

FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, September 3, 2013
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Executive Boardroom (2390), University Capitol Centre

MINUTES

Councilors Present: F. Abboud, S. Ali, H. Bartlett, D. Black, C. Bohannon, E. Ernst, C. Fox, E. Gillan, N. Grosland, P. Muhly, J. Pendergast, S. Schultz, S. Seibert, E. Wasserman.

Officers Present: E. Lawrence, A. Thomas.

Officers Excused: D. Cunning, E. Dove.

Councilors Excused: J. Kolker.

Councilors Absent: P. Brophy, S. Gardner.

Guests: S. Campo (Council on Teaching), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), G. Meyle (*Daily Iowan*), J. Moore (Evaluation and Examination Service), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), T. Weingeist (Emeritus Faculty Council), 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.09.03.13.pdf>.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda –President Lawrence indicated that there would be a change to the agenda circulated earlier – Professor Alan MacVey, Director of the Division of Performing Arts, was unable to speak with the Council today regarding a proposed increase to the cultural arts fee. Professor Schultz moved and Professor Black seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 16, 2013) – Professor Black moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 24, 2013) – Professor Black moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- D. Committee Replacements (Alexandra Thomas, Chair, Committee on Committees)
 - Nathan Fethke (Occupational & Environmental Health) to fill the unexpired term of Nandita Basu (Civil & Environmental Engineering), on the Faculty Senate, 2013-15
 - Glenn Penny (History) to replace Jennifer Sessions (History) on the Faculty Senate, 2013-14

- David Drake (Dows Institute) to the Judicial Commission, 2013-16
 - Patricia Zebrowski (Communication Sciences & Disorders) to the Judicial Commission, 2013-16
 - Timothy Havens (Communication Studies) to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee, 2013-16
 - Steven Hitlin (Sociology) to the University Safety and Security Charter Committee, 2013-15
 - Christine McCarthy (Educational Policy & Leadership Studies) to the Human Rights Charter Committee, 2013-16
 - Tong Li (Mathematics) to the Financial Aid Advisory Charter Committee, 2013-16
- Professor Black moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the replacements be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

President Lawrence announced that Katherine Tachau, Professor of History and former member of the Faculty Council and Faculty Senate, had recently been named to the National Council on the Humanities, the advisory board for the National Endowment for the Humanities. Professor Christopher Merrill already serves on the National Council on the Humanities. Professor Pendergast suggested that a letter of congratulations be sent to Professor Tachau on behalf of the Faculty Council.

President Lawrence reminded the Councilors that over the summer they had approved the appointments of Professor Edwin Dove (fall semester) and Professor Richard Fumerton (spring semester) as past presidents, following the appointment of last year's Faculty Senate President, Professor Linda Snetselaar, to the administrative position of Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement. Professor Dove had served as Faculty Senate President during the 2010-11 academic year, and Professor Fumerton during the 2011-12 academic year.

III. New Business

- *Membership of the Committee to Review the Office of the Provost (Erika Lawrence)*

President Lawrence listed the names of the faculty members nominated to the review committee: Richard Fumerton, co-chair, from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Victoria Sharp, co-chair, from the Carver College of Medicine; Susan Assouline, from the College of Education; Jonathan Carlson, from the College of Law; Jon Garfinkel, from the Tippie College of Business; Jane Pendergast, from the College of Public Health; and Jon Whitmore, former UI provost and current CEO of ACT, as the outside member. Professor Seibert, as a new member of the Faculty Council, asked how these nominations had come about. President Lawrence explained that last year's Faculty Senate Officers had solicited suggestions for nominees, based on the guidelines given in the Operations Manual, and then identified individuals who would be willing to serve. Professor Muhly asked whether it wasn't odd to have a former UI provost on the provost review committee. President Lawrence responded that Dr. Whitmore is the external reviewer, chosen to give some additional insight into the position of provost.

