

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes

Tuesday, 3 November 1998

Room 335, IMU

Members Present: A. Bhattacharjee, J. Carlson, K. Clark, C. Colvin, L. Cox, R. Curto, J. Jew, J. Kline, J. Menninger, K. Mescher, M. Pincus, M. Stone, K. Tachau, E. Wasserman, B. Weir, B. Wiley.

Members Absent: L. Burmeister, B. Butler, H. Diehl.

Guests: C. Drum, University Relations; L. Muller, *Cedar Rapids Gazette*; J. Whitmore, L.A. Clark, John Folkins, J. Knight, Office of Provost; L. Cox, M. Sagen, Ombuds Office; A. Bhatti, Council on Teaching; L. Sims (Graduate College), S. Pettinger, S. Shuman, UISG.

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:37 PM.
- II. The agenda for the meeting was approved.
- III. The minutes of Faculty Council of 6 October 1998 were approved.
- IV. Announcements
 - A. The University administration has provided \$25,000 for Faculty Senate operations; the funds originate from the vending contract with Coke. Routine operations of the Senate require approximately half the available money and Councilors were asked to suggest projects for the remainder. The funds may increase in the future.
 - B. The Governmental Relations Committee and Faculty Senate are sponsoring an all-day symposium for Alumni Legislative Advocates on 13 November. There will be faculty presentations and discussions of University needs. All Councilors are welcome to attend.
 - C. The Faculty Senate officers are still developing the questionnaire for faculty on service and research. This will probably be distributed in January and ask about faculty activities during the fall semester.
- V. Old Business: there was none to discuss.
- VI. New Business
 - A. Report from Ombuds Office: Lois Cox, Ombudsperson, and Maile Sagen, Ombudsperson

The annual report of the Ombuds Office and brochures were made available, as well as student-oriented materials. There was a dramatic drop in faculty served by the Ombuds Office during the past fiscal year (40-45%). Councilors were asked to encourage faculty to feel free to consult the office. The Ombuds Office to the extent possible remains neutral during resolution of complaints. It is possible that a mistaken impression might be made because the office judges after investigation that a particular complaint is not justified or that events seem different than the complainant's perspective, or because during the early stages of an investigation the office initiates contact with others in the University administration. Informal proceedings are the rule; no records are kept, except for statistics. Complainants can choose to talk with the office via

telephone to avoid even being part of the statistics. The office is independent, reporting only to University President Coleman. The mediation service, which operates currently out of the Ombuds Office and opened 1 October 1998, is also informal, although necessarily more structured since consent of two or more parties is required to mediate. There is a limited mandate at present: only employment issues are eligible for mediation and students can use the service only to the extent that they are University employees. Maile Sagen, who is operating the mediation service, noted that 50 faculty/staff mediators have been trained and 25 have signed up for service. The mediation service will get a permanent home after this year, during which it is associated with and operated by the Ombuds Office.

B. Recognition for Teachers: Asghar Bhatti, Chair, Council on Teaching.

President Wiley distributed a list of extant teaching awards, prepared by the Council on Teaching. The question is should there be a more substantial award? Prof. Bhatti went over the various extant awards. The funds associated with these awards were limited to computer programs, teaching materials, anything other than salaries. Prof. Tachau asked about the administration budget for the N-title program. Prof. Bhatti responded that last year there were 120 faculty trained, with the rest of the \$450,000 budget spent on administration of the program. Prof. Cox asked why instructional improvement awards were decided centrally rather than via departments. Associate Provost Folkins answered that the budget is too small to distribute to departments. The Council on Teaching has met at length on the issue of recognizing teachers and has concluded that awards for teaching leadership, for long-term outstanding teaching, for department-specific teaching (award made to the department) are all needed. Before proceeding further the Council on Teaching needs feedback from the Faculty Council. Prof. Kline pointed out that the n-Title budget is very much larger than other award programs. Associate Provost Folkins noted that this program derives from a separate legislated budget item. Prof. Bhatti added that these are not awarded by the Council on Teaching. President Wiley asserted that the University currently does precious little to reward good teaching. Prof. Curto suggested that the University needs to give recognition for long-term effort in high quality teaching perhaps not outstanding. Dean Sims expressed concern that there is no recognition for teaching other than the didactic classroom variety--for example, for apprentice type teaching and mentoring. Assoc. Provost Folkins mentioned a need for clinical teaching awards, or teaching in the practicum environment. Prof. Tachau observed that some of the extant award mechanisms provide what in an ideal world should be available to all teachers. There is currently only a low rate of renewal of computer supplies: a seven-nine year replacement is just too slow. All teachers need computer support, not just n-Title awardees; there are unmet needs for all teaching.

