

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, August 25, 2009
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Penn State Room, 337 IMU

MINUTES

Councilors Present: M. Cohen, J. Cox, D. Hammond, B. Justman, T. Mangum, F. Mitros, P. Mobily, D. Morris, N. Nisly, G. Russell, R. Valentine, R. Williams.

Officers Present: E. Dove, D. Drake, M. O'Hara, K. Tachau.

Councilors Excused: L. Richman, L. Robertson.

Councilors Absent: S. Kurtz, J. Reist.

Guests: C. Drum (University Relations), B. Eckstein (Office of the Provost), D. Heldt (*Gazette*), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), S. Johnson (Office of the Provost), B. Morelli (Iowa City *Press-Citizen*), V. Sharp (Office of the Provost), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate)

I. Call to Order – President Drake called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.
<http://www.facsen.uiowa.edu/AGENDA>

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Justman moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 14, 2009) – Professor Morris moved and Professor Mitros seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 8, 2009) – Professor Mobily moved and Professor Cox seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- D. Committee Replacements (Ed Dove)
 - Jill Beckman (Linguistics) to fill the unexpired term of Catherine Ringen (Linguistics) on the Senate, 2009-10.Professor Cohen moved and Professor Mitros seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. New Business

- *Report on Faculty Council/Administration Retreat (David Drake)*

President Drake commented that he thought the annual Faculty Council/Administration retreat, held Thursday, August 20, had been successful. There, Provost Loh gave a presentation on “The Iowa Promise, Part II.” This led to a discussion with the chairs of the Strategic Initiatives Task Forces (<http://provost.uiowa.edu/work/strategic-initiatives/>). President Drake expressed his expectation that there will be extensive discussion of many of the topics mentioned, such as first-year seminars, over the coming months.

Professor Nisly suggested that the task force chairs periodically give updates on the work of their groups prior to the December deadline. Professor Mangum added that those chairs heading task forces with particular impact on faculty workload be invited to Council meetings for in-depth discussions. Professor Nisly noted that the task force chairs would have the opportunity to gather input from faculty during these appearances before the Council and/or Senate.

Professor Cox suggested that a budget report to the full Senate be made. While federal stimulus funds made up for the university’s budget shortfall this fiscal year, budget cuts loom for the university during the next fiscal year (FY 2011), a matter of grave concern to faculty. Past-President O’Hara, recalling the comments of Vice President Doug True at the Retreat, commented that there is much still unknown about the FY2011 budget at this time. He explained that, while it is unlikely that new information will emerge in the near future, by the end of September, we should know how many university employees plan to take early and phased retirement. Then, the next report from the Revenue Estimating Conference should provide some indication of how serious the budget situation will be.

President Drake also mentioned that the Faculty Senate Officers [and Governmental Relations Committee] had met with Governor Culver Friday, August 21, the day after the retreat. During that meeting Professors Magnum and Segre gave presentations on their work. President Drake expressed his thanks to both for doing so, and indicated that Governor Culver appeared to be very impressed by the presentations. This particular meeting had been arranged because Governor Culver had earlier indicated a willingness to resume the tradition of annual meetings between the governor and the faculty -- meetings which had ceased under Governor Culver’s predecessor.

Past President O’Hara thanked President Drake for organizing a successful Faculty Council/Administration Retreat this year.

- *Update on Administrative Searches (David Drake, Mike O’Hara)*

Vice President for Strategic Communication: President Drake reported that the search committee, chaired by Professor Keith Carter (Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences), has received over 200 applications, plans to finish screening candidates by the end of August, and hopes to begin interviews by late September or early October. Campus visits, to include public events, will follow shortly thereafter. The committee’s goal is to provide a list of finalists to President Mason by the end of the calendar year. Professor Morris asked about the professional backgrounds of the candidates; President Drake responded that there is a mix of individuals

with business and academic backgrounds. [The search committee's website can be found at <http://www.uiowa.edu/vpsc-search/committee/index.html>.]

