

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, March 6, 2007

MINUTES

Present: L. Boyle; C. Catney; M. Cohen; D. D'Alessandro; D. Drake; P. Heidger; S. McGuire; F. Mitros; S. Moorhead; M. O'Hara; C. Ringen; L. Snetselaar; D. Thomas; B. Thompson; and J. Woodhead

Excused: V. Dominguez and J. Tomkovicz

Officers Present: R. LeBlond, V. Sharp, and J. Glass

Officers Absent: S. Kurtz

Guests: M. Artman (Pediatrics), G. Christensen (Engineering), S. Collins (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee); C. Drum (University Relations); J. Gorman (Human Resources); J. Hermsen (Human Resources); M. Hogan (Provost); S. Johnson (AP, Faculty); J. Kearney (CLAS); C. Lynch (Epidemiology); C. Orgren (Emeritus Lib and Info Science); R. Saunders (University Human Resources & Benefits); A. Shurson (*The Daily Iowan*); and J. Spratt (Pharmacology Emeritus)

The meeting opened at 3:29 pm. Vice President Victoria Sharp presided over the meeting in President Kurtz's absence.

- I. Minutes of February 20, 2007 – Professor Ringen had previously sent corrections to Evalyn regarding membership on the Gender Equity Task Force. She moved that the minutes be approved with said revisions; Professor McGuire seconded; voice vote; motion passed.
- II. Reports –
 - A. Preliminary discussion of mandatory insurance for students, A.J. Cannon, Chair, Student Health Advisory Committee

The resolution to mandate student insurance was presented to the Shared Governance Council, which is not authorized to take action. Since that meeting, the word was changed from “health insurance” to “insurance”.

Mr. Cannon provided a brief background to this issue. He said it provided obvious benefits to the UI, its students and faculty. Health science students have been required to have health insurance since 1996; international students since 1980.

The policy would cover any student enrolled at UI for 5 credit hours or more who does not have any form of health insurance. The UI would incur no cost for implementation—we

already have a way to track and enforce the policy. He cited several Big Ten and other institutions that already have this policy in place.

At the UI, 10% of students do not have health care (15% is the national average). Due to health care expenses, there is the potential for students to end their education. It has happened at UI for one who declared bankruptcy. He cited his own appendectomy. Had he not been insured, it would have cut off his education by one year. It could potentially happen to anyone.

He cited game theory:

- If there is an incident and you don't have insurance, it could easily mean \$10,000 in expenses;
- If you have insurance but not incident, you would have invested \$3-4K over a few years;
- If you have insurance, and you have insurance you could save \$10,000+.

The only way to pursue education without the possibility of ending it because of medical expenses is to buy insurance. If students know that they have health insurance, they are more likely to be treated and can achieve a greater degree of health.

The floor was open to discussion. Professor Ringen questioned if insurance would be in addition to mandatory Student Health fees. It would, but Student Health does not offer comprehensive services; the insurance is meant for catastrophic illness. There is probably minimal overlap between Student Health and other hospital services.

The insurance for a single student would cost about \$85/month. Richard Saunders, UI Benefits, noted this covers individuals up to \$200,000 with a low deductible; \$50 outpatient services; low prescription fees, provides worldwide coverage; and it does not discriminate by age or disability. There is \$10 co-payment for mental health and substance abuse treatment. Students who are covered by their parents' insurance are waived, but must be prepared to show proof of coverage by a random audit. Since it would be mandatory, students would be allowed to factor it in their financial aid. There are provisions for dependents. Although mandated for students with 5 credit hours and above, it would also be available to all students, no matter how few hours they are registered for.

It was noted that this was tabled by the BOR a few years ago and that ISU and UNI do not have similar policies in place. Mr. Cannon said this is why it is especially important to show consensus of opinion from students, staff and faculty. It is also important to speak with legislators.

Professor Cohen moved to endorse the resolution calling for mandatory student insurance; it was seconded by Professor McGuire; all in favor; the motion carried.