President Wiley asked for a straw vote. There was unanimous support for the Council on Teaching continuing to address the issue of more substantial teaching awards.

President Wiley described his preference for endowed chairs for teaching. When the Senate officers considered this issue there was more enthusiasm when the awards included support for teaching assistants and unrestricted research grants, instead of supplements to salaries. Another suggestion was that alumni be included in the pool of those nominating faculty for such awards, since many students become more aware of the impact of their teachers two-five years after graduation. A proposal "Recognition for Outstanding Teaching" was distributed to councilors. Prof. Curto questioned why there would only be one such award. Prof. Bhatti responded that

while this was not fixed, to combine two aspects of teaching into one award perhaps might produce complications. Instead they discussed giving two distinct awards: for recognition and for leadership. Prof. Weir indicated another category for evaluating good teachers: teaching in more than one department and thus demonstrating competence in more than one area. Should there not be an award for interdisciplinary teaching? Prof. Tachau suggested different genres of teaching might be recognized on a rotating cycle, à la the dissertation awards. Such a scheme might relieve the complexity of evaluation, comparing apples and oranges. Perhaps the schedule would allow an award for best teaching in the creative arts in one year, an award for the best teaching in a clinical environment in the next year, followed by an award for teaching via lectures, etc. Prof. Colvin observed that the proposed awards would make everyone more familiar with various kinds of teaching, especially if the Council on Teaching provided a definition of the teaching for which the award was made. Prof. Bhatti thought that having different categories for awards might automatically provide solution to this issue. President Wiley noted that the proposed program would be substantially different from the Academy of Teaching considered last year.

C. Proposed Constitution and Bylaws Amendment: Jon Carlson, Chair, Committee on Rules and Bylaws

There is some difficulty in finding candidates to serve as senate officers, perhaps because nominees are currently restricted to current members of the Faculty Senate. A possible solution is to expand the eligibility to former as well as current senate members. This change would apply to Article II of the Constitution and to Article III of the Bylaws; there would also be some technical consequences concerned with automatic extension of terms, etc. An amendment to Article V of the Bylaws: assignments to committees are currently balked by late knowledge of who will be the eligible new senators. The ploy with the least difficulties merely asks the Committee on Elections to report the election results quickly to the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Rules and Bylaws requests that these proposed amendments be placed on the agenda for the Faculty Senate.

Prof. Kline asked why late identification of senators impairs making appointments; membership on committees is not limited to senators. Prof. Carlson responded that the Committee on Committees felt they had an easier time persuading senators to serve, a sentiment echoed by President Wiley who noted also that willingness to stand for election to the Senate indicated a general interest in governance issues.

Prof. Stone moved, seconded by Prof. Weir, the proposed amendment to Article II of the Constitution and to Article V of the Bylaws to expand the eligibility for election of Faculty Senate officers to former as well as current senate members.

