

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA FACULTY SENATE  
Minutes  
Tuesday, 23 March 1999  
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

Members Present: J. Andrews, J. Arora, Z. Ballas, C. Berman, A. Bhattacharjee, S. Bishara, K. Clark, C. Colvin, J. Cox, R. Curto, G. El-Khoury, M. Emery, K. Ephgrave, G. Fishcer, J. Hayes, J. Hoballah, R. Hohl, E. Irish, J. Jew, S. Lawrence, I. Levin, E. Link, C. Lynch, D. Manderscheid, D. Marcella, K. Marra, L. Marshall, A. McCarthy, J. Moyers, G. Oden, M. Pincus, M. Raymond, J. Ringen, C. Ringen, E. Rivera, C. Roy, C. Stanford, K. Tachau, B. Thompson, M. Vartas, D. Wake3field, R. Zbiek.

Members Absent (excused): B. Stanford, E. Wasserman, J. Bertolatus, M. Grover-Mckay, B. Levy, D. Liddell, V. Nair, M. Rizzo.

Members Absent: M. Barrick, L. Burmeister, B. Butler, P. Chang, D. Davis, Diehl, A. Dipardo, B. Doebbeling, K. Ephgrave, P. Hitchon, T. Judge, D. Klemm, J. Kline, K. Mescher, A. Roberts, D. Rosenthal, S. Rynes-Weller, D. Stephens, M. Stone, J. Tomkovicz, M. Wall, R. Weir.

Guests: Janice Simmons-Welbourn (UI Libraries), Lyle Muller (Cedar Rapids Gazette), John Folkins (Office of Provost), Camie Johnston (Daily Iowan), Tom Rocklin (Center for Teaching), Kim Zyer (Surgery), Sara Tynes (Management & Orgs.), Tim Judge (Management & Orgs.) Lee Anna Clark (Office of Provost), Jon Whitmore (Office of Provost), Clark Stanferd (College of Dentistry), Ronald Ettinger (College of Dentistry), Charlie Drum (University Relations, Carin Green (Classics), David Johnsen (Dentistry), Carol TeBockhorst (Faculty Senate Office).

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:37 PM by President Wiley.
- II. The Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of 2 February 1999 were approved as corrected.
- III. Announcements: President Bob Wiley
  - A. Carol TeBockhorst was welcomed as the new Senate Office coordinator.
  - B. The faculty survey on research and service received a 60% response rate and useful data are expected.
  - C. University President Mary Sue Coleman is hosting a reception for Faculty Senators on the evening of 3 April 1999 at the president's residence.
- D. Senate election proceedings are going well.
  - E. The Committee on Committees has met to consider membership on various committees and is now confirming the nominees' willingness to serve.
- IV. Reports and Discussion
  - B. Report from Ad Hoc Compensation Committee: Amitava Bhattacharjee, Chair.

A revised report was distributed to senators. Faculty approached members of the Faculty Council with questions concerning salary increases for central administrators following publication of news stories in July, 1998. These accounts quoted 6-8% increases for administrators, higher than the 4% mandated by the Iowa General Assembly for faculty salary increases. The Office of University Relations attributed some of the high raises received by administrators to "extraordinary performance." The Faculty Council, in an executive session, referred the matter to an ad hoc committee, which included also Profs. R. Curto, M. Pincus, M. Stone and R. Wiley. The report which emerged is based on data supplied by the Office of Vice President for Finance and University Services and would not have been possible without the willing cooperation of that office and other central administrators.

The data in the report included tables and figures that illustrated percent and dollar increases for a selected group of 20 central administrators and deans, in comparison with faculty generally and with College of Liberal Arts faculty in particular (chosen for the large numbers of faculty in that college). The data showed that the senior administrators received annual percentage salary increases higher than those received by faculty over the fiscal years 1996-1999. In fiscal years 1996-1998, the annual percentage salary increases of faculty generally were higher than those received by CLA faculty. Various reasons for these differences were discussed, including more rapid turnover among administrators than among faculty and the varying availability and use of "open lines", salaries for positions not currently filled.

Prof. Bhattacharjee moved, seconded by Prof. Lawrence, that the report be accepted.

