

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, February 5, 2008
3:30-5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

Present: D. Asprey; J. Beckman; G. Bergus; L. Boyle; C. Catney; M. Cohen; S. Collins; J. Cox; K. Culp; D. D'Alessandro; E. Dove; D. Drake; El-Khoury; S. Fagen; J. Fieselmann; R. Glasgow; G. Carin; C. Helms; R. Herman; G. Hope; G. Jogerst; B. Justman; T. Lowe; S. Lutgendorf; D. MacFarlane; M. Maktabi; T. Mangum; F. Mitros; S. Moorehead; A. Morris; N. Nisly; M. Noonan; F. Nothwehr; B. Plapp; A. Poremba; L. Robertson; G. Russell; J. Sa-Aadu; K. Schuh; W. Sharp; L. Snetselaar; K. Southard; N. Street; S. Stromquist; A. Sullivan; B. Thompson; T. Ton-That; S. Vincent; W. Vispoel; R. Wachtel; R. Williams; M. Wilson Kimber; S. Wolfe; C. Woodman; T. Yin

Absent: L. Ayres; M. Donovan; T. Kresowik; S. Lagos Lavenz; J. Leddy; K. Porter; D. Redlawsk; B. Schutte; T. Scruggs; C. Thomas; M. VanBeek

Excused: J. Bertolatus; G. Buettner; G. Bulechek; D. Filios; C. Kletzing; Y. Li; R. Martin; L. Richman; C. Ringen; K. Tachau, J. Woodhead

Officers

Present: S. Kurtz (Past President); S. McGuire (Secretary); M. O'Hara (Vice President); and V. Sharp (President)

Guests: E. Bottando (Dept of Communications); J. Carlson (President's Office); A. Duong (Faculty Senate); S. Johnson (Provost's Office); K. Klein (Staff Council); L. Lopes (Provost's Office); S. Moller (The Daily Iowan); B. Morelli (Press Citizen); R. Sayre (Emeritus Fac. Council); A. Shurson (The Daily Iowan); R. Stephens (Dept of Engineer); C. Porter (Ombuds); and L. Zaper (Faculty Senate)

I. Call to Order – President Sharp called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals

A. Meeting Agenda – President Sharp noted a change to the agenda: the item “Peace Week Proposal” will be moved up to the second item of New Business, because of the time-sensitive nature of this proposal. Past President

Kurtz moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion was unanimously approved.

- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (November 27, 2007) – Professor Cohen moved and Professor Drake seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- C. Senate Replacements – (Michael O’Hara)
- Katherine Porter (Law) will replace Jim Tomkovicz (Law) on the Senate and Council, spring 2008. This appointment was made following the last Faculty Council meeting. Past President Kurtz moved and Professor Drake seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - Tung Yin (Law) will replace Jonathan Carlson (Law) on the Senate, spring 2008. This appointment was made following the last Faculty Council meeting. Past President Kurtz moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - Howard Cowen (Dentistry) will replace James McPherson (Writers’ Workshop) on the Human Rights Charter Committee, 2007-2010. Past President Kurtz moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - Anne Sullivan (Family Medicine) will replace Johna Leddy (Chemistry) on the Parking and Transportation Charter Committee, spring 2008. Professor Cohen moved and Professor Boyle seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- D. Faculty Senate Elections Vacancy Tally (Michael O’Hara) – There are 33 vacancies next year in the Faculty Senate. The electronic nomination process will be underway shortly.

III. Update on Provost Search (Michael O’Hara) – The search committee will shortly interview the semi-finalists off-campus, and the search committee hopes to have a final group of five for on-campus interviews during the weeks of February 25-29 and March 10-14. The search committee will report to President Mason on the morning of March 14. Vice President O’Hara encouraged the group to attend the public events for each candidate.

IV. New Business

- Research Track Proposal (Steve McGuire)
Secretary McGuire stated that the proposal has gone through several rounds of discussion with various constituencies on campus, including the Research Council, the Faculty Policy and Compensation Committee, and the Council of Deans. He referred the group to the *Executive Summary*. Secretary McGuire noted that this proposal tries to balance two competing ideas. The university has a mission to sustain academic freedom by maintaining the tenure track; the creation of the research track is potentially detrimental to that mission. On the other hand, certain units within the university have a need to pursue their research enterprise in a flexible way, distinct from other units on campus.