Prof. Pincus wondered why people not elected as senators by their peers should be eligible to serve as an officer. Prof. Carlson responded that perfectly respectable candidates were now rendered ineligible by the rule forbidding more than two consecutive terms as senator and pointed out that any officer would still need to be elected by a vote of the senators. Prof. Jew inquired why the two-term rule exists. Prof. Carlson opined that it keeps Senate membership churning. Prof. Jew suggested that the proposed remedy seemed going at it backwards: someone no longer serving on the Senate could become an officer; it seems likely that out of the whole Senate eight candidates could be found. In response to a question by Prof. Curto, several officers pointed out

that expanding eligibility would increase the pool of candidates significantly more than allowing senators to serve longer, three terms for example. In response to a query by Prof. Kline it was explained that under the current rules a senator can be elected to be vice president as late as the fifth year of service and the term as senator would be automatically extended to allow progression to president and past-president. Prof. Tachau expressed the hope that the proposed amendment would increase the probability of electing a woman a senate president.

The motion was carried without dissent.

The proposal to amend Article V of the Bylaws, to ask the Committee on Elections to report the election results to the Committee on Committees not later than one week after the elections, was moved by Prof. Tachau, seconded by Prof. Pincus, and carried without dissent.

D. Review Days" Proposal from University of Iowa Student Government: Sarah Pettinger and Scott Shuman, University of Iowa Student Government.

Students are requesting that each department ask instructors to schedule "review days," the last few days of a semester which are to be used for review and not for new material or assignments. In response to a question from Prof. Weir, it was stated that colleges and departments will decide how many days to dedicate to review, one-to-three are suggested. Responding to a question on whether this would be mandatory, Associate Provost Folkins noted that as presently written the proposal could be ignored by colleges or departments. Prof. Carlson asked whether consideration had been given to a "dead week", with no classes, when students could devote 15 hours a day to study. Associate Provost Folkins responded that students initially proposed a dead week, or one-two day reading period but for one administrative reason or another these fell short of success and review days was the surviving acceptable compromise. Prof. Carlson expressed doubt about the implementation of review days; his experience suggested that a few students would come well prepared but many others would interpret time devoted to review as an excuse not to study, and would merely listen to others work. Prof. Bhattacharjee observed that many instructors already devote the end of a semester to review and verified that the proposed review days were advisory in nature. Assoc. Provost Folkins mentioned additional complexities: courses tied closely to specific days of the week (theater performances, for example) that argued for autonomy of units in deciding how to manage review days. Prof. Curto portrayed the proposed program as weaker than it might be but this opinion was rebutted by Prof. Clark, who averred that dedicating classes to review put a burden on students to come to such classes prepared with questions. Prof. Cox argued for evening out the length of the two semesters (currently fall = 76, spring = 74 days), describing the faculty exhaustion he perceived at the end of the fall semester. Prof. Colvin asked whether inconsistency of implementation across various units might not defeat the intent of the proposal. Prof. Bhattacharjee wondered how other institutions were able to manage dead days and Prof. Weir pointed out that a pre-finals week occurred elsewhere. Assoc. Provost Folkins felt that review days might evolve into dead days as faculty became more experienced with the custom and as a result more enthusiastic. Prof. Curto lamented the circumstance when an instructor, in trying to complete the advertised syllabus, introduced new material on Friday that would be examined at 7:30 AM the following Monday. Assoc. Provost Folkins opined that were the proposal adopted, it would provide departments with a rationale for rules condemning such activities.

A straw vote to endorse the principle of the proposal was passed without dissent. A straw vote in favor of a stronger proposal was passed with but two negative votes.

Prof. Tachau asked how Councilors might help the students in this regard and Ms. Pettinger replied by encouraging support of the Faculty Senate.

Prof. Clark moved, seconded by Prof. Mescher, that the UISG Proposal on Review Days be taken up by the Faculty Senate.