Prof. Ringen asked whether open lines were given higher raises in CLA, thus explaining lower CLA faculty raises than for faculty as a whole. Prof. Bhattacharjee pointed out that no conclusions were offered in report. The ad hoc committee asked about differences between CLA and other colleges and the answers offered included "open lines". Whether open lines account for all the difference is not known. Prof. Ringen inquired if all colleges were given same amount for salary increases. Prof. Bhattacharjee responded that they were in 1999, but not in prior years. The ad hoc committee doesn't know about the details of any differences among colleges. Prof. Tachau noted that in an ideal world, administrators should be given same percentage salary increases as faculty. Also, funds used to produce large raises in administrators' salaries could be used instead to meet serious university needs, for example to cover severe increases in the cost of serials subscriptions to the university library. Provost Whitmore stated that the funds held back from the FY1998 amounts assigned to regular increases in faculty salaries were all returned to the colleges, based on recommendations made by deans to the Office of the Provost for needs in equity balance of salaries, counteroffers, etc. In response to a question concerning the pay period for the tabulated faculty salaries, Prof. Bhattacharjee stated that all the tabulated salaries were reported normalized to a nine-month pay period. [This turned out later to have been not true: the administrator salaries tabulated were based on 11- or 12-month pay periods. A revised table has been prepared and will be distributed as part of these minutes. The percentage increases originally reported remain the same, only the dollar amount of the salary gap is changed by the correct normalization of the data.]

The motion to accept the Report of the ad hoc Sub-Committee on Compensation was passed without dissent.

C. Report from Libraries Committee: Carin Green, Chair.

The university libraries are experiencing an increase in journal prices of 10-15% per year with no signs of this rate diminishing. The entire budget of some libraries is given over to

acquisition of serials and still the numbers of subscriptions must be regularly cut. There appears to be no way to drastically change these economics quickly; a long-term project is required. The problem arises from private companies having taken over the publication of scholarly journals. There is no effective competition. Scholars provide the original manuscripts, evaluate them, pay for their publication via page charges, and then must pay again for subscriptions.

Prof. Green made several suggestions on how faculty might help to mitigate this problem: (1) reconsider every year the prices of journals to which faculty submit articles; (2) reconsider which journals faculty should edit, peer review, book review and recommend to students; (3) especially in the sciences, faculty should retain the copyright (at least partial); this allows publication of articles on one's own web site, for example; (4) faculty should encourage the publication of scholarly articles by professional societies since they exist to foster dissemination of research results and can represent barometers of reasonable price increases.

Several other points were raised in the report: what is not now acquired is unlikely ever to be replaced, threatening the archival uses of the libraries; electronic journals are less expensive to publish but in fact cost libraries more for a subscription, since purchasing the print edition is usually required; worse, canceling an electronic journal makes all the back issues inaccessible; faculty need advice from the administration and its legal staff concerning how to acquire copyrights and the implications of government prohibition of restrictions on the publication of results of research financed by governmental grants. The three Regents universities are now collaborating on these issues. The argument must be made to the Regents and legislators that faculty regard the problem as very serious, are working hard to solve it, but need help.

Prof. Green asked for approval of the report and support by the Faculty Senate. The report was accepted by acclamation.

#### V. Old Business

Prof. Carlson reported that the faculty referendum on the recommendation to broaden eligibility for election as a Senate Officer passed comfortably. The recommendation now goes to the University President and then to the Board of Regents for approval and implementation.

#### VI. New Business

##### A. Report of the Committee to Review the Center for Teaching: David Manderscheid, Chair.

The Center was portrayed as doing well in five key areas. The staff of the Center was singled out for special praise, as was its record of leveraging funding. The review committee was particularly impressed by the high profile of the Center (Director Rocklin was interviewed recently on "NBC Nightly News").

Prof. Lawrence moved, seconded by Prof. Tachau to accept the report and to endorse its recommendations, including putting the Center for Teaching on a regular review cycle with the next review scheduled for five years hence. A brief question and answer period followed, in which Center Director Rocklin noted that the Council on Teaching acts as a board of directors for the Center while the Center Director attends meetings of the Council on Teaching.

