

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Tuesday, March 7, 2000

Penn State Room (#337), Iowa Memorial Union

Members Present: A. Bhattacharjee, J. Carlson, C. Carney-Doebbeling, K. Clark, C. Colvin, R. Curto, V. Grassian, J. Jew, C. Lynch for P. Pomrehn, D. Manderscheid, G. Milavetz, G. Parkin, M. Pincus, R. Slayton, M. Stone, B. Wiley

Members Absent: L. Geist, J. Kline, D. Liddell

Members Absent (excused): C. Berman

Guests: K. Buckwalter, L.A. Clark, J. Whitmore (Office of the Provost); S. Kurtz (Faculty); M. Chapman (Daily Iowan); J. Jacobson (Gazette); Carol Tebockhorst (Senate Staff Secretary)

I. President Carlson called the meeting to order at 3:37 PM.

II. Approvals

There being no objections, the meeting agenda was approved as revised.
The Faculty Council minutes of February 15, 2000 were approved as distributed.

The motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously:

MOTION: that Joseph A. Buckwalter (Professor, Orthopedics) be appointed to the Faculty Senate as a representative of the College of Medicine to replace Harold Adams for a term ending June 30, 2000.

The motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously:

MOTION: The Council approves and forwards to the Senate for its approval the Committee on Elections recommendation that Charles Lynch (Professor, Public Health) be appointed to the Faculty Council as a representative of the College of Medicine to replace Paul Pomrehn for a term ending June 30, 2000.

III. New Business

A. Leave Task Force Recommendations. This item of business was deferred to the April 11 meeting when Bob Foldesi will be invited to present and discuss proposed changes in sick leave, family leave, etc. policies.

B. State Budget Update

Although the University has not been informed about the legislative budget targets, it appears that the Legislature will support the Governor's recommendation to provide approximately 62% funding for salary increases at Regent institutions. It is possible that the Legislature will come in under the Governor's recommendations on other items in the University's budget. Central administration is meeting with various committees across campus to keep faculty, staff, and students informed about ongoing developments in the budget process and how they may be of assistance.

Faculty Council, the Budget Committee, and the Government Relations Committee will be meeting with local legislators on Friday to seek information and provide input about the University's budget requests.

President Carlson is preparing a document to be posted on the Faculty Senate website to inform all faculty members about the current state of the budget process, implications of budget cuts, and the University's plans for dealing with the budget issues.

IV. Old Business

A. Developmental leaves

Associate Provost Clark presented the latest revision of the faculty developmental leave policy. Notable changes include:

1. Allowing 9-month faculty to take a 2-semester leave "under exceptional circumstances."
2. Name change to "career development award" from the current "semester assignment."
3. Added paragraph re: deferring a granted award
4. Added paragraph to clarify that when the salary is paid wholly or largely by someone else (e.g., fellowship, grant agency, another University), such a leave is not considered a developmental award.
5. Extension of eligibility to clinical-track faculty

It was noted that although Council had recommended that faculty with 9-month and with 12-month appointments have the opportunity to be awarded 2-semester developmental leaves, Council had also requested that the Provost include wording in the policy permitting individual colleges to apply conditions and restrictions to the policy, according to their specific needs and circumstances. Associate Provost Clark indicated that this would be done.

Professor Stone moved, Professor Milavetz seconded, and the motion passed unanimously:

MOTION: The Council approves and forwards to the Senate for its approval, the recommendation to support the revised developmental leave policy.

B. Clinical Track Expansion/Clinical Track Review

Professor Bhattacharjee reported that the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly had recently voted against increasing the number (6) or percentage cap (2%) of clinical track faculty in that college. Therefore, he suggested that the Council's discussion focus on "Option A", the proposal to increase the cap on Clinical Track faculty to 30% only for the five health science colleges (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Public Health) and to retain the current 20% cap for the rest of the University. Professor Buckwalter stated that she is preparing another version of the proposal that focuses on the health sciences colleges. Since there appeared to be general agreement that the clinical track expansion proposal would be limited to the health sciences colleges, discussion proceeded on this basis. Topics raised and comments made during discussion:

