

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Tuesday, 2 March 1999

Penn State Room (337), IMU

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

Members Absent: A. Bhattacharjee, L. Burmeister (excused), M. Clark, C. Colvin.

Guests: L. Clark, J. Coulter, J. Folkins, J. Whitmore (Provost Office); C. Green (Library Committee); C. Johnson (*Daily Iowan*); S. Lucas, D. Mandersheid, D. Yarbrough (Center for Teaching Review Committee); T. Rocklin (Center for Teaching).

- I. The meeting was called to order by President Wiley at 3:36 PM
- II. Prof. Curto moved, seconded by Prof. Lynch, to approve the agenda for the meeting. The agenda was approved without dissent.
- III. Prof. Tachau moved, seconded by Prof. Stone, to approve the minutes of the Faculty Council meeting of 16 February 1999. The minutes were approved without dissent.

IV. Announcements

- A. Ms. Sandy Cosgrove has decided not to remain as Senate Office Coordinator. Carol TeBockhorst will take on the position starting 8 March 1999.
- B. Councilors were reminded of the reception by Pres. Mary Sue Coleman on 13 April.
- C. The survey on faculty research and service has a 55% return rate at present; additional responses were solicited.
- D. Senate officers and others are discussing entrance requirements for undergraduates to improve the quality of their education. Participation by Councilors was solicited.
- E. Nominations for the Brody award are being considered by the committee.
- F. Nominations for the Senate election have been received and there has been a gratifying response by nominees as being willing to serve.
- G. Nominations for Senate and Charter Committee service have been received but the Committee on Committees has not yet met to consider them.
- H. Prof. Tachau reported that the F.A.R.L. (Faculty for Academic Research Libraries) group encourages Councilors to join them in meeting with Mr. Wedgeworth, an external consultant on the University Library, 1:30-2:30 on 9 March 1999 (room yet to be decided).

V. Old Business

- A. Report from the Libraries Committee - Carin Green, Chair.

Librarians, Senate presidents and faculty from SUI, ISU, and UNI all met during the recent Regents meeting to discuss serial acquisition costs and going together as group to speak with the governor and legislature about these issues. Also discussed were pro-

posals to control subscription increases, to help faculty change article placement, and to discover new venues for disseminating scholarly writing that guarantee quality but do not enrich commercial publishers. Another meeting of this group will be held at ISU in two weeks. Prof. Green asked the Council for approval of the efforts so far and for a recommendation to the Faculty Senate to support the undertaking by the three Regents' universities to seek the legislature's and the governor's assistance in managing these exorbitant price increases.

Prof. Cox asked whether the group was seeking more money. Prof. Green responded that their major impetus now is educational rather than financial; they are trying to change the means by which publishers control faculty. Prof. Kline noted that libraries throughout the world are involved; will the governor and/or the legislature be asked to bring these issues forward to national bodies? Prof. Green agreed that might be a good idea and reminded Councilors that the problem is felt most by research libraries. German Universities have also protested to the same publishers, stating "You are destroying the universities". On the subject of funding for the libraries Provost Whitmore reported 8% increases in the acquisition budget for the past two years and requested also this year of the governor, who recommended 6%. Provost Whitmore hoped that starting from this point we might obtain an increase in the future. He suggested that that the group talk with Mr. Larry Murphy, a legislative affairs consultant to the University and an ex-legislator. Prof. Curto noted that US libraries will need to watch out for differential pricing among countries. Prof. Green reported there was already evidence that American universities are bearing the brunt of cost increases. Our libraries are expected by publishers to carry their profits as the economies of other countries collapse. Prof. Tachau recommended that the University Counsel be consulted on anti-trust implications of publishers' actions and hoped that Gov. Vilsack can be brought up to speed soon. Prof. Green agreed that educating local government agencies is critical. A motion by President Wiley to endorse the Library Group's efforts was passed by acclamation.

B. Report from the Council on Teaching on the Center for Teaching - David Manderscheid.

Pres. Wiley introduced the topic by reminding Councilors that the Center for Teaching was established for three years only; a recommendation was needed to continue its operations. Prof. Manderscheid opined that the report, distributed before the meeting with comments from the Center staff, speaks for itself. There was very little controversy and very high opinions of the Center, including strong support from faculty and graduate students. The staff quality is high, as is the potential for outside funding. The Center has an impressive record of leveraging its limited funds to achieve a high profile. Prof. Lynch asked how the Center fits in with the University's strategic plan. Prof. Manderscheid noted that the strategic plan expects high-quality teaching. In response to a question from Prof. Lynch about how the quality of teaching would be measured, Assoc. Provost Folkins stated that the really substantive issues in quality of teaching are determined by the faculty. The role of the Center is to provide more tools to faculty, not to create measures of quality. The fraction of faculty involved in undergraduate education, for example, is determined by colleges and departments, not the Center. The Center should be evaluated by process measures.

It was moved by Prof. Curto, Prof. Kline seconding, to endorse the report of the review committee and to accept their recommendation for a subsequent review in five years. The motion passed without dissent.