This proposal seeks to balance these two competing needs in a way that secures tenure and still allows individual colleges to pursue the research track as it fits their needs. Secretary McGuire read the first point in the Executive Summary: “Research-track faculty shall be funded (including all start-up costs) exclusively by grants, contracts, clinical income, and private donations, and not with general education funds.” He stressed that the indirect costs that come back to a college that would go into the general fund cannot be used to pay for the research track. Research-track faculty will be responsible for their own funding. It has been argued that we could simply move these potential research-track faculty into tenure-track positions; however, as Interim Provost Lopes explained at the January 22 Faculty Council meeting, the salaries of tenured College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) faculty are guaranteed by the university even if all outside funding of the College disappears. In the Carver College of Medicine (CCOM), however, external funding covers nearly all of tenured faculty members’ salaries. Therefore, for the CCOM, hiring tenure-track faculty is contingent upon the amount of external funding the College can obtain. Also, there are some faculty who want to do only research, but need the title of “professor” to bolster their chances of obtaining funding. In order to protect tenure, we have built “firewalls” into the policy. For example, if the CCOM decided to adopt the research-track policy, other colleges would not be harmed by this. One of these firewalls would be the restrictions on funding sources.

Secretary McGuire read the second point: “Each college’s faculty determine whether to adopt the hiring of research-track faculty by obtaining the approval of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty within the college and the approval by The University of Iowa Faculty Senate and others.” Therefore, each college must come before the Senate with its individual policy for approval. There have been several concerns expressed regarding this. One is that all the colleges should have the same faculty types. However, we work better as a university when we acknowledge each college’s autonomy, as long as harm is not caused to another unit.

Secretary McGuire read the third point, “Research-track faculty contribute to the research mission of the University and devote their time exclusively to performing externally supported research. Following this: Research-track faculty cannot be elected to the Faculty Senate but can participate in departmental and college governance to the extent allowed by the collegiate policy.” There is a concern that we may create a second-class faculty. However, tenured/tenure-track and clinical-track faculty all teach, in addition to doing research and service. It is not appropriate for the research-track faculty to have a vote on tenure and curricular issues in the Faculty Senate, as they will not be teaching. “Research-track faculty can provide auxiliary lectures on areas of knowledge relevant to their research or as may be required by the terms of grant or contract, and may serve on but not head doctoral committees. Research-track faculty will not teach courses, though.” They will not be hired to teach, but they might bring with their research distinct pieces of knowledge that they can share with classes in a lecture or two during the academic year. They can serve on doctoral committees with permission, but cannot direct a thesis or dissertation. “Consistent with current university practice, research-track faculty will not participate in the vote to hire tenured/tenure-track or clinical-track faculty.” They can participate in discussions on hiring, but they do not vote on hiring. This is similar to the language concerning clinical-track faculty. “Research-track faculty will be initially

appointed for one to three years. Re-appointment reviews will evaluate the faculty member's ability to obtain and sustain extramural salary support. Appointments cannot last longer than the faculty member's external support." The language in the proposal mirrors the language on clinical-track faculty regarding review, appointment, and notification of termination. "Research-track faculty hold faculty rank at assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure. The number of research-track faculty in a college cannot exceed the greater of eight research-track faculty members or ten percent (10%) of the tenured/tenure-track faculty (computed in FTEs)."

The CCOM theoretically could hire 50 research-track faculty at this point. If the CCOM wanted to increase this percentage, they would need to have the increase approved by the Faculty Senate. So, might we be overrun by research-track faculty in the future? No. "This policy will be reviewed no later than five years following its implementation. The Faculty Senate will then vote on whether to renew the policy. If not renewed the research track terminates." In five years, we will try to determine if hiring practices have changed because of the research track. We will also look at the funding of research-track faculty. In five years, we will look back on this pilot project and make any necessary adjustments. Secretary McGuire continued that when he first began looking at this issue, he had strong reservations. He saw the possibility of undermining tenure. But, all who support this policy see it as a win-win situation. In his experience teaching in two different colleges, he has seen two different ways of doing things. We must be flexible in the university to balance competing needs, and allow colleges to pursue their individual destinies without doing harm to other colleges. No policy is perfect, and unforeseen problems may emerge. It is important to endorse the policy in order to help the university move forward. If this policy were to come before the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences or Education, he would vote against it. But he supports it overall.

Professor Cohen moved and Professor Drake seconded that the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of the research track.