B. Issues related to Lottery advertising, Professor Charles Lynch, Chair, Presidential Committee on Athletics

Lynch briefly described the issue at hand, that the state lottery promotion had used the UI logo and put its own words to the tune of the *Iowa Fight Song*. He first heard about it from Athletic Director Gary Barta, who told him the commercial crosses the line. Barta had not been involved in this commercial, but said he would take personal responsibility for these advertisements. He assured the PCA he would be more

involved in the future, but also that they would continue the relationship with the Lottery. Some PCA members thought we should cut ties with gambling altogether. He has moved it to the April PCA meeting for further discussion. He will seek one motion to accept the department's position; and another motion to cut ties with the Lottery, although he does not know if the committee really wants a vote, or a ballot vote. It will be a public meeting. Lynch pointed out that his committee advises the university administration who, along with the Athletics Department, will take it to the next steps.

Lynch did not know if the UI is the only Big Ten program associated with a state-run lottery. He said the state has received millions of dollars in educational support from the lottery, which contributed to the Athletic Department's view about continuing ties with the Lottery.

Professor McGuire, a member of the PCA, said that Mr. Barta has addressed that we are not following NCAA guidelines; his position is that we will distance ourselves from the lottery. Lynch said there will be more oversight provided; but he won't go all the way to cut those ties; The Athletics Department has to raise its own money to support itself and they have to find ways to support their activities; it's a tough decision for them because it involves dollars.

Professor Cohen, also a member of the PCA said that councilors heard Betsy Altmaier's opinion at the last meeting and now Dr. Lynch's more neutral approach. He thought the most powerful thing councilors can do is to vote on this.

In response to Professor Ringen's question if there evidence that the commercials result in more revenue for the lottery, Dr. Lynch said yes. There would be no incentives if they weren't getting funds from them. It's not been an issue in the past because we haven't had such a blatant commercial. The widow of Meredith Wilson, who wrote *The Iowa Fight Song*, said that it was an inappropriate use of the song.

Professor McGuire said that he is very sympathetic to Professor Altmaier's position. This is a difficult choice; the one thing it does not address is that we are not following the NCAA guidelines. It's important because the Athletic Department represents the university.

Professor LeBlond said there is no direct financial relationship from the lottery into Athletics. It goes to the state and then into the university via the general fund. Next year there will be no general fund into Athletics.

Asked if we could still have the fund but not do the advertising, Lynch said he did not know.

Asked what Professors Cohen and McGuire need from the Faculty Council to inform their decision, Professor McGuire responded that the discussion about financial constraints and the need for more money is a non-starter. Simply, it is not within

NCAA's guidelines! He thought the guidelines are such that we are being asked to stand up or down with these principles. We have to be interested in students' welfare. This group would impact the vote.

Professor LeBlond said the issue is about whether or not the UI should endorse the lottery; we should not make a special case out of Athletics.

Professor O'Hara moved that the Faculty Council go on record to urge the Athletics Department and the PCA to drop the Athletics Department's association with the Lottery. The motion was seconded by Professor Thomas. There was a unanimous voice vote in favor, with one abstention for conflict of interest; the motion carried.

C. E-Personnel File Project, Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty

AP Johnson described a personnel file system that would be electronic, not paper-based. An advisory committee was formed, including Professor Lynn Richman, who is a Faculty Senator. It is not yet ready to be implemented. There's no need for a vote; this is just for information.

It is apparent that we have a great deal of information in electronic databases through Self-Service, so this is not about developing a whole new system, but rather extending the system we already have. If we exclude disciplinary action forms, half of the documents listed on the document she provided are already on line.

The issues that need to be resolved are exactly what kinds of things should be put into this file and who can have access to it and when. The committee will consider this. In the *Ops Manual* there are guidelines about what goes into a staff person's file, but not about what goes into a faculty personnel file. She will return the Council when this has been clarified. Judie Hermesen, Senior Assistant Director, Human Resources, said they do not have a target date. Their original timeline was suspended as the issues became more complicated. The committee is working separately on a variety of issues, including online faculty hiring. It may be implemented within the next fiscal year.

There are generally six – ten files across campus that constitute the personnel file. There are practical reasons to have a consolidated file in central HR; however, files related to disciplinary actions will not be in there. They are held in various places, but mostly within departments.

Priority is being given to include these documents: time records, credentials, employment history (e.g., conflict of interest reports), and faculty-specific documents such as extensions of probationary periods, which are currently paper-based. An electronic *cv* is a separate project related to this. Further information about this will be forthcoming. Although cumbersome, faculty will have the opportunity to make revisions.

