

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 8, 2014
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: F. Abboud, S. Ali, H. Bartlett, D. Black, C. Bohannon, C. Fox, E. Gillan, J. Kolker, J. Pendergast, S. Schultz, S. Seibert, E. Wasserman.

Officers Present: D. Cunning, R. Fumerton, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas.

Councilors Excused: E. Ernst, S. Gardner, N. Grosland, P. Muhly.

Councilors Absent: P. Brophy.

Guests: B. Butler (Provost), W. Darling (Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President Lawrence called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm,
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultyCouncil.04.08.14.pdf>.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – President Lawrence indicated that a report on the annual meeting of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics had originally been planned for today but the presenter had a conflict arise. Professor Schultz moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 4, 2014) – Professor Black moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 29, 2014) – Professor Bohannon moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results (Erika Lawrence) – President Lawrence presented the election results. Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Black seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2014-15 Committee Recommendations (Alexandra Thomas, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Thomas indicated that the Committee on Committees had not yet had time to contact and hear back from those faculty members recommended for committee positions. A full list of committee membership recommendations will be presented for approval at the Faculty Senate meeting.

President Lawrence then updated the Councilors on several meetings that had taken place the previous week with the Deloitte consultants who are conducting an efficiency review of the Regents institutions. In addition to hosting a town hall meeting open to all

members of the university community, the consultants met with the leadership teams of the shared governance bodies. At this meeting the consultants explained the review process and sought answers to general questions about what is and what is not working well at the university. In a separate meeting, President Lawrence, Past President Fumerton, and Secretary Cunning spoke with the lead consultant from KH Consulting Group, the entity with which Deloitte has contracted to conduct the academic portion of the efficiency review. They discussed various general trends in higher education, such as the increase in online course offerings. The officers stressed the need to examine not just financial and technological issues, but pedagogical issues, as well, while acknowledging the unique strengths and missions of each of the Regents institutions. The consultant reassured the officers that faculty would be involved throughout the review process. The Deloitte and KH consultants plan to return to campus in May with an initial set of recommendations. The officers emphasized that significant faculty input could not be obtained during the summer, when many faculty members are away, so the academic portion of the review should be postponed until the fall. The officers expressed reservations about the review's focus on the undergraduate experience, since graduate and undergraduate education are closely intertwined. They also cautioned against embracing short-term financial gains that may sacrifice quality, leading to long-term financial losses.

Provost Butler commented that in addition to the town hall meeting, he attended three other meetings with the consultants. At a meeting that included the deans, the participants also stressed the difficulty in separating graduate and professional education from undergraduate education. At this time, there appear to be no plans to review graduate and professional education. Provost Butler also met alone with the KH Consulting team to educate them on the academic mission of the university, as well as to discuss general trends in higher education. Provost Butler's third meeting focused on process. He stressed to the consultants that any ideas generated for efficiency or cost-saving should be reviewed by those most likely to be affected by them. He felt assured that the consultants indeed plan to follow this procedure. Professor Abboud asked if the consultants would examine each university separately, taking into account their different missions, or if they would be viewing the Regents system overall. In particular, would the consultants be looking for perceived instances of duplication on the three campuses? Provost Butler responded that he did not have that impression. He thought that the consultants' outlook would vary from local to system-wide throughout the review. Professor Fox asked if there were a list of institutions at which both Deloitte and KH Consulting had performed reviews. Provost Butler commented that such lists could be found on the companies' websites. He noted that the focus of many of these previous reviews may have been very narrow.

III. New Business

- *Updates from Faculty Senate President (Erika Lawrence)*

President Lawrence indicated her intention to update Councilors on a variety of concerns that they had discussed over the past year. Regarding the declining funding levels of the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies, she announced that Vice President for Research and Economic Development Dan Reed was scheduled to speak to the Faculty Senate at the April 29 meeting and was expected to address this issue. A topic about which President

Lawrence has been repeatedly contacted by faculty members is the transition of the Center for Teaching to Information Technology Services. She mentioned that a committee of faculty members has been formed to provide faculty input on the transition process. In a related topic, the process of moving course evaluations online has been slowed somewhat. A faculty committee formed by the Faculty Senate is continuing to meet and formulate guidelines for the use of online evaluations. The work of the Regents' Performance-Based Revenue Model Task Force has also been of interest to Councilors. The task force will present their report to the Regents in June.