Chief Diversity Officer/Associate Vice President for Diversity: President Drake stated that the Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials has made recommendations to President Loh for faculty to serve on the search committee. This will be a national search for a successor to Professor Marcella David, who currently holds this position and will be stepping down in December.

Associate Provost for Faculty: President Drake indicated that he and CLAS Executive Associate Dean Raúl Curto are co-chairing this search committee, which is still being formed. Professor Susan Johnson, who currently holds this position, will be stepping down in December.

Ombudsperson: Past-President O'Hara stated that Professor Nancy Hauserman, a former ombudsperson, is chairing the search committee, and that he is serving on the search committee, which has been formed and charged. This will be an internal search; the job description has been created and an advertisement will be sent to faculty during the first week of September. Applicants should be faculty members holding the rank of tenured professor, or of clinical professor at the associate level or higher. The position has a four-year, nonrenewable term and carries a 50% appointment. Past-President O'Hara encouraged those with an interest in the position to apply or to identify suitable applicants. Professor Cohen asked if research faculty are eligible to apply. President O'Hara responded that this was not an issue that the search committee had considered. Associate Provost Johnson commented that there are currently seven or eight research faculty.

- *Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) Annual Report (Jean Jew, Professor, Anatomy & Cell Biology)*

Professor Jew reminded the Council that COIA membership is comprised of many of the faculty senates of the NCAA /FBS (Division IA) institutions. COIA was created in response to faculty concerns about athletics taking precedence over academics. COIA advocates for appropriate faculty oversight of athletics and seeks to better integrate athletics into the academic mission of universities.

Professor Jew then reported on COIA's annual meeting, which took place at the University of Arizona, March 6-8. The keynote speaker, Jim Livengood, Athletic Director at Arizona, gave a presentation on how COIA's "Framing the Future" white paper recommendations [<http://coia.comm.psu.edu/FTF/FTFtext&appendix.htm>] were being implemented at Arizona. There was also a panel discussion regarding Arizona's integration of athletics and academics (e.g., Arizona Athletics sponsors university lectures, collaborates on research grants, etc.).

The status of the assessment survey, developed by COIA to be distributed to the Division IA institutions, was also discussed at the COIA meeting. The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the integration of athletics into academics at each university. A pilot survey has been sent out to selected faculty senate chairs. It emerged during this discussion that a university's

Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) is not necessarily an advocate for faculty in athletics issues, but is rather a presidential appointee representing a university to the NCAA or other organizations. There was debate among COIA members present regarding how effective a FAR might be as an advocate for academics, given the fact that some FAR's, for example, had objected to early drafts of the assessment survey out of concerns that their institutions would have negative ratings.

Another presentation that Professor Jew described was an update on NCAA Division I Academic Reform by Diane Dickman, Managing Director for Academic and Membership Affairs. Professor Jew's handout included charts provided by Ms. Dickman itemizing Academic Progress Rate (APR), eligibility, and retention trends in baseball, men's basketball, and football (traditionally the weakest areas) at Division IA institutions. A minimum score of 925 is required for an institution not to be sanctioned by the NCAA. Professor Jew also distributed to the Council the NCAA Division I 2007-2008 Academic Progress Rate Public Report of the University of Iowa, along with a handout giving the Graduate Success Rate Reports for the 1997-2000 and 1998-2001 cohorts.

A related issue from the conference brought up by Professor Jew is the decline of Olympic sports, such as gymnastics, in intercollegiate athletics due to lack of funding.

Finally, COIA conference attendees agreed that other Division I faculty senates must be encouraged to join COIA. Iowa State University, for example, is not a member. There is a need for cooperation among faculty senates on athletics issues. For example: conference attendees were surprised to learn that UI has a maximum number of class days that athletes are allowed to miss because of sports events. It turns out that this is a Big Ten policy, yet the University of Michigan apparently does not adhere to this rule. Professor Drake wondered if there were penalties for Big Ten schools that do not follow this policy.