Professor Bohannon asked for clarification whether this review was of the current provost himself, or of the Office of the Provost (its structure and responsibilities). President Lawrence observed that it was difficult to separate the two, even though there might be a slight emphasis on reviewing the provost himself. Professor Pendergast, a member of the review committee,

commented that the review committee members look upon the review as incorporating both aspects, given how difficult it is to separate them. Professor Black asked if this was a routine or special review. President Lawrence responded that it was a routine review, somewhat overdue, given the recent turnover in the office. Professor Grosland asked if there were a review committee member from the College of Engineering. President Lawrence answered that the committee was limited to seven members; therefore not all colleges could be represented. In addition to the chair and the external reviewer, the committee must consist of two members of the Faculty Senate's Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials and three additional faculty members. This review committee has two co-chairs, one of whom is also a member of the Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials.

Professor Wasserman followed up on Professor Muhly's question about inviting Dr. Whitmore, a former UI provost, to serve as the external reviewer. He asked who the external reviewer was during the last (2002) review of the Office of the Provost, but that information was not available during the meeting. [The external reviewer in the 2002 review was Provost Lee Huntsman of the University of Washington.] He expressed the opinion that a provost at another institution might bring considerably more information to the review process than Dr. Whitmore might, given that his experience as provost was exclusively at the UI. President Lawrence offered to gather more information on the choice of Dr. Whitmore as external reviewer. Professor Pendergast commented that, among the CIC institutions, the core responsibilities of provosts are the same, but there is much variation beyond that, particularly in reporting structures. Other provosts may not understand the UI system as well as Dr. Whitmore would. Professor Emeritus Weingeist commented that in his view it was unusual for a person to be reviewing a position that s/he previously held. He suggested still including Dr. Whitmore in the review, but also bringing in an additional external reviewer currently serving as provost in another institution

President Lawrence suggested taking a vote on the other six members of the review committee and then gathering further information on the choice of Dr. Whitmore before taking a vote on his appointment. She noted that the Operations Manual describes the external reviewer as "appointed as indicated above from among off-campus persons nominated in consultation with the central administrator whose office is to be reviewed." President Lawrence and Professor Pendergast observed that this language did not require the committee to specifically appoint *a provost at another university* as the external reviewer.

Professor Schultz moved and Professor Black seconded that the composition of the committee to review the Office of the Provost be approved except for the external reviewer. The motion carried with one abstention.

- *Transition to Online Course Evaluations (Shelly Campo, Chair, Council on Teaching; Joyce Moore, Evaluation and Examination Service)*

Prior to the presentation, President Lawrence indicated that she would be requesting nominations from Councilors for faculty members to serve on an ad hoc committee to produce recommendations regarding online course evaluations. Joyce Moore, Director of the Evaluation and Examination Service, explained that Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Beth Ingram had requested that vended and on-campus solutions be explored for an online course evaluation system. A committee was formed consisting of faculty members, support staff, and

students from across campus. Currently, the university uses the *Assessing the Classroom Environment (ACE)* paper-based evaluation system; Ms. Moore commented that during a typical academic year, the Evaluation and Examination Service processes evaluations for approximately 7500 courses or sections, which includes about 170,000 responses put through scanning. Response rates range from 40% to 100%. The average response rate is 76%. The committee has produced a set of guidelines and features that the members are looking for in an online system. Companies being considered include Class Climate, which currently serves Iowa State University; Evaluation Kit, currently used by Baylor University; College Net, currently used by state-affiliated institutions in Oregon; and Blue Evaluation Explorance, which serves many institutions in the south and southwest. Following the company interviews, there will be a bidding process, and the committee will eventually make a recommendation to the Office of the Provost. Additionally, the committee will investigate the feasibility of UI creating its own online evaluation process; many other institutions have done this, as have several UI colleges. The committee will also examine these collegiate systems. Once it has submitted its recommendations, the committee will disband. Next, the policies that will drive the implementation must be examined. This issue falls under the purview of the Council on Teaching, chaired by Professor Shelly Campo of the College of Public Health.

