

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, April 16, 2013
3:30 – 5:15 pm
2520D University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

- Councilors Present: F. Abboud, D. Black, C. Bohannon, S. Gardner, N. Grosland, B. McMurray, J. Murph, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, K. Sanders, S. Schultz, J. Solow, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman, S. Wilson.
- Officers Present: E. Lawrence, N. Nisly, L. Snetselaar.
- Officer Excused: R. Fumerton.
- Councilor Excused: E. Ernst.
- Councilors Absent: D. Bonthius, S. Clark.
- Guests: T. Bannow (*Iowa City Press-Citizen*), G. Gussin (Emeritus Faculty Council), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), B. Monroe (Iowa Public Information Board) S. Murray (*Daily Iowan*), M. O'Hara (UI Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics Representative), E. Rodriguez (Internal Medicine), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President Snetselaar called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm,
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultyCouncil.04.16.13.pdf>.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Black seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (March 5, 2013) – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Solow seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (April 30, 2013) – Professor Black moved and Professor Solow seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results – President Snetselaar presented the results of the Faculty Senate and Council elections. Professor Solow moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the election results be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- E. 2013-14 Committee Recommendations (Erika Lawrence, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Professor Snetselaar indicated that the 2013-14 committee membership recommendations were not yet ready for approval, but would be presented at the April 30 Faculty Senate meeting.

III. New Business

- *Bill Monroe, Iowa Public Information Board and Transparency Issues*

Mr. Monroe explained that the Iowa Public Information Board was officially created in 2012, following six years of discussion by the Iowa legislature. The purpose of the Board is to provide a “one-stop solution” for local governments, the public, and the media for any issue regarding chapters 21 and 22 of the Iowa Code, i.e., the open meetings and open records laws. The Board is charged with resolving any disputes involving these laws; three levels of dispute resolution are possible: informal discussions, mediation, or accelerated legal proceedings. The Board is also charged with making recommendations to the legislature regarding aspects of the laws that are vague or that do not speak to developments in technology (the laws were written prior to the widespread use of email, etc.). Mr. Monroe then explained that previously, if an individual wanted to obtain a public record, or if s/he wanted to attend a meeting covered by the open meetings law, and was refused access by a local government entity to that document or meeting, the individual had little recourse except to hire an attorney and sue, with results to come perhaps months or years in the future.

With the creation of the Iowa Public Information Board, individuals will have a new, more efficient course of action to take in the event of a perceived violation of Iowa Code chapters 21 and 22. The first step would be for the complainant to contact the executive director of the Board to report the perceived violation. The executive director would then contact the attorney of the government entity (school board, city council, etc.) involved to obtain that entity’s perspective on the situation. The executive director would then report the result to the complainant (e.g., the document sought is not subject to open records laws, there were no illegal meetings). Mr. Monroe commented that the Board members hope that the vast majority of complaints can be resolved in this informal manner; however, if the complainant is not satisfied with the outcome of the informal discussion, then resolution can be sought through informal mediation. Both parties involved would meet with the Board in Des Moines and present their interpretations of the situation. If resolution is still not achieved, then the issue rises to a contested case, which is a streamlined legal proceeding. In these cases, the Board would have veto power, witnesses would be called, evidence would be presented to the Board, and the Board would then make a decision that would have the force of law. Mr. Monroe added that the Board is operating under the assumption that its effectiveness will be judged by how infrequently complaints rise to this highest level of resolution.

Mr. Monroe further explained that the Board consists of nine members, appointed by the governor. No more than three members shall represent the media, no more than three shall represent local government, and at least three shall represent the public. It is the goal of the Board to be the most transparent state entity. All meetings are widely publicized well ahead of time and minutes are distributed afterwards. The Board will soon have an executive director, a deputy director, and an administrative assistant. The executive director is required to be an attorney who has practiced law in Iowa for at least five years and who has extensive knowledge of the open records and open meetings laws. The Board is also developing a website that will contain searchable information about open records and open meetings laws, as well as a training program for the public, local governments, and the media.