Past-President O'Hara thanked Professor Jew for her work as COIA representative. He asked if it is important for the COIA representative also to serve on the Presidential Committee on Athletics (as Professor Jew does). Professor Jew responded that it was advantageous for her to hear Athletics' views on issues. She has also been impressed by the enthusiasm and creativity of Athletics staff; Faculty Council and Senate should explore collaborating with Athletics on fundraising and other activities.

- *Report on Research and Creativity Strategic Initiatives Task Force (Michael Cohen, Pathology, Co-Chair)*

Professor Cohen gave a Power Point presentation based on his handout. [Task Force membership can be found here, <http://provost.uiowa.edu/work/strategic-initiatives/tf-res.htm>.] Professor Cohen displayed the charge and then indicated that there are five sub-charges. The committee has thus far spent most of its time working on the first sub-charge:

Identify 5 to 10 areas of research, scholarship, and creative activities for which Iowa can achieve international eminence and distinction given current resources and realistic enhancements. (One area will be "sustainability.") Do these areas fit with external funding priorities and philanthropic opportunities? Is there a critical mass of faculty and

supporting resources in these areas? If we were to pursue the “cluster hire approach,” identify strategies for accomplishing this.

A list of principles has been developed for identifying these 5 to 10 areas of focus. President Mason has already declared sustainability as one of these areas. These foci should be broad enough to encompass a wide variety of topics, but not so broad as to become meaningless. Professor Cohen stressed that the work of all six of the Strategic Initiatives task forces is interconnected and that there is room for further integration.

Past President O’Hara recalled an initiative about fifteen years ago that called for emphasis on five or six certain priorities and asked if this was a similar effort. Professor Cohen responded that the president and provost have stated a desire to fund 100 new tenure-track lines in a cluster-hire approach. Thus, the task force’s effort is one of targeting areas within which these hires would fall. Professor Cohen then drew attention to the four additional sub-charges. Some of these have been the subjects of prior reports and the task force plans to review those reports.

Secretary Tachau commented that the term “interdisciplinary,” stated in the overall charge [“Articulate priorities for enhancing areas of excellence in research, scholarship, and creative activities at The University of Iowa, and make recommendations on the broad interdisciplinary themes that will provide distinction to the University in the years ahead.”] could be understood differently in the humanities and in the sciences, and asked why it is assumed that only at the junctures of disciplines will the “emerging profiles of excellence” be found. Professor Cohen commented that there are clearly areas of strength on campus and we could continue simply to invest in those. If, however, we want the university to be a national or international leader, we must “break ground,” and typically, the true breakthroughs come at the intersection of two or more disciplines. Secretary Tachau responded that this is not necessarily true of the humanities. Professor Cohen said that not all research foci need to be interdisciplinary; however, it is most likely interdisciplinary areas that will guide the provost in filling the proposed 100 new faculty hires. Secretary Tachau observed that there can be huge breakthroughs within disciplines. There are differing views on whether disciplines are static and can lead to cutting edge discoveries.

Professor Cohen next pointed to the principle, “a response to one of the grand challenges of the current historical moment in world history” as a crucial one for the committee, and stressed that the task force needs input from disciplines across campus to identify what those grand challenges are. President Drake emphasized that the entire campus community needs to be part of this conversation. Professor Nisly commented that some national organizations, such as NIH, have already established some key priorities, and she expected that most likely other organizations have done so, as well. She suggested that we look into what those priorities are, then determine what priorities we have in common and what priorities we can contribute to. She noted, too, that the president and provost have also identified globalization as one of the university’s areas of focus.