Professor Campo commented that she had suggested appearing before the Council and Senate prior to the selection of the vendor, as it may be too late to create thoughtful policies once a vendor has been chosen. She added that UI is somewhat “behind the curve” when it comes to instituting online course evaluations. She indicated that there are many issues to be resolved. For example, how will the students receive results of the evaluations? Currently there is a bank of questions available to students; an online system would no doubt increase the usage of this bank. Will there be a separate policy for new faculty and teaching assistants? And, how will response rates be handled? Will there be university guidelines on the length of evaluations? How will we determine the metric by which student results are reported? Will everyone be required to use the online evaluations, or will colleges or departments or individual faculty members be able to opt out? Professor Campo added that she thought these issues were too much for the Council on Teaching to take on in the required time frame; therefore she was approaching the Council and Senate for assistance.

Professor Bohannon asked whether those institutions with online evaluation systems had higher response rates than those with paper-based systems. Ms. Moore responded that when online systems are first implemented, there is a drop in the response rate. The rate does eventually rebound, but usually does not reach the rate of paper-based systems. The effectiveness of the latter can be attributed to the “captive audience” feature of in-class paper-based evaluations. A possible option to reverse this decline is to have students complete the online evaluation *in class*, using their phones or tablets. However, this removes one of the benefits of online evaluations – reclaimed classroom time for instruction. Ms. Moore added that the response rate can be strongly influenced by the instructor, who can stress how important the evaluations are and how feedback is used. Online evaluations can provide students with the opportunity to see the results of the evaluations, which is another benefit. Ms. Moore noted, however, that some institutions have returned to a paper-based system after using an online system in order to increase the response rate. Professor Bohannon commented that the poor

response rate was a significant disincentive to adopting online evaluations. Ms. Moore stressed that this is an option and that it is unlikely that paper-based evaluations would disappear from campus entirely. There are two colleges, however, that are prepared to move their evaluations completely online. She also noted that the aspect of evaluations that faculty find most useful are the comments, and the comments in online evaluations tend to be more thoughtful and in-depth.

Professor Pendergast asked for clarification regarding what problem is being solved by moving to online evaluations, other than the environmental issue of saving paper. Ms. Moore responded that the biggest issue was cost, especially cost for staff time. Professor Pendergast commented that there was also a cost for moving to online evaluations, although this cost could not be measured in dollars. She was concerned that only those students with complaints about the class would take the time to fill out the online evaluation, thus skewing the results. Professor Campo responded that there are options to encourage greater participation, such as conducting the evaluation in class, or even withholding grades until the evaluation is submitted. Response rate should not be as much of an issue for small colleges with predominantly graduate students as it might be for undergraduate colleges, such as the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, with numerous large lecture classes. Professor Pendergast stressed that there are many serious issues to consider, such as the consequences of the release of results, including student comments; the low response rate and resulting skewed results; the issue of who decides which system a department will use; etc.

President Lawrence commented that, given the many issues to consider, it seemed wise to gather a faculty committee to formulate recommendations on the use of online course evaluations, before the process has moved too far forward. Therefore, she was requesting that Councilors submit two or three names from each college as potential ad hoc committee members. Ms. Moore noted that the last vendor will be interviewed in early October and Professor Campo projected that an online evaluation system would be tested in the spring.

Professor Pendergast asked how student identity was protected when results of online evaluations were made public. Ms. Moore responded that data was disassociated from student names. Professor Pendergast followed up, asking about situations in which student identity might become clear to other students via the comments. Ms. Moore and Professor Campo responded that this was a policy, rather than a technical, issue, to be examined by the ad hoc committee. Ms. Moore added that most institutions did not release qualitative data. She noted that course evaluation was a very decentralized endeavor at UI; recommendations made by the ad hoc committee would serve to provide some general guidelines within which colleges and departments could act. Professor Pendergast expressed concern that a new faculty member, if instructor name is attached to the evaluations that are made public, might acquire a reputation as a poor instructor at the beginning of his/her career and students might avoid his/her classes. Ms. Moore responded that some institutions have a policy of not releasing evaluations from courses taught by new faculty members for several years.