Professor Cox expressed the view that the establishment of the research track will undermine tenure. It will create a class of people with no job security. The research track will also undermine academic freedom, as the purpose of tenure is to give people the chance to devote themselves to a lifetime of research. Research-track faculty will compete with tenure-track faculty for resources. There will be pressure to put money towards short-term projects. Regarding governance, a second-class group of faculty will be created. There is a viable alternative to research-track faculty – the research scientists already on campus. There may be some small harm done if we do not adopt the research track, but there would be great harm done to the university overall if we do adopt it.

Professor Cohen stressed that the proposed policy recognizes the autonomy of each college, and this is an important point. Regarding finances, the CCOM would very much like to hire additional tenure-track faculty. In CLAS, there has been a significant reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty over the past few years, due to lack of resources. Adjunct faculty have been recruited to cover teaching needs; perhaps this is not fundamentally different from the research track. He reminded the group that the

CCOM receives less than 10% of its funding from the state, unlike many of the other colleges. The resulting financial risk in hiring tenure-track faculty cannot be taken on by the CCOM or the university. The UI ranks 30th in NIH funding, but aspires to the top 20. Most of the other universities in the top 20 already have research-track faculty.

Professor Mangum stated that, although she respects the challenges facing the CCOM, she has been struck by a fundamental contradiction, namely, that there is a difference between the titles of “research scientist” and “research professor” because the term “professor” has a serious meaning. “Professor” implies a life of teaching, research, and service, and a willingness to be evaluated on these activities in order to gain tenure, in order to have academic freedom. Without all of these aspects, the term “professor” will cease to have any meaning.

Professor Robertson commented on his experience bringing a research professor in his lab to the UI, where this person has been given the title of “research scientist,” while he had faculty status at his previous institution, and there enjoyed all the benefits of being a faculty member. This person feels like a second-class citizen at the UI. It would be of great benefit to him to be given the title of “research faculty,” and to be treated like faculty.

Professor Boyle stated that she has had discussions with her colleagues in the College of Engineering, many of whom support the adoption of the research track. They want to give research scientists the status they deserve. However, the proposed policy as currently written does not give these individuals the opportunity to mentor students or teach. Several other issues arose in her conversations with her colleagues. Can a person switch from the tenure track to the research track if they are unsuccessful in obtaining tenure? Who will make salary decisions? Can a research-track faculty member make more money than a tenure-track faculty member? Research-track faculty will have a lot of knowledge and experience – will they have any opportunity to share this with students?

Professor Drake noted that 19 out of the top 20 NIH-funded universities have the research track. He described the experiences of his colleagues around the country who work with top young researchers who want to devote all their time to research, to the exclusion of teaching and service. These are the types of positions they would seek. Professor Sa-Aadu cautioned against putting too many restrictions on the policy. Also, not all faculty do all three activities – teaching, research, and service – therefore, perhaps we should allow those who excel in research and only want to do research, have that opportunity.

Vice President O’Hara addressed various questions that had arisen in the previous comments. As to whether research scientists could convert to research-track faculty, he explained that they would have the opportunity to apply for these positions, but it is not contemplated either in the policy or by the colleges that this would occur often. He expanded upon the comparison of research-track faculty with adjunct faculty. Just as lecturers are hired to address unmet teaching needs, research-track faculty would be hired to address unmet research needs. The CCOM cannot afford to hire more tenure-track faculty at the present time to meet these research needs. Regarding salaries, those would

be set by superiors, just as in other parts of the university. Part of the university's mission is to expand the research enterprise, and thereby contribute to the health and welfare of our citizens – the research track would bring in more external funding to pursue more research. The university overall would benefit.

Professor Maktabi requested further clarification regarding salary, and tenure-track positions that research-track faculty could apply for. If a research-track faculty member no longer has funding, their contract will not be renewed. Professor Nisly commented that salaries are often determined in the CCOM according to faculty members' clinical work or research funding, a practice which may differ from those in other colleges.

Past President Kurtz stated that this proposed policy sets the university-wide floor. Each college that adopts the policy will set its own additional rules. The point of the research track is that these faculty are committed to the research mission of the institution. Regarding salary, research-track faculty are paid out of the money brought in by grants; however, the process of setting pay will be carried out according to collegiate policy. Also, these are new competitive positions that many people will find attractive.