Professor Cohen turned to the third principle, that there be “a viable form of sustainable, fiscal support (whether grants, tuition, philanthropy, or something else).” He remarked that investment must be selective. Regarding this point, Professor Mangum commented that the notion of hiring 100 new faculty appeared to go entirely against what she had been hearing about the financial situation of her college. If in fact there is very little hiring over the next few years, has any thought been given to protecting and salvaging what we already possess? Professor Cohen responded that currently we clearly have areas of excellence, but we must

eventually decide if these areas are our top priorities. The task forces provide strategic guidance regarding our priorities. For example, the university has many graduate programs, but do we have the resources to support them all? Professor Williams commented that the principle, “a viable form of sustainable, fiscal support,” may cause concern among faculty in the fine arts and humanities where such support may not be widely available for departments whose reputations have suffered in the wake of recent budget cuts. She also asked concerning any newly-hired interdisciplinary scholars: which departments would they call home, and how much choice would the home departments have in accepting them?

Professor Tachau suggested that there are “grand challenges” that the arts and humanities can address. Professor Russell referred to the principle “a response to one of the grand challenges...” and cautioned against giving a political leaning to the challenges identified. Professor Williams asked if the task force is planning to identify areas that are not viable and to which resources should not be directed further; Professor Cohen said he did not think it would. Professor Mangum recalled College of Public Health Dean Sue Curry’s comment at the Retreat that general excellence should not be sacrificed to targeted excellence. Professor Cohen indicated that the task forces would be happy to meet with each college’s executive committees and other groups.

- *Revision of Post-Tenure Review Policy (David Drake)*

President Drake reminded the group that Professor Cox had raised a concern about the state of post-tenure review in a Faculty Council meeting last year. Looking into the matter, President Drake had found that the issue had been studied by the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee several years ago and that a draft revised policy had been produced. That revised draft policy has been unearthed and is now being presented to the Faculty Council for review. President Drake noted that the revised policy would apply to *all* tenured faculty, not just full professors. Other significant revisions are that the outcome of the review will not be used in making departmental administrative decisions, and there will be *only one* standard review procedure for all faculty (some colleges now have a two-tiered system of review).

Professor Hammond asked what the point of the review is if the outcome is not used for departmental decision-making. President Drake explained that this would be a developmental review, to give a faculty member suggestions for improvement. Secretary Tachau added that the AAUP does not want this review to undermine tenure and therefore it should not be punitive. Professor Cox commented that faculty have merit reviews with their DEO every year, and that such reviews are the way to deal with faculty who are not performing. In his view, the best way to improve tenured faculty is to encourage them. The post-tenure review can make faculty more aware of opportunities to improve. The review committee could, for example, recommend research resources be provided to the faculty member being reviewed. Thus, the post-tenure review should be a separate process from the annual merit pay review. Professor Hammond added that in some departments peers are reluctant to criticize each other, so perhaps there should be an outside reviewer on the committee. She pointed out that Professor Cox’s model assumes that a faculty member is not performing well because of not having adequate resources; yet, that person may then be given additional resources but still not improve his/her performance. Perhaps, Professor Hammond concluded, it would instead make better sense to allocate any additional resources to individuals who are already performing well. President Drake commented that the policy does not have the power to divert departmental resources to an individual; this would be just a recommendation. Associate Provost for Faculty Susan Johnson asked how an individual would get these resources if the Dean is unaware of the outcome of the review; President Drake responded that the reviewee can share the outcome of the review with the Dean if s/he wishes. Professor Cohen also expressed concern about those

faculty who are not performing well. Although the yearly merit pay reviews are useful in addressing poor performance, he noted, statements from peers about poor performance can carry a lot of weight. President Drake responded that peers are certainly able to make negative comments about a faculty member's performance. Associate Provost Susan Johnson asked how negative aspects of a review would be addressed, if decisions about teaching, etc. cannot draw upon the report. Past President O'Hara commented that it may be difficult for a DEO to make such decisions without being influenced by the report. Professor Cox acknowledged that there would be an influence, but stated that the intent of the policy is to separate the DEO review from the peer review so that faculty who need it can benefit from some encouragement. The peer review does not have to be positive if that is not warranted.