In response to a question, Ms. Moore explained that the committee interviewing vendors was focusing on the features that each system could provide, such as flexibility, e.g.,

customizable items and results, and metrics, e.g., norms based on medians and means. Professor Pendergast asked if the metrics would provide for association between a student's information such as grade point average and his/her responses. Ms. Moore responded that the committee was not seeking such a capability in the online evaluation systems, but that the evaluations could provide a section on demographics. She stressed that unless a class was very small, responses should not be traceable to particular students. Professor Pendergast suggested that, in the pilot phase, some classes should submit the evaluation several times throughout the semester, because it is valuable information, patterns might change over time, and any problems with the system can be worked out before the end of the semester.

Professor Ernst asked about the impact of a new online evaluation system on those colleges using an online system of their own. Presumably both the paper-based ACE evaluation system and the collegiate online systems were operating in accordance with current university policy on course evaluation. Ms. Moore indicated that at some institutions (not UI) all aspects of the evaluation process were centrally mandated. She explained that here, colleges which have already implemented an online system can continue to use that; any new online system would be simply another option, as would a paper-based system. Professor Ernst observed then that policy recommendations produced by the ad hoc committee would not involve changing the university's general policy on course evaluation, but rather would provide guidance on the use of online evaluation systems. Professor Campo commented that results from different evaluation systems might be stored in separate banks; this may cause difficulty for colleges that wish to compare results across departments. Therefore a college may require that only one type of system be used.

Professor Bohannon commented that she was generally in favor of colleges and departments making their own policies, but in this situation she wondered if perhaps some general university-wide rules need to be established. There are fairness issues, related to faculty and to students, that must be considered. A 20% response rate for course evaluations could have unfavorable consequences for both faculty and students. Professor Grosland mentioned that the College of Engineering currently uses online evaluations, but is considering a return to paper-based evaluations. She wondered if perhaps students are annoyed by the frequent notifications to fill out online evaluations. Ms. Moore noted that some online evaluation systems use a dashboard listing all the evaluations a student needs to fill out; this solution reduces somewhat the number of notifications. Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education Ingram commented that the current university policy on evaluation is fairly simple, only requiring the use of some type of evaluation. Professor Bohannon commented that such a general policy may be adequate when evaluation response rates are high enough to give a relatively accurate picture of the course, but when response rates drop to 20%, additional guidelines may be necessary to address the role of course evaluation in the tenure process.

- *Possible Modifications to Research Track (Erika Lawrence)*

Observing that nearly half the Councilors this year were new to their positions and therefore not familiar with the discussions that had previously taken place in Council meetings regarding the research track, President Lawrence explained that the research-track policy in the Operations Manual mandated that a review of this new faculty track be conducted five years

after its implementation. The review was carried out during the 2012-13 academic year. The policy also required that the Faculty Senate, immediately after the review, take a vote on whether to retain the research track permanently. At the April 30 Faculty Senate meeting, Senators voted unanimously to retain the track. The review report had also recommended some modifications regarding restrictions on representation and teaching. The Senate did not discuss these modifications in depth, however, because the vote was taken to retain the research track in its present form, with the understanding that any modifications to be made to the track would be thoroughly discussed in the following (now current) year. President Lawrence added that the purpose of today's discussion was to gather input from the Council regarding the proposed modifications. The Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee would use that input in its work on drafting revisions to the research-track policy.

Robert Wallace, Professor of Epidemiology in the College of Public Health and a member of the research-track review committee, indicated that the committee members had conducted interviews with a range of individuals, including deans and faculty members. He did not know of any administrators who were opposed to the research track. Feedback from research-track faculty members had been gathered from a survey; results of the survey of these thirty individuals (all in the Carver College of Medicine) were provided in the review report. Professor Wallace expressed the personal view that modifications should be made to the research track in order to improve it. President Lawrence clarified that the review committee had recommended modifications to the track in the areas of representation, graduate student mentoring, and course instruction. Professor Pendergast asked if there had been recommendations regarding evaluation of research-track faculty, particularly if they do engage in any type of teaching. Professor Wallace responded that the committee had discussed this issue, along with many others, and that he was of the opinion that the same protections and obligations in evaluation provided to other faculty groups should also be provided to research-track faculty.