D. Faculty Policy and Compensation Committee update, Professor Michael O'Hara, Chair

Professor O'Hara wanted to comment on salary and salary decisions. He wanted to thank the Provost for the pools for faculty salaries over the past few years; but this has required a substantial reallocation. We're moving up in our peer group—8 out of 11. His committee endorses the Provost's goal to move us up to the midpoint. They think it should continue to be the principal priority.

The Governor is recommending full funding of faculty salaries—if funded by the legislators—we hope it will flow directly and proportionately to the university. It's important for recruiting and retention; it's important to keep our status. We may make a big push this year, but we have to be able to stay there. The committee is once again supportive of the Provost's efforts, and he hopes his colleagues and all faculty will get behind another strong year of faculty salaries.

Professor LeBlond asked what the priorities are on compensation issues. He noted that approximately 100 faculty positions have been lost. Faculty need to be thinking about pursuing new faculty lines and shifting workloads. There are competing strategies that need to be considered.

Provost Hogan thanked the faculty. He said last year's reallocation of university resources is what took the UI from number 11 to number 8. He hopes we are able to "bite the bullet" one more year have about 5 or 5.7%, an 11% jump in the past two years. He would like to do as much as 6.5% this year. He also wanted to thank the Governor; this is looking like the best higher education bill that the Regents have had in a decade, because of the funding we are likely to get from the state. It might otherwise have taken several more years.

Provost Hogan thanked our local delegation, Bob Dvorsky in particular. The original goal was to end up in the bottom of the top tier. That plan is now defunct. To get from number 6 to number 4 is a very big leap. Once we've gotten to the middle of the pack, he said, it's a good time to sit back and speak with the Deans about whether this is a good idea, or if we should stop doing that and reallocate to lost faculty lines. Without prejudice to the outcome, he wanted to encourage our Deans to discuss it.

E. Research Track Proposal, Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty, and Dr. Paul Rothman, DEO, Internal Medicine

Associate Provost Susan Johnson asked for Councilors' thoughts concerning the proposed Research Track. No vote was necessary at this time. She provided a brief overview to the policy, stating that it would establish university guidelines to allow individual colleges to establish a non-tenure research track, allowing people to be appointed to certain levels, laid out on the distributed handout. Salaries would largely come from grants and funds generated by those faculty members.

Universities around the country handle this differently; some offer bridge support, others do not. The purpose of the track is to allow for the hiring of folks to support certain kinds of

research enterprises where particular skills are needed and where there is no instruction involved. These people are hired on soft money so it provides flexibility.

On the 2005 NIH funding list naming the top 25 recipients of NIH money, out of the top ten public institutions, Johnson reported at least nine have a research track. The University of Iowa was 14th among public schools in that year.

Johnson explained that this has been percolating for several years in the CCOM, and that she was asked a few years ago to try to crystallize a policy. Pat Winokur, Chair of the CCOM Executive Committee, has also been involved. The CCOM is in support of this track as a way to provide a more robust research platform, to take advantage of research opportunities. Their intention and goal is to promote the University of Iowa and its stature.

Dr. Paul Rothman, DEO, Internal Medicine and one of the drafters of the proposal, said there is an NIH roadmap on how research will be conducted in the future. Scientists will move beyond the confines of their individual disciplines into team science. Scientists with a different skill set than in past decades will be the ones to get funded. He cited a new program in the Heart Institute which needs people from all different disciplines. They cannot all be hired as tenure track. This is where the research track would be helpful. Rather than hiring them under the usual model of research scientists, they are more likely to recruit a large complement of the people if they are called a “research professor”. He added that they will not want to come if they cannot have that title.

There is anecdotal data from those who sit on NIH grant reviews that an “assistant research professor” is looked upon more favorably than a “research scientist.” AP Johnson added that those most interested are likely to be clinical or interdisciplinary departments.

Professor Cohen cited recent discussions about the extension of the tenure clock to illustrate a response to how research is changing. He said a research track is imperative and welcomed the flexibility it would provide.