Professor Collins commented that he thought that in the College of Engineering there was interest in moving some research scientists and research engineers into research-track faculty positions. He also had several questions. One question concerned research-track faculty taking on administrative duties, specifically on a half-time basis. Secretary McGuire stated that it was his understanding that research-track faculty would only be hired to do full-time research. The next question concerned promotion decision making. This policy mirrors the policy in place for clinical-track. Additional promotion criteria will be determined by the colleges. Professor Collins asked for clarification of the criterion "fulfillment of important responsibilities in the research enterprise" for the rank of associate professor. Professor Cohen indicated that this reflects the changing nature of research, for example the different roles carried out by members of large, interdisciplinary NIH-funded research teams. Associate Provost Johnson cautioned against a prohibition on administrative work, as this is a component of some grants. Secretary McGuire responded that the policy was referring to administrative work within a department rather than as part of a grant. Professor Collins questioned whether the meaning of the statement "Support for research-track faculty, including all start-up costs, shall be funded exclusively by grants, contracts, clinical income, and private donations, and not with general education funds," would be altered if the phrase "and not with general education funds" was stricken. Vice President O'Hara responded that the phrase had been added for emphasis. Secretary McGuire added that indirect funds go to the general education fund, where they can be used to benefit the university as a whole, but these funds cannot go toward the research-track faculty salaries. Professor Collins suggested adding "or other university funds." Vice President O'Hara said that the university has a variety of other funds that shouldn't necessarily be precluded from supporting research-track faculty. Professor Collins stated that indirect cost recoveries do not all go into the general fund, the university makes a decision regarding what portion of those monies to put into the general fund. Vice President O'Hara responded that Senior Vice President and Treasurer Doug True has made it clear that those monies all do go

into the general fund, which also consists of tuition and state allocations. Professor Collins stated that his point was that the university can decide what portion of those indirect cost recoveries goes into the general fund. Vice President O'Hara reiterated that the policy states that none of those three sources – tuition, state allocation, or indirect cost recoveries – can be used to fund research-track faculty. Professor Collins commented that the university has available a variety of funding sources that have traditionally been used to support tenure-track faculty; therefore, the above-quoted statement that restricts funding sources for research-track faculty may not be an effective firewall.

Professor Stromquist re-affirmed Professor Mangum's point that the title of professor is critical to obtaining research grant funding because of all that the term "professor" means. If we were to adopt the title of "research professor," we would drain the word "professor" of its meaning, which is not something a university – committed to faculty and the tenure track – should do. In reference to another earlier point made, he stated that a lecturer would not be the equivalent of a research-track faculty member, because a lecturer is not considered a professor. Also, although 19 of the top 20 NIH-funded universities do have the research track, there is no evidence that this is a cause-effect relationship. We need to maintain a sense of ourselves as a university, not as a collection of separate entities.

Professor Plapp stated this is an extremely important vote that we are taking today, as it could cause dramatic changes to the university. There is some misinformation and many unanswered questions about the research track. Professor Plapp had a handout available with his thoughts about the research track. He stated that one fact has been lacking from the discussion thus far. The research scientist track already exists. This research-track faculty policy does not differ from the research scientist track, except that the individuals involved will be called by a different name because they bring in all of their salaries through grants. There were research professors in the past, but they did not have tenure and were therefore in a difficult situation, so those positions were eliminated. When the issue of the research track arose in the CCOM in 2002, the proposal at that time did not include restrictions – the research-track faculty would have been allowed to teach and serve on committees, but they would not receive tenure. Our vote will not have an impact on the research enterprise. The lack of research-track faculty does not stand in the way of the CCOM's progress. We don't really know what the research-track faculty are going to be doing. It is unlikely that funding for their salaries will come only from grants; these days, the chances of getting funding from a grant you apply for are 10%. There is no evidence that giving someone the title of "research professor" will help them obtain grant funding, what matters is how good their science is. It is unrealistic to think that research-track faculty will get all of their funding from grants. Professor Plapp expressed dissatisfaction with the Senate leadership for supporting this policy without sufficient discussion. There is a real threat to tenure in the CCOM. As had been previously stated, the title of "research professor" diminishes the meaning of the term "professor." There are many problems with this proposal, and we are not standing in the way of the research enterprise by rejecting it.