C. Policy on Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources - Jeffrey Cox.

Pres. Wiley informed Councilors that Draft E of the policy had become available on 2/24/99; it was then distributed. Prof. Cox reported that he, Senator M. David, Webmaster C. Preuss, and University Counsel M. Schantz met to discuss matters regarding the policy that had been raised in the 2 February 1999 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Their longest discussion was on part III of the policy, "Security and Privacy." The revised language stressed bringing in the concepts of "probable cause," requiring consultation with the University Counsel before monitoring individual users, and generally notifying users before monitoring. Informal resolutions of disputed use will be the norm. All references to telephones were removed since they raise different issues and there is already a separate telephone policy. Prof. Curto asked if the telephone is not an information technology resource. Prof. Cox responded yes it is not. When asked about faxing Prof. Cox noted that the distinction between telephones and computers is blurred and their policies may overlap. Assoc. Provost Clark asked about provision IV. F.: personal use may be excessive if takes place during regularly scheduled work time. Prof. Cox stated that wage earners would likely be impacted more than anyone else and pointed out that some work places may forbid all personal use of computers. Supervisors will supply detailed guidance for computer use and will determine rules. He reported that UIHC believes any personal use is excessive. Prof. Bishara asked about which was being limited, usage time or content, and if the latter, how can content be monitored without a court order? Prof. Cox responded that the university can under the policy inspect files and/or monitor usage. Prof. Carlson noted that all computer files were university property, and warned that conversations could be monitored if they were stored on a university computer or crossed university lines. Assoc. Provost Folkins opined there is a threshold of "personal": after a use was determined as personal, then the amount would be evaluated to see if it were excessive. Prof. Cox asserted that the amount of use cannot be the conclusive criterion since this policy is designed to avoid, among other uses, commercial businesses; any amount of that would be forbidden. Prohibited uses are specified and they would constitute "probable cause." Prof. Curto wondered about a scenario in which an altercation between two faculty members via e-mail becomes degraded from professional to personal. Prof. Stone stated that the issue would be decided finally by the University Counsel, on appeal from ITS via the DEO (who would make the initial determination). Prof. Kline suggested that one standard for everybody is cumbersome; students differ from faculty and staff. Prof. Cox reported that ITS was absolutely determined to have a global policy. Prof. Tachau asked whether it might be unfair in law to have different policies for faculty, students, and outside contractors? Prof. Cox answered no. Prof. Carlson asked why the first sentence in IV. F. had been deleted; it is both true and helpful [the sentence read "Although modest personal use may improve the skills of individual users and otherwise contribute indirectly to the University's mission, excessive personal use can infringe upon the rights of others."] Prof. Cox suggested reintroducing the sentence. Profs. Tachau and Bishara asked what is meant by "regularly scheduled work time" for faculty; is after 5:00 PM okay for personal use? Prof. Cox guessed it was. Prof. Menninger pointed out that merit employees were entitled to breaks and lunch hours and asked whether personal use was permissible then. There seemed to be general agreement that it would be. Prof. Milavetz asked if a user seriously jeopardized a substantial interest of the university would they shut down the offending computer? Prof. Cox responded, yes; activities that threaten damage to the system or criminal activity might even excuse lack of notification of monitoring. He went on to note that the point of the policy is not punishment; rather it is protection of the computer system.

Pres. Wiley suggested that, without approving this document per se, the Council might reinsert the sentence preferred by Carlson and then refer the revised policy to the Senate for its 23 March 1999 meeting. Prof. Kline moved, Prof. Tachau seconding, to refer the

revised policy to the Faculty Senate with the reinserted language. The motion passed without dissent.

Prof. Stone wondered whether faculty without a computer on their desk might resent voting on this policy; not all faculty have access to computers. Assoc. Provost Folkins stated that if Councilors knew someone without computers he would try to get them one. Prof. Curto noted that some departments have computers that may not be connected to the internet. Provost Whitmore stated that some departments have only modem connections. Prof. Curto pointed out that computers can't always obtain attached documents via modem. Assoc. Provost Folkins reported that phase 10 of the campus wiring plan was in progress; when completed, almost everyone will have at least 28k modem connectivity. It was the sense of the Council that all faculty should have access to a computer with connectivity sufficient to attach documents to e-mail.

D. Specifications of Promotion Standards - Jonathan Carlson.

Prof. Carlson portrayed the issue as a conflict in the Operations Manual between promotion standards, which state that a decision to promote and/or grant tenure should be determined by the standards in effect at time of most recent appointment, reappointment, etc., with the dispute procedures, which state that the standards for promotion or tenure are those in effect at time of the original appointment. The proposed changes, as amended, were distributed to the Council. The University Counsel has been asked to comment but has not yet done so. The thrust of the proposed changes is for both promotion and dispute procedures to use the standards in effect at time of the original appointment or promotion to current rank, unless too long an interval has elapsed. In the latter case, either the standards in effect three years previously or the current standards would be used. The Council was asked to discuss whether this is sensible in principle.

Prof. Curto pointed out that the remedy for too long an interval would be to go back three years but for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor the standards would go back six years. Prof. Carlson agreed, stating that if one was at any rank more than the typical interval, one would need some warning about the applicable standards. While three years is arbitrary, it is also the standard appointment period. Prof. Tachau noted that the newly adopted promotion procedures should be consistent with the proposed revisions. Assoc. Provost Clark stated that procedures now vary widely so the language of the revision should include explicit reference to departmental custom. Prof. Curto pointed out that the term "extension" is technically defined so its parenthetical phrase should not be confusing. Prof. Carlson, responding to a question from Prof. Jew, stated that lots of places in the Operations manual will need to be changed to achieve consistency in the standards appropriate for Assistant and Associate Professors. Prof. Wiley noted that the issue is still an open question and urged Councilors to send their comments to him for forwarding to the University Counsel. Prof. Bishara asked if notification will be given to faculty that they may make an election between current or previous standards. Assoc. Provost Clark responded that the final language will indicate it will be the clear responsibility of the DEO to inform candidates they must make an election of standards. Prof. Curto suggested inserting "in writing" after "election." Following a suggestion from Prof. Pincus, any further revisions will be distributed by e-mail before the next Council meeting.

VI. New Business

There was no new business to discuss.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
John R. Menninger, Secretary