Professor Abboud, who had also been a member of the review committee, commented that when the research track was implemented in 2008, there was concern among some faculty regarding the impact of this new track, particularly on the tenure track and on scarce university resources. Much of this concern has since subsided. Of the modifications suggested to the track, Professor Abboud believed that the issue of representation would be the one most easily solved. Issues of teaching and mentoring would be more complicated and perhaps best resolved at the collegiate or departmental level, but there would still need to be general guidelines incorporated into the university-wide policy. He stressed that the faculty must proceed through the modification process in the belief that the university is committed to the institution of tenure.

Professor Bohannon expressed the view that mentoring of graduate students seemed to her the easiest issue to resolve. She found the language in this portion of the review report persuasive but was puzzled by the reference to "soft money" (One of the main arguments for limitations on mentoring is that the RT is a soft money position) as a negative factor in the mentoring relationship. Professor Gillan explained that since research-track faculty are entirely dependent on soft money, i.e., grant money, usually from federal sources, if their grant funding should run out, they will lose their position and therefore the graduate student would lose both his/her mentor and funding. While acknowledging the risks posed by this situation, Professor Wallace commented that tenure-track faculty often depart the university as well, leaving

graduate students without their mentors and funding; therefore, this should not be a reason for not allowing research-track faculty to mentor graduate students. Professor Bohannon accepted the pedagogical reasons for allowing research-track faculty to mentor, if they are leading experts in their fields, but she found less acceptable the notion of research-track faculty members serving on the Faculty Senate, in which matters frequently arise that are unique to tenure-track faculty, such as teaching and curriculum issues. Because of research-track faculty members' current limited or non-existent activity in these areas, she found Senate representation for them to be problematic. Perhaps a limit on the number of research-track faculty serving on the Senate could be imposed.

Professor Bohannon continued, indicating that the issue of course instruction was for her the most difficult, due to the potential impact on the tenure track. She commented that the more faculty are hired outside the tenure track, the fewer resources are available for hiring tenure-track faculty. There would be less incentive for departments to hire tenure-track faculty if they can hire other types of faculty for less money. Nevertheless, she realized the wisdom of using good teachers already on campus, no matter their track. The more that teaching opportunities are provided to research-track faculty, the more that the functional differences between the research track and the tenure track begin to disappear. This is a "slippery slope," she said, and we do not know what the consequences will be. She recalled that one of the reasons for implementing the research track was to provide highly-talented individuals who wished to devote all of their time to research with the opportunity to do so, along with a faculty title.

Concurring with Professor Bohannon, Professor Pendergast stressed that the three tracks – tenure, clinical, and research – must be distinguishable. If they are not, then a second class will arise, made up of individuals doing the same work as tenure-track faculty, but not eligible for tenure. There is also the issue of core responsibility for the academic program; typically this responsibility has fallen to the tenure-track faculty. Would research-track faculty begin playing a role in curricular issues? Professor Pendergast added that she had once been a research-track faculty member at another institution. Teaching there was sporadic, not paid for by the faculty member's grant, and limited to the faculty member's narrow area of expertise. If there is no limit on teaching opportunities for research-track faculty, she said, then a threat to tenure will emerge.

Professor Emeritus Thomas Weingeist, a representative of the Emeritus Faculty Council, commented that he agreed with many of the earlier comments. He asked if research-track faculty members were "worker bees" or independent researchers obtaining their own funding. If the latter, he asked what the difference was between research-track and tenure-track faculty. He wondered if the tenure track would evolve such that tenure-track faculty who do not receive tenure would frequently move to the research track. He stressed that, although he was supportive of the track, there are many important issues to consider when modifying it.