Professor Thomas commented that when the clinical track was established, some of these same issues were brought up, since clinical-track professors would not be expected to do all three activities – teaching, research, and service – that tenure-track professors were expected to do. There was a concern that there would be a dilution of the role of professor. Clinical-track faculty are not expected to do research, but it is essential that they perform the other two activities. It is now apparent that the CCOM would not be in the position it is today without the clinical-track faculty. The clinical track deviates from the norm for professors, but it is now regarded as necessary. High-quality researchers may be unwilling to come to the university if they are given any lesser title than that of “research professor.” And, in Professor Thomas’ experience, the title of “professor” does make a positive difference to one’s grant applications. Professor MacFarland stated that he was on the research track at one time. For young people, the research track works well. Because of the impermanent nature of the position, however, few people will want to do this, and those that do will move out of the track after several years. People will be seeking job security as they grow older. Another professor commented on how this proposal lays the groundwork for the policies to be developed by the individual colleges. At the college-level, the situation of the research-track faculty may become un-monitorable. For example, regarding the evaluation of individual research-track faculty, who will be doing the evaluating? With tenure-track faculty, scholarship is evaluated by peer review, not by the grant marketplace. Evaluation based only on grant money obtained does not fit with the evaluation process for the other tracks. The “professor” terminology for research-track faculty is also not appropriate. Professor Sullivan stated that for her the debate had come down to what it means to be a professor. Teaching is essential to the role of a professor. She spoke with pride of her teaching activities that distinguish her from her M.D. colleagues who do not engage in teaching. If both teaching and service are taken away, how can one still be called a professor? Professor Lutgendorf noted that this is a complex issue, but that she had come to identify most with Professor MacFarland’s point of view, that this new track is exploitative and it undermines tenure and academic freedom.

Secretary McGuire called the question. Professor Drake seconded. Professor Boyle moved and Professor Cohen seconded that there be a paper ballot. Twenty-nine senators voted in favor of the proposal and twenty-seven senators voted against it. The proposed research-track policy was approved.

- Peace Week Proposal (Evelyn Bottando, Department of Communication Studies)
Ms. Bottando, a graduate student in the Department of Communication Studies, presented a *Resolution Encouraging Campus Discussion of the Iraq War*. She read a revised version of the fifth and sixth paragraphs:

“Let it be resolved that the week of March 24th-28th of 2008 should be a week of discussions about the Iraq War across the University of Iowa campus and that students should be encouraged to engage faculty and staff in such discussions throughout that week. Further, faculty, staff, students and student groups will be encouraged to hold other events to foster discussions and the sharing of information and new understanding about the U.S. war in Iraq, as well as in Afghanistan.

As we offer this resolution with the intention of seeing it translated into meaningful action, we hope that this week of engagement might lead to a better understanding of what must be done to achieve peace in Iraq and in other areas of conflict around the world.

The University of Iowa Faculty Senate”

Ms. Bottando stated that UISG has already passed a form of this resolution and committed money to bring in speakers and show films during the week of March 24-28. Many CLAS faculty will be participating in discussions outside of the classroom, or inside the classroom as it pertains to their particular disciplines. About 1500 students took part recently in an inter-collegiate dialogue about global warming. As universities speak as one voice and produce active citizens, she encouraged the Senate to participate, and support this resolution.

Professor Drake moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the resolution be supported. The resolution passed. Professor Cox explained that, because of how quickly the show of hands took place and noise, he was not sure of the vote. A second show of hands supported passage of the resolution.

- Electronic Storage of Background Check Information (Associate Provost Susan Johnson)

Associate Provost Johnson explained that the requested modification to the policy on *Criminal Background Check at Point of Hire* is to delete the following bolded phrase: “Such records shall be retained for seven years **in paper copy only and shall not be retained in any electronic file.**”

Professor Cohen moved and Professor Justman seconded that the phrase be deleted from the policy. The motion was unanimously approved.

- Directory Publication Review

On behalf of Mary Greer, President Sharp explained that this recommendation had been passed by Faculty Senate and Staff Council last year, but was not put into effect by Interim President Fethke. President Mason will now be approached with this proposed policy. Staff Council already approved it in November. Instead of the default being that faculty and staff home addresses and phone numbers **will be published**, the default will be that this information **will not be published** unless the faculty/staff member elects to do this.

Past President Kurtz moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the recommendation be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, February 19, 2008, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Penn State Room, 337 IMU
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 25, 2008, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

VI. Adjournment – President Sharp adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.