Professor Tachau commented that she had not found exclusions in Iowa Code chapters 21 and 22 for copyrightable and patentable material; protection of such material is central to academic freedom and to the ability of faculty members to publish their research when they feel ready to do so. She added that faculty members would be willing to work with the Board to modify language in the Iowa Code to ensure that such material would be protected from open records laws. Mr. Monroe responded that if Code language needs to be modified, the Board would certainly communicate with affected constituencies prior to recommending any changes to the legislature. Professor Wilson asked whether the Board would concern itself with transparency issues at the university. Mr. Monroe responded that it would, if such a complaint were brought to it. In conclusion, he observed that it is one of the duties of government employees to provide documents to the media or members of the public when such documents are requested.

- *Research Track Review Committee Report (Erika Lawrence and Nicole Nisly, Co-chairs; Frank Abboud, Internal Medicine; Edgardo Rodriguez, Research Assistant Professor, Internal Medicine)*

President Snetselaar commented that she had been a member of the Faculty Council when the research track policy was initially approved five years ago and she recalled how contentious the issue had been at the time. She added that the policy calls for a review of the research track not later than five years following its implementation. Vice President Erika Lawrence and Secretary Nicole Nisly were appointed as co-chairs of the review committee so that the perspectives of both sides of the river would be represented during the review process. President Snetselaar then praised and thanked the committee for its hard work. Vice President Lawrence explained that the goals of the review had been to determine the benefits of the research track, whether it had served the purpose it had been intended to serve, whether any of the concerns raised initially had come to fruition, and ultimately to decide whether the research track should be retained permanently. She indicated that the committee had unanimously recommended that the research track be retained.

As part of their work, the committee administered a survey to the current research-track faculty members (there are a total of thirty, all in the Carver College of Medicine). Committee members also interviewed deans, several associate deans, and the current and former vice presidents for research. Feedback was obtained from a number of departmental executive officers, particularly from those departments that receive considerable outside funding. Vice President Lawrence observed that there was a concurrence of opinion among all these constituencies that the track should be retained. Suggestions for improvement of the track were also made. Finally, there was broad agreement that the track was relevant and useful for certain colleges, while irrelevant and even undesirable for other colleges, and recognition that the policy itself is flexible enough to encompass both these perspectives, as the research track policy can only be implemented in a college through a vote of the faculty.

Professor Abboud, a member of the review committee, then spoke about specific findings in the report. He began his remarks by observing that he has been at the university for fifty-three years. He commented that he likes the university in part because it was the first university to accept creative work on an equal basis with traditional academic research. Professor Abboud

expressed the opinion that there is an extraordinary intercollegiate spirit across campus, and that when any one college succeeds, it reflects well on the entire university and does not detract from the success of any other college. Professor Abboud also expressed strong support for the concept of tenure, which protects creative thinking. Turning to the research track, he observed that the need for such a track has only existed for the past ten or fifteen years, as a result of the increasing complexity of the interdisciplinary science done today, which demands that multiple types of expertise converge on a problem that has a major impact on society. A research-track faculty member is an individual who possesses a specialized expertise and is recruited to contribute that expertise to a major research project. Team research is a reality in the health sciences. The federal government is now funding a number of institutes that support interdisciplinary research carried out by teams doing fundamental science that has a clinical and translational application. Research-track faculty members play crucial roles as members of these teams. There are approximately 300 research scientists employed at the university and they, too, play important roles. Research-track faculty members, however, exhibit an enhanced ability and desire to work independently and more creatively while remaining a member of a team.

Five years after implementation, there are only thirty research-track faculty members at the university. Only three colleges have opted to implement the track and only one of those actually employs research-track faculty. The policy limits the number of research-track faculty to 10% of the tenured/tenure-track faculty; therefore, there could have been 163 by now. Even within the Carver College of Medicine, research-track faculty are concentrated only in a handful of departments. The Department of Internal Medicine employs eleven of them. Most research-track faculty members are assistant professors. Twelve were hired in 2009, ten in 2010, two in 2011, and six in 2012. In the last five years, research-track faculty have applied for 150 grants. Some of them are principal investigators on these grants. Recalling the survey results, Professor Abboud noted that some research-track faculty are still seeking their identity within the college, as the track is not well-known there. He expressed the opinion, based on the information that the review committee had gathered, that the research track does not pose a threat to the tenure track at this time. Any loss of tenure-track positions in other colleges cannot be attributed to the hiring of thirty research-track faculty members in one college. In concluding his presentation, Professor Abboud commented that he had reviewed the minutes of the Faculty Council and Faculty Senate meetings at which the research track had initially been approved, and felt that the review report has adequately addressed the concerns raised at those meetings. One of those concerns had been that general education fund (GEF) money might be used to support research-track faculty. While a small amount of GEF money had been used for this purpose, that mistake was quickly corrected and no such money is used for this purpose now. The Carver College of Medicine receives very little GEF money overall. He added that indirect cost funding from grants received by research-track faculty goes directly to the university, not to the college. This is part of the spirit of intercollegiate stability and sustainability.

