

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 3, 2007
Penn State Room, IMU
3:30-5:15 pm

~DRAFT~
MINUTES

Present: C. Catney; M. Cohen, D. Drake; P. Heidger; F. Mitros, M. O’Hara; C. Ringen; J. Sa-Aadu; D. Thomas; B. Thompson; H. Woodhead

Absent: V. Grassian; S. McGuire; S. Moorhead; J. Tomkovicz

Excused: L. Boyle; D. D’Alessandro; V. Dominquez; L. Snetselaar

Officers

Present: J. Glass, Secretary; S. Kurtz, President; R. LeBlond, Past President; V. Sharp, Vice President

Guests: J. Andrews (AAUP); C. Drum (University Relations); M. Greer (Staff Council); D. Heldt (*The Gazette*); K. Klein (Staff Council); C. Orgren (Emeritus); A. Shurson (*The Daily Iowan*); J. Spratt, and Raúl Curto

I. Call to Order— The meeting opened at 3:33 pm

II. Approvals

- a. Meeting Agenda—The meeting agenda was approved with the addition of Michael O’Hara who wished to discuss revisions to *Ops Manual*, section 28, related to collegiate reviews.
- b. Faculty Council Minutes, March 6, 2007— The minutes were approved by voice vote
- c. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda, April 24— Professor O’Hara moved; seconded by Professor Ringen to approve the draft agenda for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

III. Reports –

- a. Faculty Policy and Compensation Committee - Professor O’Hara reported that Vice Provost Cain reported that the Deans, VP Group and Interim President have approved the changes recommended by the committee and they now appear in the *Ops Manual*. He thanked all members of the committee for their hard work on the revisions.

The policy regarding DEOs is still incomplete. The committee hopes to have recommendations in time for the first meeting of the new Faculty Council in autumn 2007.

Professor O'Hara reported that the faculty symposium, being planned by committee members Jeff Denburg, Vickie Sharp and Kathryn Gerken, is moving forward.

The committee is also working on Chapter 15 concerned with faculty ethics. Professors Steve Collins and Jon Carlson are working on the wording which will be shared with the Ombudspersons.

The research track policy is also being reviewed. Professor O'Hara will work on it throughout the summer and hopes to have it ready for full university discussion in the autumn, engaging all colleges.

The committee is also working on a policy for the promotion of adjunct faculty. With hope, it will be ready for review in the autumn.

b. Extension of Tenure Clock – Faculty Senate President, Sheldon Kurtz

A proposal is forthcoming from the ad hoc committee to review the tenure clock, co-chaired by Susan Johnson and Shelly Kurtz. Some significant changes have been made at the most recent committee meeting with unanimous support from all who attended. Professor Cohen, who was not there, said at this meeting that he probably would have voted no.

He reported that the tenure track would remain six years, with an exception for the colleges of Medicine and Dentistry, whose norms could go up to 8 years for those tenure track faculty with significant patient care responsibilities (not biochemistry, for example). Other colleges may make a request to the Faculty Senate to change their tenure norms. To date, Medicine and Dentistry are the only colleges that have made a case for an 8-year norm.

By allowing other colleges to make a request to the Faculty Senate allows this body which represents all colleges on campus to participate in the decision. In part, this was steered by deans who thought it might be a good idea.

Kurtz reported that an automatic extension provided for a child brought into a home, with a maximum of two, was added to the policy. Committee members now think it is appropriate that it should be extended in pre-tenure period one year for each child.

He said they basically kept the same language in section e.2, related to personal situations, but disengaged this from the two-year automatic extensions for bringing a new child into the home. The way it had been presented before, that is, a person who had 2 years of the extension for children would probably have a hard time of getting

any further extension. It was a two-year cap, and if the faculty member needed a further extension for health reasons, the theory was it would be hard to get.

The committee was happily unanimous on this, Kurtz reported.

Susan Johnson, Associate Provost for Faculty, wished to put this discussion of a longer tenure clock into context. Many other medical schools have something similar. Every model considered by the UI committee is being used at some other institution.

Professor Cohen pointed out that the policy now states “significant patient care...” and wondered who will determine if a person’s responsibilities are “significant.” AP Johnson said she preferred to get rid of that word; on a practical level it is not workable.