- What are the implications of the proposal for the rest of the University?
- Does the proposal represent a threat to tenure in general?.
- With a large increase in numbers of non-tenure track clinical faculty, the make-up of the University's faculty will change.
- For some colleges, use of, and especially increased use of, the clinical faculty track may result in preventing growth in the number of tenure track faculty, or in decreasing the number of tenure track faculty. For other colleges, e.g., the College of Medicine, Professor Lynch believes that the numbers of faculty will increase, both in the tenure track and in the clinical track.
- If expansion of the clinical track faculty increases absolute numbers of faculty, then changes will occur in the composition of faculty governance bodies, such as the Faculty Senate.
- The non-health sciences colleges face many of the same types of pressures to meet teaching and service responsibilities as well as deal with increased competition for funding to carry out research and other scholarly activities. These colleges may decide that they would like the same thing - to hire faculty only to teach courses in order to relieve the tenure track faculty of these responsibilities. If the University is driven by dollars, then the nature of the University changes – the model of the faculty member as a teacher / researcher / scholar no longer holds.
- Provost Whitmore observed that slightly less than 60% of the course credit hours at the University of Iowa are taught by tenure track faculty; therefore, 40% are taught by non-tenure track faculty.
- Faculty in the health sciences colleges are different from those in other colleges in the University: faculty in other colleges don't see patients. Patient care and related

activities require commitments of time and effort unique to faculty in clinical departments.

- No one denies or questions that more clinicians are needed, but should they be called “faculty”? Do they meet the criteria of “faculty”? The issue is faculty rank and status. Are the job responsibilities and outlook of faculty in the clinical track appropriate for their full integration into the governance structures and other structures that affect faculty. If so, why aren’t they tenured?
- The bar for the tenure track and for tenure has been raised. Is the clinical track being used to raise the bar?
- What other mechanisms have been used by health sciences colleges at other universities to meet the need for clinical faculty? One model is the implementation of a clinical tenure track and a non-tenure clinical track.
- In the College of Medicine, since implementation of the clinical faculty track, the number of tenure-track faculty has decreased, whereas the number of non-tenure track faculty has increased. Associate Provost Clark stated that the drop in the number of tenure track faculty in the College of Medicine occurred in the initial stages of setting up the clinical track; since then, the numbers have been relatively static. Professor Buckwalter stated that there is no evidence that faculty are being forced into the clinical track or that this track is being used as a “mommy track”.
- Professor Bhattacharjee reiterated his concern about the criteria for “faculty”. Physics and Astronomy has a large number of research scientists. They publish and bring in large amounts of research funds, and are vital to the department’s function, but they do not teach, and therefore are not faculty. How do clinical track faculty in the health sciences meet the criterion that faculty should demonstrate professional productivity beyond service?
- How has it happened that some colleges have already surpassed the 20% cap? It is likely that in the near future, the health sciences colleges will want to surpass the proposed 30% cap. Should a solution be found that would avoid having to go through this process again in the next year or two?
- What are the opportunities for clinical track faculty to progress? How do we define the scope of this position?
- Are clinical track faculty treated as equals (to tenure track faculty)? Professor Carne-Doebbeling expressed concern that clinical track faculty should not be treated as second-class citizens and challenged the notion that the perspectives of clinical track faculty differ from those of tenure track faculty, based on their tenure status.
- Should other options be considered? A different 1st class (e.g., tenure track clinical faculty as well as tenure track non-clinical faculty)?
- How do the health sciences colleges define scholarship?
- Can a faculty member start off on the clinical track and expect to have the opportunity to change to the tenure track? Professor Buckwalter stated that a faculty member would be poorly served to have those expectations. Professor

Carney-Doebbeling stated that if you are appointed to the clinical track, you shouldn't have those expectations.

- Does the character of the University change if a significant number of our faculty don't have those expectations?

Further discussion was deferred until the next meeting of March 28.

C. Brody Award.

Professor Pincus moved, Professor Colvin seconded, and the motion unanimously passed that the Council go into executive session. A Council subcommittee presented their recommendations for nominees for the Brody Award. After discussion of the candidates' credentials, Professor Stone moved, Professor Milavetz seconded, and the motion unanimously passed to accept the committee's nominations for the Brody Award. The nominations will be forwarded to President Coleman for her approval.

IV. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Jew, Secretary