Assistant Research Professor Edgardo Rodriguez then described his experiences on the research track. He explained that he has been in his position for about three years and that his research focuses on understanding the pathogenic mechanisms that underlie many adult-onset neurological disorders, with the goal of identifying and developing a gene-based medicine therapy. This is a high-risk, high-reward area of research. Professor Rodriguez indicated that he

was recruited here by Professor Beverly Davidson in the Department of Internal Medicine. Professor Davidson is a world-renowned gene therapist, so Professor Rodriguez felt that coming to the University of Iowa would provide a great opportunity to gain greater research independence, as well as to benefit from Professor Davidson's mentoring. Professor Rodriguez expressed the opinion that obtaining faculty rank has enhanced his career. For example, he has applied for and obtained multiple grants, as a principal or co-principal investigator, since being hired as a research-track professor. This grant funding has allowed him to establish an independent research program within Professor Davidson's team, but has also allowed him to complement and contribute to Professor Davidson's team in a way that amplifies her established research. Thus, research-track faculty members have benefitted from the establishment of the track, and the university overall has benefitted from the track. The research-track faculty title has allowed Professor Rodriguez to establish new collaborations with faculty nationally and internationally, as well as to present his findings to a wider audience.

Turning to the issue of the differences between research scientists and research-track faculty members, Professor Rodriguez explained that research scientists are asked to oversee different projects within a research program. They carry out the experiments that will support or counter the hypotheses being tested. They are also expected to have a role in the preparation of manuscripts and grant applications. They are not expected, however, to pursue independent areas of research or to generate novel hypotheses that would guide future research endeavors within the group. Research-track faculty, on the other hand, are expected to successfully compete for external funding and demonstrate the potential for autonomy not only as independent scientists but also as part of the research team. For a research-track faculty member to achieve academic excellence, s/he must have the ability to generate novel hypotheses, design experiments to test those hypotheses, obtain or play a pivotal role in obtaining the funds necessary to carry out the experiments, and demonstrate the ability to complete those research projects. He added that research-track faculty members have collaborated with tenured/tenure-track faculty members outside of their teams. He expressed the opinion that, far from contributing to the erosion of tenure, research-track faculty members appreciate and support tenure and see it in their best interests for the university to maintain a strong tenure track. In conclusion, he voiced his support of the research track for the benefits it provides to the university and, even though it presents some challenges, for the opportunity it provides to individuals such as himself to thrive on independence, academic stature, and leadership.

Professor Tachau observed that part of the concern about the research track's impact on tenure was the belief that, at a Research 1 university, all teaching should be informed by ongoing research. Also, the University of Iowa has a strong tradition of shared governance, which requires that faculty members fulfill service obligations. The research track appeared to some faculty at the time of its establishment as a path to avoid both teaching and service. Professor Tachau asked whether Professor Rodriguez and his research-track colleagues would find a tenure-track position more appealing than a research-track position. Professor Rodriguez responded that, based on the survey results and his own interactions with his peers, some research-track faculty members would prefer a tenure-track position, while others would choose to remain in the research track. Professor Pendergast, who worked in a research-track position

at another institution, commented that in her experience, the only research-track faculty members who would not want to pursue a tenure-track position were those who disliked teaching. Professor Abboud stressed that the research track was not created to prepare individuals for the tenure track. Professor Tachau commented that there are “many niches to fill in the ecology of the university” and that she was merely trying to determine if the research track was a positive niche for those in it.