Faculty Council discussion ensued about who has clinical responsibilities, and if, for example, the policy would apply to Pharmacists and Psychologists in the College of Medicine but not those in the Psychology Department. Professor Kurtz said there would be some administrative points needing to be dealt with.

Professor Cohen commented that there are broader issues. The whole notion of tenure was made in the 1920s, when it was predominantly white men, when mandatory retirement was different. On a very fundamental level, to adhere to those principles does not make sense. The College of Medicine is driving this, he said. To help this medical school lead the university, there have to be changes. We are behind the curve, Professor Cohen added. It is critical for the success of the university. He also added that the whole gender issue has gotten short shrift in all this.

Extensive discussion ensued. Points covered include:

- In the past, almost all extensions were granted for parenting and other extenuating circumstances.
- AP Johnson said that out of 500 MD’s in the College of Medicine, there is probably only one who does not see patients. The funding argument piece applies to both PhD investigators and clinical investigators.
- President Kurtz asked if funding is any different in Medicine than CLAS. Professor LeBlond said the expectations from CLAS are that people who get a PhD will have a postdoc period within the sciences. The comparison to Medicine is strained. In Medicine, faculty get a MD, then a minimum of 3, up to 10, years of post doc training. In many ways, it is equivalent to getting a PhD Professor Cohen responded that one difference is the clinicians’ side where they have significant clinical responsibilities in addition to research, and the funding climate we live in. It would cover the gamut of all faculty in the college. It puts us at a competitive disadvantage with other institutions that we compare ourselves to.
- Professor Woodhead said there is the additional problem of recruiting young people; many are opting for the clinical track.

- President Kurtz commented on the notion that associates who come in for three years into the College of Medicine may then convert to the tenure track. Professor LeBlond said they expect some degree of maturation that the clinical people do not have; they are expected to perform at a high level immediately after they complete their program.
- AP Johnson commented that before there was a clinical track, there were very different expectations. Once you have the ability to create a track for people to excel, you can change the expectations back to the criteria.
- Professor Ringen wondered if cutting back on clinical responsibilities for tenure-track faculty is a realistic goal. Professor Cohen responded that people on the clinical track spend 70-80% of their time doing clinical care. The tenure track as a different mix. 75-80% of their time is spent on research and a mix of teaching. At the moment, he added, the discussion is just about tenure track faculty.
- Concerned that the discussion was getting too complicated, Professor Cohen pointed out that the topic should apply to the whole university, not just the College of Medicine. Other colleges will have their chance at a later time, noted President Kurtz.
- Professor Heidger added new elements to the discussion. He said his department will not look at anyone who has not had 3-5 years of post doc experience, publications and so forth. He added it is almost necessary for the incoming faculty member to have a grant in-hand. He added the thing we are not able to do is to relieve such individuals from teaching responsibilities. Most have come out of molecular sciences, and they did not have anatomical classes. While they have research competence, it is essential that they demonstrate teaching competence. A lot of the teaching is done at the bedside.
- President Kurtz read from page 2, section 6 of the policy related to joint appointments.
- Guest Professor Spratt wondered why the College of Medicine could not continue to use the extremely flexible “associate” title. He cautioned the Council to look very carefully at any data they receive.
- Professor Drake expressed his concern about clinical faculty with dual qualifications (PhD and DDS) who have clinical and research responsibilities, but less teaching. Would they also go to an 8-year tenure clock? President Kurtz said that point goes to how people are classified. There will have to be some assessment made with a new hire, and if they will come in on a 6- or 8-year track. He would trust administrators to make that point. It is important that they know which track they are on when they come in.
- President Kurtz said this revised proposal reflects a sense of caution about how we should go forward with this process and the momentous decision we’re making, that is, walking away from a 6-year track. We need the discussion about what we would be losing in tenure by doing this. This is momentous for a university to make this decision at this time in history, we want to take it slowly. The notion here is that each unit who wants to do this has to make a case to a broad group representative of the university. At the core of this proposal is the belief in the tenure system, and we step back from it and only in the most special of circumstances.
- Professor Cohen added that he does not think the UI would be doing anything fundamentally different than what our peers are doing. All the other institutions have addressed this and are doing much better. Some of these places have 20-year tenure clocks. We are behind the curve, he added, we are taking a conservative approach.
- Professor LeBlond said that he personally favors this step, but that it is an error to overstate the need for it.