President Lawrence clarified that research-track faculty members can submit grants as the principal investigator and can maintain their own labs. She added that there is a limit on the number of research-track faculty per college, "the greater of eight faculty members or ten percent of the tenured/tenure-track faculty (computed in FTEs) of that college." Professor Wasserman pointed out that there had been a limit to the number of clinical-track faculty

members per college when that track was first established. However, several colleges eventually greatly exceeded that limit, so the cap was subsequently raised. Regarding representation on the Faculty Senate, he suggested that data be provided indicating the number of senators, both clinical- and tenure-track, from each college from the time when the clinical track was implemented. He recalled that years ago the delegation from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences had outnumbered the delegation from the Carver College of Medicine, but that this was no longer the case, due to the loss of faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the gain of clinical-track faculty in the Carver College of Medicine. This has re-shaped the composition of the Senate, so that it doesn't represent tenure-track faculty to the extent that it once did. He expressed concern that the research track would eventually be expanded just as the clinical track had been. This will lead to the Faculty Senate being composed of fewer and fewer tenure-track faculty.

Professor Black indicated that he was the chair of the Carver College of Medicine's Executive Committee, a body that has discussed the research track extensively. Professor Black noted that the CCOM strongly supports the research track. He concurred with Professor Pendergast that the research track not become a "tenure-track lite," a place for those unsuccessful in gaining tenure or a cost-saving measure for administrators. Regarding the precedent of the clinical track, he acknowledged that there may be cause for concern. The clinical track was implemented with a cap of 35% of the total salaried faculty in the CCOM, but was recently increased to 75%, because of the perceived need to expand the clinical operation of the college. Professor Black then offered the perspectives of members of the CCOM Executive Council on the three proposed modifications to the research track. There was general support for research-track faculty members to have representation, given their status as faculty. Regarding the issue of mentoring graduate students, Professor Black observed that some basic-science tenure-track faculty are concerned that they will be competing for the small number of available graduate students with the research-track faculty, should the latter be allowed to mentor graduate students. As for course instruction, Professor Black pointed out that research-track faculty are considered to be individuals who wish to spend all of their time doing research; any amount of teaching would detract from that mission. He also noted that there are "hard money" funds used to reimburse CCOM tenure- and clinical-track faculty members' salaries for teaching. Since research-track faculty are required to be supported only by grant funding, this would become problematic. He added, where would one draw the line to limit their teaching? Five percent of their time? Ten? Professor Black concluded that while the issue of representation would not pose a problem for the Senate, the other two modifications, mentoring graduate students and course instruction, would likely be met with opposition.

Professor Wallace expressed concern that some of the arguments he had heard were in fact still about the presence of the research track, rather than any modification to it. Other issues raised, he believed, had more to do with larger problems with how university funds are allocated, not specifically with the research track. He stressed that, given the current difficult federal funding environment, it was in the university's best interests to attract as many outstanding researchers as possible. Research-track faculty at other institutions around the country are distinguished investigators with their own institutes, patents, etc. Our university should have our share of such individuals. Professor Pendergast commented that, unless a grant

has a specific training component, teaching cannot be paid for with grant money. Teaching would need to be done on overload or the funding for teaching would need to come from a different source. This needs to be made clear. She agreed that research-track faculty should have representation, but that does not imply that they should be able to vote on issues that primarily affect tenure-track faculty, such as curricular issues. Frequent switching of tracks should also be prohibited. And, research-track faculty should be attached to departments, not floating in a college. President Lawrence thanked the Councilors for their input at this early stage of the possible revision of the research-track policy. Councilors' comments would be passed on to the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee.

IV. From the Floor – Professor Muhly expressed concern about the difficulty of obtaining health insurance for itinerant faculty, such as visiting professors. Professor Pendergast commented that she had been told that those employed at 50% time or greater, even on a temporary basis, must be offered health insurance coverage by their employers. This includes family coverage. Those employed at less than 50% can negotiate possible coverage with their employers; it is not required for employers to offer coverage to them.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 24, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber of the Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 8, 3:30-5:15 pm in room 2520D of the University Capitol Centre.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Black seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Lawrence adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.