Professor Wasserman, who had earlier obtained data on the composition of the Faculty Senate over the past twenty years, voiced his concern about changes to the membership of the Senate over time. He noted that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) has lost about 100 faculty members during this time period; one of the consequences of this loss had been a corresponding loss in the number of Senate seats for CLAS. At the same time, the Carver College of Medicine (CCOM) has increased its number of faculty members and therefore its number of Senate seats. Twenty years ago the CLAS Senate delegation outnumbered the CCOM delegation; now, that situation is reversed. Many of the additional CCOM seats have been filled by clinical-track faculty members. Recently, a new track, the research track, has been implemented at the university and the Council will today consider whether research-track faculty should be given representation in the Senate. In light of these changes to the faculty and the Senate, Professor Wasserman posed the question, who are the faculty serving in the Senate? In the past, senators engaged in teaching, research, and service. Now, however, senators may be engaging in only one or two of these activities. He urged that Councilors keep this question and the increased blurring of lines among faculty tracks in mind as they consider changes to the research-track policy. Vice President Thomas commented that she is planning for the upcoming Faculty Council /Administrative retreat to consider the broad issue of the future of the professoriate. Professor Pendergast observed that it is difficult to separate the loss of tenure-track faculty from the loss of state funding over the years. Professor Abboud acknowledged that change has come to the university, as it has to the world in general. He urged that we must be confident that those who have appointed faculty to these new tracks share the values of the university overall and have acted in the best interests of the university. Professor Wasserman observed that the tenure track model enforces breadth. The other tracks have a narrower focus which may lead to greater self-interest represented in the Senate. Professor Abboud stressed that faculty members in all three tracks are professors in every sense of the word.

- *Research Track Policy Proposed Revisions (Erika Lawrence)*

Prior to initiating discussion of the proposed revisions, President Lawrence stressed that last year the Faculty Senate voted to retain the research track permanently; this decision will not be revisited. The revisions proposed to the track have been approved by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee (FPCC), chaired by Professor Warren Darling. The Research Council also had an opportunity to review the proposed revisions. President Lawrence and Past President Fumerton will present to the Council of Deans tomorrow morning the version of the policy approved today by the Faculty Council.

The first set of revisions taken up by the Council were those pertaining to promotion criteria. At the last Council meeting, Professor Darling had presented a series of revisions to this portion of the policy. The FPCC had proposed the revisions in response to concerns expressed by research-track faculty members during the review of the track that they were unclear about what was required of them in order to be promoted. The Council had determined that the criteria proposed by the FPCC were too specific, however, and requested that the FPCC revisit them. Councilors had urged that responsibility for developing specific criteria be left to the departments. President Lawrence indicated her intention to stress to the Council of Deans that the departments must develop specific promotion criteria and share those criteria with their research-track faculty. In response to Council concerns, the FPCC had again revised the promotion criteria to make them more general, thus reflecting promotion criteria in the tenure track policy.

Councilors reacted favorably to this latest set of revisions. Professor Bohannon observed that departments should also develop guidelines on whether teaching and service would be considered at the time of promotion. Professor Gillan noted that the research-track promotion procedures document found on the website of the Office of the Provost indicates that departments should determine whether teaching and service count towards promotion. Professor Bohannon commented upon the term *key personnel* in the policy language on extramural grants and contracts, noting that it had replaced the earlier terms *principal investigator or co-principal investigator*. Professor Darling indicated that some FPCC members still felt that to be promoted, a research-track faculty member should attain the rank of principal investigator or co-principal investigator on an external grant, although the committee had ultimately substituted the more general term *key personnel*. Professor Bohannon advocated for allowing departments to determine the grant rank required for promotion. She suggested that the sentences *Candidates for promotion shall be evaluated primarily upon the quality of their research. Incidental teaching and service activities may also be given some consideration as permitted by collegiate and department guidelines* in 10.10 g, be moved up to 10.10 e. Professor Bohannon also suggested that the word *continuous* be replaced with *sustained* in (c) and (d) in the criteria for promotion to professor.

Professor Abboud moved and Professor Black seconded that the revised language (with the additional edits suggested today) on the promotion criteria in the research-track policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

The Council then discussed permitting research-track faculty to *co-chair* dissertation committees. The research-track policy currently states that research-track faculty are not permitted to *chair* dissertation committees. President Lawrence indicated that, according to Graduate College policy, research-track faculty, as well as emeritus and clinical-track faculty, are permitted to serve as *co-chairs* of dissertation committees. Only tenured and tenure-track faculty are permitted to serve as *primary chairs* of dissertation committees. The revision to the research-track policy suggested by the FPCC is simply to strike the relevant sentence, *Research-track faculty cannot be chairs of doctoral defense committees because this is the role of the tenured/tenure-track faculty*. Professor Fox raised the question of how the Graduate College might have arrived at this decision and whether this should be given some additional thought. Others commented that research-track faculty would need to follow the same procedures for

approval to co-chair that emeritus and clinical-track faculty would. Councilors discussed whether it was necessary to state explicitly in the policy that research-track faculty could co-chair. In addition to striking the sentence indicated above, they decided to add on to an existing sentence in the policy, *Teaching is an essential function of all faculty, but in the case of the research-track faculty it would occur predominantly in the form of service on doctoral committees (including serving as a co-chair with a tenured/tenure-track faculty member) with the approval of the Graduate College.*