The motion to accept the report and endorse its recommendations passed without dissent.

#### B. Qualifications for Faculty Rank: Bob Wiley

Prof. Roy moved, seconded by Prof. Tachau, to approve for inclusion in the Operations Manual (Sec. III-10.4) the Qualifications for Academic Ranks distributed before the meeting.

Prof. Ringen asked about the phrase "where applicable" as applied to the qualification for Professor that pertains to the successful guidance of doctoral students to completion of their degree programs. Pres. Wiley declared that fields not awarding doctoral degrees would not expect such a qualification, nor would fields that train very few Ph.D.'s. Prof. Tachau noted that each academic unit is expected to develop its own criteria, including whether Ph.D. supervision is an appropriate qualification; approval of the criteria is required by both the dean and provost so special cases would be identified. Prof. Boos asked what had been changed from the extant list and was told that the qualifications had been extensively revised. In response to a question about whether the bar had been raised or lowered, Pres. Wiley responded that neither had occurred; the revised wording was primarily intended to discriminate clearly between the criteria for associate professor and full professor. Prof. Boos, having heard the extant qualifications read out, suggested that a major change had taken place in the qualification for Associate Professor, namely "unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor." Pres. Wiley averred that this language already occurs in another section of the Operations Manual and was thus not invented during the revision process. Prof. Sanford asked whether clinical track faculty would use the same qualifications. Pres. Wiley answered that the procedures for clinical track faculty are independent. Prof. Tachau spoke in favor of raising the bar for promotion to full professor, portraying that outcome as a reasonable reflection of national trends in raising standards from generation to generation and as consistent with the University's stated goal of becoming one of the top ten public educational institutions.

Prof. Roy pointed out that the qualifications for full professor fail to specify any level of scholarly productivity, only of reputation, and suggested that both ranks should have specified levels of both criteria. Following a brief interlude in which variants of the proposed language were discussed, Prof. Ringen moved, seconded by Prof. Oden, to refer the matter back to the Faculty Council for further editing. The motion to refer was passed, with one dissenting.

#### C. Appropriate use of information technology resources: Jeffrey Cox.

An ad hoc committee (including also Prof. David, University Counsel Schantz and Webmaster Preuss) discussed the concerns expressed at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate and made some revisions, resulting in Draft F, that reflect two basic concerns: (1) a standard of "probable cause" to be met before inspecting files or monitoring usage; (2) notification of the user before inspecting files or monitoring usage (except when such notification would jeopardize substantial University or third-party interests). In addition, all references to telephones, which have a separate policy, were deleted. There is now a phrase in the Preamble that refers to appropriate personal uses of computers (which are described more fully in IV. F., G.).

Prof. Berman asked whether the expectation of prior notification applied to making modifications to a computer in a university office. Prof. Cox responded that this policy dealt only with inspections of files or monitoring usage, an interpretation with which

Counsel Schantz agreed. Prof. Bishara asked for examples when files might be examined. Counsel Schantz pointed out that faculty don't have "supervisors" in the usual sense so probable cause of a policy violation would be necessary. In response to a question concerning criteria for not notifying a user before inspecting files or monitoring usage, Counsel Schantz offered the example of someone receiving threatening e-mail. Prof. Clark asked about the meaning of regularly scheduled work time for the case of faculty. Prof. Cox stated that faculty do not have regularly scheduled work time and Counsel Schantz suggested one should assume those provisions do not apply to faculty. When Prof. Marshall pointed out that many secretaries have unusual work hours, Prof. Cox stated that supervisors are supposed to specify work rules. The committee did not reconsider the phrase "consumes large amounts of regularly scheduled work time" (IV.F.). Counsel Schantz agreed, stating that the wording had been changed back to that approved by the Staff Council.

Prof. Roy moved, seconded by Prof. Ephgrave, to approve the proposed policy. The motion passed without dissent.

During a brief colloquy following the vote, Pres. Wiley promised to add the issue of faculty access to computers to the charter of the Information Technology Advisory Committee.

VII. President Wiley declared the meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Menninger, Secretary