

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY COUNCIL

Minutes
Tuesday, December 14, 1999
Iowa Room (#335), Iowa Memorial Union

Members Present: S. Aquilino, J. Carlson, C. Colvin, J. Cox, R. Curto, J. Jew, D. Manderscheid, G. Milavetz, G. Parkin, M. Pincus, P. Pomrehn, M. Stone, B. Wiley

Members Absent: K. Clark, C. Carney-Doebbeling, L. Geist, V. Grassian, J.Kline

Members Absent (excused): A. Bhattacharjee

Guests: L.A. Clark, J. Whitmore (Office of the Provost); F. Boos, B. Pelton (Faculty Welfare Committee); C. Drum (University Relations); Carol Tebockhorst (Senate Staff Secretary)

I. President Carlson called the meeting to order at 3:37 PM.

II. Approvals

A. Professor Parkin moved, Professor Colvin seconded, all approved the revised meeting agenda.

B. Professor Wiley moved, Professor Manderscheid seconded, all approved the Faculty Council minutes of November 30, 1999 as distributed.

III. Announcements

Provost Whitmore has sent letters to the collegiate deans regarding procedures for the review of the clinical track by central administration and Faculty Senate.

IV. New Business

Associate Provost Clark distributed copies of a document containing proposed revisions to the University's Faculty Development Program. These revisions were initiated at the request of the health sciences colleges and address (1) making developmental leaves available to clinical faculty and (2) adjusting eligibility requirements, duration of developmental leaves, and payback obligations to better respond to the circumstances of 12-month faculty.

Professor Wiley observed that the proposed revisions provide for leaves of up to one year for 12-month faculty but only one semester for 9-month faculty. He regarded this as discriminatory and proposed that two-semester leaves be available for both 9-month and 12-month faculty or that 9-month and 12-month faculty both be restricted to one semester/6-month leaves.

There was discussion about the need of 12-month faculty for longer leave assignments, whether deans of faculty with 9-month appointments would have the resources to enable them to grant two-semester developmental leaves, and which colleges have 9-month vs. 12-month faculty. Associate Provost Clark indicated that the deans of 12-month faculty had the expectation that two-semester leaves would be granted only if funding and staffing needs could be met. However, it was noted that this expectation could also be applied to 9-month faculty, and that funding and staffing factor in any decision to grant developmental leave, whatever the duration.

Professor Wiley moved, Professor Aquilino seconded, and the motion unanimously passed that:

MOTION: To recommend to the Provost that the proposed revisions from the Provost's Office re: the University's developmental leave policy allow faculty with 9-month appointments to be eligible for one year/2-semester leaves.

Suggested wording:

Faculty with 9-month appointments

Eligibility and Length of Award

Full-time faculty members with 9-month appointments are eligible for an initial Career Development Award of one semester at full salary or two semesters at one-half salary on completion of ten semesters full-time academic service; or two semesters at full salary on completion of twenty semesters full-time service. Faculty members are eligible for subsequent awards on completion of ten or twenty additional semesters of active service.

Part-time faculty members become eligible for Development Awards when their service on a pro-rata basis meets the requirements specified above. For example, a faculty member with a 9-month 50% appointment would become eligible for a one-semester award on completion of twenty semesters of service.

Professor Cox asked whether clinical faculty would be taking leave to do research and the implications of this for tenured faculty. Associate Provost Clark indicated that she did not anticipate that clinical faculty would utilize the developmental leave program very often. There was discussion about the use of developmental leave for different types of activities that would qualify as scholarship.

Professor Aquilino moved, Professor Colvin seconded, and the motion unanimously passed:

MOTION: That the proposed revisions to the developmental leave policy, including the Council-approved recommendation to allow faculty with 9-month appointments to be eligible for 2-semester leaves, be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

V. Reports

A. Ad hoc committee to discuss means for recognizing and promoting teaching excellence at the University. Professors Colvin and Wiley reported that this committee is continuing to make progress. They anticipate that they will have a proposal to bring to Council early next year that will generate good faculty support..

B. Response to University Safety and Security Committee. President Carlson distributed copies of the memo he sent to Connie Tipsword, chair of the Safety and Security Committee. The memo summarized the Council's concerns about the Committee's proposed amendments to its charter, and the reasons for our decision to decline endorsement of the changes.

C. Faculty Welfare Committee. Professor Beth Pelton, chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, presented a report about the Committee's charge, functions and responsibilities, and their activities over the past year.

During the past year, concerns have been brought to the Committee regarding resignations, grievances, intellectual property, grievance procedures and policies, administrative decisions at all levels, roles of various University officials, inquiries about where to go for help or information. In carrying out its functions and

responsibilities, the Committee has interacted with individual faculty, the Office of the Provost, the University General Counsel, AAUP, the Office of the Ombudsperson, and the Judicial Commission.

There was discussion about how individual faculty members find out about the Faculty Welfare Committee and the repeatedly expressed concerns by faculty about who are advocates for faculty. The remainder of Professor Pelton's report focused on the status of the 1999 Faculty Welfare Committee Survey.

Professor Pelton outlined the background, rationale, and purposes of the survey and study. The last Faculty Welfare Committee survey of all faculty was carried out in 1979. The purposes of the current survey are to: assess quality of life for faculty, determine whether and what similarities and differences exist between faculty subgroups, and disseminate results and recommendations.

Professor Pelton discussed the process in obtaining support and resources for carrying out the survey, and the factors and rationale used in design of the survey. The survey was mailed in the spring of 1999 to all University of Iowa faculty who were eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections. Data collection was closed in September 1999. The response rate was 57.44%, and analysis of the data thus far indicates that reliability is very sound.

The Faculty Welfare Committee is seeking advice from Faculty Council and other faculty constituent groups about reporting the results of the survey: e.g., target audiences, disseminating results, releasing parts of, or the whole report, use of the media, format.

Active discussion followed Professor Pelton's presentation. Comments and suggestions included: seeking input from individuals and offices across the campus, who are knowledgeable about specific categories of the survey; use of webpages to disseminate information; whether or not to disseminate the information to other institutions; how to make the report and information interactive by focusing specific information; oversight of the database; objective-based analysis of data; comparison with past surveys; who should see the report prior to wider dissemination and to the media; how to report the open-ended responses in the survey. Associate Provost Clark suggested that the use of statistical techniques for data reduction might be useful for analyzing and reporting the survey data. Professor Pelton thanked the Council for its input and indicated that we would be kept informed of the survey's progress.

VI. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jean Jew".

Jean Jew, Secretary