved without dissent.

III. Prof. Jew moved, seconded by Prof. Bishara to approve the minutes of the Faculty Council meeting of 19 January 1999. The minutes were amended to correct the wording of the pending "Qualifications for Faculty Ranks", then approved without dissent.

IV. Announcements

A. Ms. Sandy Cosgrove, formerly of the College of Law staff, will be the new Faculty Senate Office Coordinator.

B. President Wiley has reserved the Hoover room at 1:30 PM, 17 February 1999, for a meeting with other Regents' institution faculty officers to discuss library matters, especially the increasing prices of scholarly journals and monographs.

C. Councilors were reminded that nominations for the Brody award are due.

D. Nominations for service on Charter and Faculty Senate Committees have been solicited by mail. Current members were reminded to inform the Committee on Committees if they are willing to continue serving.

E. Prof. Cox informed the Senate that the recently discussed policy on the Acceptable Use of Technology has been the subject of meetings with University Counsel Schantz. Agreement has been reached on revisions to the policy and it will be

available for discussion by the Faculty Council at its next meeting.

V. Old Business

A. Report from the Subcommittee on Compensation: Amitava Bhattacharjee, chair.

The subcommittee [Profs. Curto, Pincus, Stone and Wiley] was formed in response to an earlier discussion by the Council of press reports concerning the salary increases granted in 1998 to central administrators, in comparison with those granted to faculty. The subcommittee obtained data from the Vice President for Finance and University Services and had discussions with Mr. Don Szeszycki of the Provost's office and Mr. Doug Lee of Vice President True's office; all were thanked for their cooperation. Prof. Bhattacharjee displayed a table that showed salary increases for the past five years for certain full-time administrators: Deans, Vice Presidents and Associate Vice Presidents, 21 in all. Average salary increases were calculated (including all except those who are on phased retirement; an approximation was used to compensate for the interim Provost regime). These were compared with salary increases for general faculty and for College of Liberal Arts faculty.

The five-year increase for these administrators averaged 4.58% per year, for general faculty 4.13% per year, for Liberal Arts faculty 3.87% per year. In the last year, Liberal Arts faculty received a 3.89% increase, general faculty a 3.74% increase and the administrators a 4.38% increase. The substantial gap in average salary between these administrators and faculty is widening.

Prof. Bhattacharjee and other subcommittee members discussed various factors that impact these comparisons: the significant jump in salary that occurs when a new person replaces an administrator, retirements by senior faculty that are generally replaced by lower-paid junior faculty, college-to-college variation in salaries, etc.

Prof. Stone reminded Councilors that salary increases are mandated by the state legislature; rewarding one member of the faculty entails decreasing another by an equivalent amount. Prof. Pincus noted that the "faculty" list includes department executive officers so that the discrepancy between the listed administrators and regular faculty was even wider. Prof. Tachau pointed out that the top five administrators on the list included some who had not been replaced during the past five years; a salary difference between faculty and administrators of as much as \$85,000 could be used to hire more faculty, allowing them to cope better with the increasing numbers of students. Prof. Pincus opined that a more pertinent benchmark might be faculty at comparable universities, rather than administrators, but such data are difficult to obtain. Prof. Curto reminded Councilors that the legislature-mandated salary increases were the same for administrators and for faculty. Assoc. Provost Folkins agreed: the same mandated increases are assigned to

each pool and the amounts spent for salary increases are accounted for in reports to the Regents. He went on to suggest that deans as a group are rather successful and thus probably received higher than average increases when they were members of the faculty. Prof. Menninger calculated that if the listed administrators were receiving increases greater than the mandated level then other administrators must be receiving lower increases. Prof. Stone asked whether the news accounts that precipitated the issue were based on aberrations. Prof. Bhattacharjee responded that in the small print the complete story was told but the headlines and initial descriptions were incomplete and/or misleading. Prof. Cox asked whether there would be a written report by the subcommittee and President Wiley stated that there would. Prof. Cox pointed out that administrators' salaries are growing disproportionately in the general society; if this persists administrators will soon be living in a different world from the faculty, not a good outcome.

Prof. Tachau moved, Prof. Jew seconding, that the subcommittee prepare a written report and distribute it for a debate by the Faculty Senate. The motion was passed without dissent.

B. Definitions for Professorial Ranks: Bob Wiley, John Menninger.

Prof. Carlson moved, Prof. Colvin seconding, to take from the table the matter of Qualifications for Academic Rank. The motion was passed without dissent. The version agreed at the Council meeting of 19 January 1999 was distributed before the meeting and, as corrected earlier in this meeting, became the matter before the body. Prof. Menninger moved, Prof. Carlson seconding, to substitute new language, distributed before the meeting, for the qualifications. After a brief discussion the motion failed on show of hands.

The Council essentially converted itself into a committee of the whole to work out the language of the qualifications for scholarly/artistic productivity. The following language was adopted on a voice vote: "Demonstration of high-quality artistic or scholarly achievement supported by substantial publication, or equivalent artistic creations or performances, of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s)." A new preamble was adopted without dissent: "Each academic unit is expected to develop detailed tenure and promotion criteria consistent with the following qualifications. If the pattern and practice in some units deviate markedly from these qualifications, such units must obtain approval of the Provost for alternative criteria."

Following the adoption of this new language as amendments, the main motion was passed without dissent. The Council-proposed revisions to the Qualifications for Academic Ranks (University Operations Manual, Sec. III-10.4) are appended.

VI. New Business

A. Specification of Promotion Standards: Bob Wiley.

A new version of the standards, proposed by Prof. Carlson, will be discussed first with University Counsel Schantz and then brought before the Council.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Menninger, Secretary

Qualifications for Academic Ranks
(University Operations Manual, Sec. III-10.4)

Each academic unit is expected to develop detailed tenure and promotion criteria consistent with the following qualifications. If the pattern and practice in some units deviate markedly from these qualifications, such units must obtain approval of the Provost for alternative criteria.

Associate Professor

Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate postdoctoral, and professional students.

Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement supported by substantial publication, or equivalent artistic creations or performances, of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).

Departmental, collegiate and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level.

The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly/artistic accomplishment and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

Professor

Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs, where applicable.

Unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar or creative artist in the chosen field.

The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the department, college and/or the University, and, if appropriate, to the profession.