Professor Black moved and Professor Gillan seconded that the revised language (with the additional edit) on permitting research-track faculty to co-chair dissertation committees in the research-track policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

Expanding opportunities for research-track faculty to teach was the next topic of discussion. President Lawrence explained that the FPCC had ultimately decided not to make any changes to the research-track policy in terms of teaching. Currently the policy only allows for research-track faculty *to provide auxiliary lectures on areas of knowledge relevant to their research or to engage in other teaching as may be required by the terms of their research grant or contract.* Responding to the recommendation of the research-track review committee that research-track faculty be allowed to teach an occasional course, however, the Faculty Senate officers proposed an alternative to the FPCC recommendation. This alternative language allowed for research-track faculty to teach no more than one graduate course every two years in their specific areas of expertise. Financial compensation would need to come from research-track faculty members' external funding sources.

Professor Gillan, a member of the Research Council, spoke briefly about the Research Council's response to the Faculty Senate officers' proposal. He indicated that there was little support for loosening the current restrictions on teaching. The Research Council worried that the lines between tracks would become blurred if research-track faculty could take on additional teaching opportunities. There was also concern about not paying a course's instructor of record with general education funds. The Research Council took issue with the phrase in the current version, *[research-track faculty] could be assigned, as needed, to provide auxiliary lectures.* Councilors, too, expressed concern about research-track faculty members being pushed into lecturing and eventually decided on the following edit, *they could ~~be assigned, as needed, to provide auxiliary lectures.~~*

Returning to the Faculty Senate officers' proposed alternative, Past President Fumerton commented that if a research-track faculty member was the only campus expert on a particular topic, it seemed unfortunate that graduate students could not be given the opportunity to learn from that person in a formal course. He added that there is a small number of research scientists, leading experts in their fields, on campus who have not pursued the research track because of the prohibition on teaching. Professor Pendergast expressed concerns about opening the door to research-track faculty beginning to teach basic courses if this alternative language were adopted. She added that some granting agencies strictly prohibit teaching. Past President Fumerton responded that the policy would not allow research-track faculty on such grants to teach. Professor Darling noted that other funding agencies may permit teaching. Professor Abboud spoke in favor of the Faculty Senate officers' version but suggested that the teaching

could be funded by a variety of sources, *except for* general education funds. Councilors continued to debate the pros and cons of the Faculty Senate officers' proposed alternative until a show of hands indicated that most were in favor of leaving the policy in its current form.

Professor Wasserman moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the language (except for the edit suggested today) on teaching in the research-track policy remain the same. The motion carried unanimously.

Turning to the final issue, representation, President Lawrence noted research-track faculty currently do not have representation in the Faculty Senate. She explained that the number of clinical-track faculty in the Senate is capped at no more than 20% of the collegiate delegation or one senator, whichever is greater. Based upon this precedent, the FPCC suggested capping the number of research-track faculty at no more than 10% of the collegiate delegation or one senator, whichever is greater. Professor Wasserman suggested that a clause be inserted into the policy requiring that this cap be evaluated after five years, in order to mirror, in his recollection, the procedure used when the clinical track was granted representation in the Senate years ago. Other Councilors were hesitant to do this, however, and commented that this seemed unnecessary. Further information on the rationale for the five-year evaluation of the clinical-track cap will be sought prior to the Senate meeting.

Professor Abboud moved and Professor Black seconded that the proposed language on Faculty Senate representation in the research-track policy be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. From the Floor – There were no items from the floor.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 29, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.
- President Lawrence thanked departing Councilors for their service: Nicole Grosland (Engineering), Ed Wasserman (Liberal Arts and Sciences), Donald Black (Medicine), Susan Schultz (Medicine), Sue Gardner (Nursing), Erika Ernst (Pharmacy), and Jane Pendergast (Public Health). She thanked all of the Councilors for their time, attention, thoughtfulness, wisdom, and passion and she expressed gratitude for this opportunity to serve the faculty as Faculty Senate President.

VI. Executive Session – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Bohannon seconded that the Faculty Council move to Executive Session. The motion carried unanimously.

President Lawrence announced the winners of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence and the Michael J. Brody Award for Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa.

Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Bohannon seconded that the Faculty Council move to open session. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Adjournment – Professor Black moved and Professor Fox seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Lawrence adjourned the meeting at 5:30 pm.