Professor McMurray praised the thoroughness of the review committee’s report. He observed, however, that tenure serves the purpose of ensuring a unit’s excellence through the tenure review process. He asked how standards of excellence would be maintained for research-track faculty in the absence of a tenure-like review process. Professor Abboud responded that at this early stage there may well be an inconsistency and lack of uniformity across departments among promotion standards for research-track faculty. This is an area that requires more work. Professor Bohannon commented that it appears that many of the concerns expressed upon the establishment of the track have been alleviated, and that in her view the research track should be maintained. She wondered, however, what thoughts about teaching had emerged from the survey and the committee’s interviews. Was there a consensus that research-track faculty should be allowed expanded teaching opportunities? Also, what other suggestions for improvement of the track were made? Professor Abboud reminded the group that teaching for research-track faculty members is limited to providing auxiliary lectures on areas of expertise. They are also not allowed to chair doctoral defense committees and cannot serve as official mentors even of the graduate students they support with their grants. He went on to say that some research-track faculty members are not interested in teaching, while others would be very interested. This is another issue that would require attention in the future.

Professor Pendergast, following up on her earlier comments about teaching, indicated that at her previous institution, research-track faculty could direct dissertations and teach classes occasionally. Teaching could be problematic, however; if it interferes with research productivity, the research-track faculty member risks losing the funding on which his/her position is entirely dependent. The more established a research-track faculty became at an institution and in a community, the less likely s/he would be to risk this loss of funding for the sake of teaching. She also observed that, since there were so few research-track faculty at her institution, promotion standards could be somewhat tenuous.

Professor O’Hara, a former Faculty Senate officer, noted that he had participated in the writing of the research-track policy when he had served as chair of the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee. At that time it appeared that national searches would take place to recruit research-track faculty. What has in fact happened is that a number of research scientists already at the university have moved into research-track faculty roles. In other cases, tenured faculty members either bring research-track faculty with them to the university as part of their research teams or they recruit specific individuals. This practice varies considerably from that in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, in which national searches are done to recruit new faculty. He also observed that research-track faculty members are essentially protégées of senior, tenured faculty members. If their mentors leave the university, there is no evidence yet that research-track faculty members can thrive independently without their former mentors’

support. When the track was established, however, it was with the understanding that research-track faculty would be entirely independent researchers. He expressed the opinion that the research track would most likely never live up to initial expectations.

Professor Rodriguez responded that there has in fact already been a situation in which the mentor of a research-track faculty member left the university, and that research-track faculty member nevertheless has continued to receive grant funding and be successful in her research. Professor Abboud added that there is a sense of obligation to retain these highly-talented research-track faculty members by finding them an appropriate spot, perhaps within a different team if necessary, as part of the spirit of collaboration. Secretary Nisly commented that Dean Schwinn of the Carver College of Medicine had stressed the mutually-dependent nature of the relationship between tenured and research-track faculty members. She added that Dean Curry, of the College of Public Health, when asked why her college had approved establishment of the track but had not hired any research-track faculty members, responded that the temporary nature of the track, subject to possible abolition after five years, as well as the restrictions placed upon it, had discouraged the college from any hiring.

Professor Solow expressed support for retention of the research track. He added, however, that any future modification of the policy, regarding issues such as teaching and governance, should be approached very carefully, given the consequences for the entire university. He voiced concern that the research track, developed for a specific research need in the grant-dependent world of the health sciences, might gradually acquire new attributes such as teaching responsibilities and service obligations until it is transformed into a soft money-supported equivalent of the tenure track. President Snetselaar reminded the group that today's vote whether to retain the research track is based entirely on the track as it exists presently. Professor Abboud added that the policy requires colleges to vote whether to establish the track. Professor McMurray raised a concern about the large proportion of grant money going to those who, like research-track faculty members, must support their entire salaries. This has increased the competition for funding greatly, especially for those who are not entirely dependent on grants for their salaries. Professor Abboud responded that the National Institutes of Health, for example, places a cap on salary compensation in their grants. Secretary Nisly stressed the team-oriented nature of health science research, in which research-track faculty work together with, not in competition with, tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Solow seconded that the continuation of the research track be approved and the discussion of modifications to the research-track policy be postponed until next year. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Report on Annual Meeting of Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (Mike O'Hara, UI COIA Representative)*