Professor Russell opined that review committee members will not be inclined to put much effort into the review if it has few perceived consequences. Secretary Tachau commented that the notion of post-tenure review was created by university governing boards and others who may be suspicious of tenure and perhaps do not believe that faculty work hard. The challenge is to make something useful for faculty out of the review. Should it be a tool for dealing with the small percentage of faculty who are not doing well or for helping faculty who are doing well? She stated that there is currently a two-tiered system in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences: faculty who are thought to be doing well receive a cursory, unhelpful review, while faculty who are thought to be doing poorly face a terrifying review. Asserting that this disrupts due process, she proposed that we need to think about how to treat both populations in a fair way. Professor Morris asked if this policy would put an end to the two-tiered system of review in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. Secretary Tachau stated that if the policy is implemented with this wording, it would put an end to that system. Professor Morris added that serving on these review committees is very arduous work, so the reviews need to be meaningful. Observing that some faculty do not require extensive review, while those who have lost their way in their research may find feedback from peers useful, she stressed that it would be impossible to review extensively one-fifth of the faculty in her department each year. Given the issues that had been raised, Professor Morris recommended further revision of the policy. Professor Williams cautioned the group about the legal implications of stating that the reviews would not be "used in departmental administrative decision making regarding faculty status, compensation, awards, or assigned teaching and service responsibilities," and asked, moreover, where that review would then be filed if no one outside a small circle sees the review? Professor Cox stressed that it is extremely helpful to know what colleagues think of one's work.

President Drake stated that the policy would be brought back to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee for further review. Vice President Dove reminded the group that this policy is mandated by the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

- *Update on Status of Faculty Senate Constitution (David Drake)*

President Drake reminded the Council that the Council and Senate had approved a revised version of the Faculty Senate Constitution last spring. The all-faculty referendum subsequently approved it, as did the Provost and the President. As the final step, the Constitution appeared on the agenda for the August 5 meeting of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Regents raised three concerns at the meeting, the most important of which was whether the Faculty Senate is in violation of the Iowa Open Meetings Law when it goes into executive session. In the course of the discussion, one Regent suggested that the constitution be withdrawn at this time while these issues are being reviewed, and President Drake agreed to do so. He reported to the Council that the Faculty Senate Officers are in contact with the UI General Counsel and the Iowa Attorney General to obtain a written legal opinion regarding the open meetings issue.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Victoria Sharp, Special Assistant to the Provost on Alcohol Safety, distributed a draft survey for faculty regarding student alcohol issues. She will be visiting a later Council meeting to give a full update on alcohol safety initiatives taking place on campus and in the community. She asked for feedback on the draft survey, as part of an effort to engage faculty on this issue. Feedback duly emerged. Professor Nisly commented that this was a community problem and everyone should be involved in solutions. Professor Mitros asked if survey respondents would be identified by college. Professor Sharp responded that this had not been decided yet. Professor Cox suggested that space be left for comments or suggestions. Professor Cohen and Professor Hammond commented that the top section of questions was probably not necessary. Professor Cox noted that alcohol safety is a particular problem for those who teach freshmen and sophomores. Past President O’Hara commented that faculty have varying levels of contact with undergraduates; those faculty who deal primarily with graduate students may nevertheless have professional expertise to share with their colleagues about the issue. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Beth Ingram commented that the rate of binge drinking does not go down for juniors and seniors – in fact it goes slightly up. Professor Mobily added that students with a four-year habit of binge drinking then go on to enter the professional programs where they may continue to have problems with alcohol.

V. Announcements

- Professor Teresa Mangum distributed a flyer about the Obermann Graduate Institute on Engagement and the Academy, an institute for graduate students who want to incorporate public engagement into their research and teaching. The application is due on October 21. While email notices will also come out soon, she urged members of the Council to help get the word out to graduate students, and indicated that past participants have developed outstanding public engagement projects.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 8, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 6, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Penn State Room (337) of the IMU.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Cox moved and Professor Morris seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved. President Drake adjourned the meeting at 5:17 pm.