- Asked about explicit dangers to the individual or to the institution in following this course, Professor O'Hara responded we are risking that this is a slippery slope, that you finally get tenure along with your retirement watch. Tenure was designed to protect academic freedom, so faculty can pursue issues in scholarship that they see fit and not feel subject to having their work constrained by the powers that be. In medicine, tenure does not mean much because our whole compensation system is based on what you produce. Those are the potential risks.
- Secretary Glass commented on the ending of the two-year limit. Although an advocate for children and families, she welcomed the two-year limit. You would not have endless tenure extensions. Children do not become easier to combine with an academic career after only one year, she added.
- AP Johnson said only a small handful are rejected for tenure. Roughly half of all people hired in a tenure track position leave before they are even up for consideration for tenure. What this proposal would do is help recruit people in the tenure track who might not otherwise go into the tenure track. Professor Cohen added that the in Gender Equity Report shows we have difficulties recruiting women on the tenure track.

Professor O'Hara moved that Councilors adopt Sections B and C of the revised document; Professor Woodhead seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

Professor Ringen proposed an amendment whereby there would be a one year extension to the tenure clock for each child brought into the home up to two years; and after that extensions would be discretionary. Professor O'Hara seconded.

Discussion ensued. President Kurtz cautioned against making this a feminist issue. Men getting married now are much more in tune with home responsibilities. Professor Glass said the fact remains that, according to surveys, women handle the bulk of child care. Kurtz said, in any event, the idea would change; there will be an extension to one year, not to exceed two, after the approval of the DEO, Dean and Provost.

A vote was called. There was unanimous approval.

Professor Heidger asked to discuss further the wording in Section G, saying a number of faculty have asked for early promotion because of previous experience. He said section G implies that you have to make the probation period part of the hire. President Kurtz clarified that this is an existing policy that was not changed. AP Johnson cited section 10.5.a on page 5. She added that Section F is new. On page 5 there is a grand-parenting provision.

Two misspellings were noted in section 10.5.b.

Professor Catney asked how taking family medical leave affects extension requests. AP Johnson said it is a completely separate issue.

Professor Ringen moved to accept all changes as amended. Professor Thomas seconded. There was a unanimous voice vote. Motion carried.

C. Faculty Senate and Council election results – President Kurtz noted the list of new Faculty Senators and Councilors that was distributed earlier

D. 2007-08 Committee Recommendations - President Kurtz noted the list of new faculty committee that was distributed earlier.

IV. New Business

A. Lecture Committees – Mary Greer, President, Staff Council. Ms. Greer sought support from the Faculty Council to approach Interim President Fethke to consider adding two more staff members to the Lecture Committee, in line with the numbers of faculty and student representation. This proposal would require Faculty Council, Senate, Student Government, and ultimately presidential approval. Professor LeBlond reported that all representatives on the Shared Governance Council approved. Professor Ringen moved; seconded by Professor Woodhead; all were in favor; the motion carried.

V. Announcements – President Kurtz read out the following announcements:

- AAUP-Faculty Senate Tenure Workshop, Monday, April 9, 6:00 pm, S401 PBB. Please encourage junior faculty members to attend in order that they may learn tenure requirements.
- President’s Reception for Faculty Senate, Wednesday, April 11, 5:00 – 6:30 pm, 102 Church Street
- Faculty Senate Meeting: Tuesday, April 24, 3:30- 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place; Reception to follow.
- Provost Annual Spring Address to the University, Thursday, April 26, 3:30 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol; reception follows.

President Kurtz commented it has been a personal privilege to have served as Faculty Senate President this year. He thanked councilors for their work and added that is not necessarily the most valued, but is the most essential work on campus. If we have learned anything this year, he said, it is that we need people to speak up for the faculty and staff. It is an important role in as open a process as possible.

VI. Executive Session –

- President Kurtz stressed confidentially and shared the names of the recipients of the Michael J. Brody and Regents Award for Faculty Excellence that would be revealed very soon.
- Past President LeBlond noted that this is his last year serving the Faculty Senate. He said the work can sometimes seem mundane and thankless. He was particularly pleased with today’s varied discussion on the extension of the tenure clock. He said we want small steps that all can live with. He added that we need to take care of the whole university, not just the College of Medicine. He said there is a struggle on the west side

of the river to make people see the university as a whole. He thanked all councilors for their past support.

VII. Adjournment - The meeting closed at 5:25 pm