Professor O'Hara explained that he has been the UI representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics for about two years and has attended three of the Coalition's annual meetings. He indicated that the focus of the most recent annual meeting (held February 1-3 at the University of South Florida in Tampa) was to advise the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), at that organization's request, on ways in which faculty could become more

involved in governance and oversight of collegiate athletics. The NCAA made this request because it is currently undergoing a process of deregulating and simplifying the rules it imposes on colleges and universities in favor of allowing higher education institutions to create their own rules for their athletics programs. A proposal grew out of the meeting in which each campus would create a faculty “academic integrity” committee to oversee its athletics programs. This committee would report directly to the institution’s faculty senate and would work cooperatively with the campus’ Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). The chair of the committee would report to the NCAA and interact with the conference and with his/her counterparts at other universities. Together with the FAR, this new faculty committee would ensure oversight and academic integrity of the institution’s athletics program. COIA is now awaiting a response to this proposal from the NCAA. Professor O’Hara has presented this information to the UI Presidential Committee on Athletics, of which he is a member; that committee is already carrying out some of these responsibilities, especially through its Academic Achievement Subcommittee.

- *Summer Scholarships (Beth Ingram, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education)*
Associate Provost Ingram explained that the Summer Hawk Tuition Grant program will enable resident students to take up to twelve credit hours in the summer with a full scholarship, while out-of-state students will be allowed to take up to twelve credit hours at the resident rate of tuition. It is only for first-time, first-year students who are entering this fall. The students must be enrolled full time for two semesters prior to the summer in order to be eligible for the grant. The goal of the program is to help students catch up on credits. The assumptions made when creating the program included available capacity; many summer courses are under-enrolled. The summer teaching budget is separate from the academic year’s budget. Also, there are faculty members who want to teach in the summer, but whose summer classes are canceled due to insufficient enrollment. Associate Provost Ingram stressed that no faculty members would be forced to teach in the summer if they did not want to. She then provided some data. There are 5800 undergraduates taking courses in the summer. About 4,000 are in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), about 800 are in the Tippie College of Business, and about 500 are in the College of Engineering. Only about 5% of the CLAS summer students are first-year students. About 12% are sophomores and about 40% are seniors who are trying to graduate. Ten percent of summer students are from other universities. Last summer, 90 classes were offered in the three-week session and 90 classes in the six-week session. In the eight-week session, about 800 classes were offered, but these include independent study classes and internships.

Professor Tachau stressed that involvement of the faculty and staff of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in this effort was essential going forward. She expressed concern that many more students than expected may enroll in summer courses because of this new program and that the College may be overwhelmed. She also noted that some summer courses are designed for intensive sessions and would need to be modified to fit a twelve-week format. There may also be huge curricular ramifications of which we are not yet aware. She added that her colleagues in CLAS are extremely alarmed about this grant program and that there are many issues to work out before the program goes into effect. Associate Provost Ingram clarified that the program is open to students who begin their first year in the fall of 2013, and they would be able to use the

grant during any one summer while they are enrolled in the university. Advisors will, in fact, encourage them not to use it during their first summer. It would likely be most beneficial to students following their sophomore year, when many start falling behind in their credits. Professor Tachau emphasized that there might be a large increase in the number of students taking classes each summer. She also wondered about the financial viability of the program, given the reduced revenue but increased number of classes. Associate Provost Ingram responded that she had been in contact with the associate deans for undergraduate education while the program was being created and two committees are currently working out the logistics of implementation. There is still plenty of time to work out the details and faculty input is welcome. Like other scholarship programs, implementation is primarily a budget issue. Professor Tachau stressed that it is also a curricular issue. Associate Provost Ingram added that appropriate advising will also be essential. Professor Solow voiced the opinion that this program may turn out to be quite popular, especially for parents, because of the cost savings. Associate Provost Ingram commented that the cost savings for out-of-state students would be even greater than for resident students, but the university would still realize a net revenue gain if large numbers of out-of-state residents were to take advantage of the program and enroll in more than three credit hours.

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

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 30, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol. Election of officers will take place.
- President Mason's reception for Faculty Senate will take place on Monday, April 29, 4:30-6:00 pm at her residence, 102 Church St.

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

President Snetselaar 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 McMurray moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the Faculty Council move to open session. The motion carried unanimously.

VII. Adjournment – President Snetselaar thanked the Councilors who were rotating off the Council, and there was a round of applause for the Faculty Senate Officers. Professor McMurray moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Snetselaar adjourned the meeting at 5:28 pm.