In a brief discussion on the desirability of forwarding a stronger proposal to the Senate, Prof. Tachau expressed opposition, pointing out that the Graduate Council had considered and rejected a stronger version. Prof. Carlson asked what the students wanted from the Council beyond reaction to their proposal. Ms. Pettinger responded that the students were unfamiliar with the appropriate channels for moving forward. Provost Whitmore thought that if supported by the students, the Faculty Council and the Faculty Senate, the proposal would go to the Provost, then the Vice Presidents for a decision on whether it would become official policy. Assoc. Provost Folkins noted that this process would be very different from changing the days of instruction, for which approval by the Regents is needed. Provost Whitmore noted that as a volunteer program, approval by the administration would probably not be required. Prof. Jew guessed that the original proposal stood the best chance of approval by the Senate; it couldn't work in the College of Medicine, where some clinical rotations are of only two weeks duration. Prof. Bhattacharjee noted that other colleges like Liberal Arts could implement the proposal even if Medicine could not. Provost Whitmore rehearsed the history of this effort: originally the students lobbied for a two-day reading period, between the end of lectures and the beginning of examinations; this was shot down and the current proposal was the fall-back.

The motion passed without dissent. The proposal will be sent on to the Senate.

E. Discussion of Libraries Committee Report: Carin Green, Chair, University Libraries Committee

Prof. Green described current library recommendations to cancel subscriptions as due to a simple problem: not enough money. The problem is acute for serials, especially in science and engineering, which are often published privately for profit. There has been a 50% increase in prices for these serials. This year, the library will cut the acquisition of monographs in science and engineering and convert the residual funds to serials; this can't go on forever. Such a difficult problem must be solved by faculty, collectively. The for-profit publishers have a stranglehold on faculty. Publication is necessary to provide a record of scholarship for promotion or the award of tenure. Publishers charge page costs or require subventions to provide their content; then faculty pay again to read their own articles. There are some practical and useful solutions:

1. Inform faculty about the problem; being separated from decision making disguises costs and need, for promotion/tenure. faculty must place their articles responsibly; senior faculty have a special responsibility, they write peer reviews; without peer review, publishers get hurt.
2. Encourage scholarly associations to publish journals of quality on our behalf.

3. Retain copyright of published articles; the University can help with legal advice; literary agents might help; research supported by governmental funds may require copyright to be retained by faculty, to guarantee general release of results.
4. Elsevier (who receives 10% of our serials budget) is grievously offensive; representatives should be brought here, as they were to Purdue; authors, economists and international financial experts convinced Elsevier that the problem was serious; a reduction in price increases was negotiated. We need to establish that faculty actually have an opinion on this issue, that our research belongs to other than the private publishers, that we ought to have some say in how our research is disseminated; that our libraries are not cash cows for the publishers.
5. Electronic publishing will not be cheaper; with electronic databases, stopping a current subscription also prevents access to old issues that were published when the subscription was still in force.

Provost Whitmore reported that only the library has received an incremental budget increase (an 8% increase annually for acquisitions, supported by the state), but it still gets farther behind. National organizations are trying to deal with this; a group of librarians are searching for alternative publishers. The AAU provosts are working with disciplinary/scholarly associations to encourage them to publish articles. Assoc. Provost Folkins noted that a number of publishing houses that have worked well with academia have gotten bought out and their principles changed as a result. The real security is journals published by scholarly associations. To encourage the widest possible dissemination of scholarship, the AAU has recommended moving away from charging for access and moving towards page or submission charges, to be defrayed by universities. Dean Sims pointed out that dissertations form the basis of many publications. The University has recently joined the National Library of Digital Theses and Dissertations. The idea is to provide alternative modes of publishing theses. This has sparked some controversy concerning restricted access among universities, publishers and professional societies.

Prof. Tachau moved, Prof. Colvin seconding, to continue this discussion at the next Council meeting. Prof. Tachau suggested that the University budget might be raided for library needs. In Denmark, she noted, middle-class people did not see the need for individual bathrooms in a brand-new apartment building. At UC/Berkeley, development of technological infrastructure was deemed pre-eminent and the library had to cope with a limited budget. We should carefully discuss priorities before making decisions about what part of the library budget should be cut. The motion carried without dissent.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John Menninger