Professor Ringen questioned the impact on graduate students, whether there would be competition between faculty and graduate students, and de facto mentors in the lab. AP Johnson said this is handled differently at the top 25 institutions. We could have a policy here that would require that research faculty members would have to individually apply to the Graduate College to be allowed to serve on graduate committees or to serve as a co-mentor of a graduate student – and we could require that primary mentor would have to be a tenured faculty member. Professor Woodhead commented that it would not have the same impact as the CCOM does not have graduate students in the usual way. If a biochemistry graduate student worked there, they would still have their own department.

Professor Thomas wondered about competition for resources and if this would prevent tenure track positions being made. Professor Cohen did not think space would be managed in favor of research rather than tenure track faculty.

Professor O'Hara commented that research scientists are tied to a PI, a tenured faculty member. He said it was unclear whether this discussion was about naming "associate research scientists" as an "assistant research professor." He wondered if they enjoy academic freedom.

Professor LeBlond said that they are PI's in their own right, funded researchers and that they can explore new areas. They can establish their own program. This gives them more academic freedom as a faculty member than as a research scientist, who are wedded and tied to the lab they work in. AP Johnson said the vision here is to have them as independent contributors. She added that most of the university policies she reviewed expected at least 4 months notice when grant runs out. Some, but not all, institutions also allow departments or colleges to provide limited bridge funding. There's no getting around the fact that these are soft money positions.

LeBlond and Johnson gave a brief history about how the clinical track was developed out of the patient care mission and as a result of specialization.

Professor Mitros asked for assurances that there will not be a negative impact on patient care. Potentially there is a scenario raised on the research side, and they will have less time to spend teaching and providing patient care. As the clinical track evolves, the bar is raised for RVU's and the time it takes. Dr. Rothman said he did not think this affects the research track at all. It is very hard to have an "academic triple threat," he said, and it is not going to trip the balance of the tri-partite mission. Guest Dr. Michael Artman (Pediatrics) said that in medicine, each disciplinary *division* has to be a triple threat, but faculty within are not expected to be.

Professor McGuire asked what this would do to governance and teaching missions within other colleges that have a different relationship with teaching, research and service. He added, when these guidelines are formulated, the first thing to recognize is that it is being driven by funding.

Dean Barry Butler, of the College of Engineering, said he wants to recognize people who are doing this. Some research scientists have a much higher profile than other faculty members; they are very competitive in getting grants from the NIH and other places. From the research unit side there is a strong interest in his college.

Professor Emeritus Spratt called for an open and honest discussion before a final decision is taken. He cautioned to think first of unintended consequences. AP Johnson will send him a copy of the data she cited earlier.

Professor Joe Kearney, Associate Dean of Research in CLAS, said there was apprehension in his college. Clearly we all benefit from more science and research, but the bottom line is it costs money to make money. We have to try to understand the economics of this. He asked what the initial investment would be. There is some apprehension about increasing the infrastructure to do the larger structure of research.

Provost Hogan congratulated the Faculty Council for its serious discussion on one of the most important topics at the university. He explained that this issue emerged the first year he arrived on campus and that it was the subject of a Faculty Senate retreat. Since then it lost momentum. Discussions were undertaken in CCOM and they have come forward with a proposal that has strong support from their faculty. He asked that this be addressed and brought to some kind of resolution.

If the CCOM is not competitive in the top 20, he added, what does that mean for the university? He would like to stay ahead of that very serious problem. He added that we cannot afford to hire enough faculty to do it. Research track faculty coming in will pay their own salary and some start-up costs. We will do it because the NIH roadmap says it has to be done.

Professor Glass expressed concern about having an open competition for these positions and Professor LeBlond said they should be limited to three-years.

The next step for the proposal is to be considered by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, and then it will come back to the Faculty Council for a vote.

F. Announcements -

- Vice President Sharp is working on the summer retreat agenda.
- Faculty Senate elections March 2 – 10, 2007
- Faculty Council elections March 23 – 31, 2007
- Faculty Senate Meeting: Tuesday, March 20, 3:30- 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol
- Professor McGuire announced that Councilor Downing Thomas has just been appointed as Associate Dean in International Programs. Councilors applauded and congratulated him.

G. Adjournment – The meeting closed at 5:21 pm

The next meeting of the Faculty Council will be **Tuesday, April 3, 2007, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Penn State Room, IMU.**