

The University of Iowa
2001-2002 FACULTY SENATE

Tuesday, April 30, 2002

3:30 pm-4:45 pm

100 Phillips Hall

Members Present: J. Aikin, S. Armstrong, Z. Ballas, J. Berg, C. Berman, D. Bills, T. Boles, P. Chang, J. Cowdery, D. DeJong, K. Diffley, L. Dusdieker, M. Graber, R. Hegeman, P. Heidger, R. Hurtig, J. Jew, V. Kumar, R. LeBlond, P. Lloyd, C. Lynch, D. Manderscheid, T. Mangum, K. Marra, J. Menninger, J. Moyers, P. Muhly, B. Muller, W. Nixon, T. O'Dorisio, G. Parkin, J. Polumbaum, C. Porter, M. Raymond, C. Ringen, J. Ringen, P. Rubenstein, H. Seaba, R. Slayton, L. Snetselaar, C. Sponsler, S. Stromquist, K. Tachau, L. Troyer, T. Tuong, R. Valentine, E. Wasserman, P. Weller, J. Westefeld, J. Woodhead

Members Absent: K. Abdel-Malek, J. Altman, N. Bauman, R. Bork, D. Brown, H. Cowen, C. Dungy, B. Fallon, V. Grassian, G. Hamot, M. Klepser, S. Kurtz, S. Larsen, J. P. Long, S. Moorhead, I. Nygaard, A. Qualls, W. Stanford, S. Vincent

Members Excused: J. Gratama, L. Hunsicker, A. McCarthy, R. Miller, R. Weir

Faculty Senate Officers in Attendance: Amitava Bhattacharjee, President; Jeff Cox, Vice President; Carolyn Colvin, Past President; Erin Irish, Secretary

Guests: Charlie Drum (University Relations), Bob Engel (Emeritus Faculty Council), Jim Andrews (Emeritus Faculty Council), Kathryn Wynes (Provost Office), Courtney Greve (*Press-Citizen*), Julie Thatcher (Faculty Senate Office), Jon Whitmore (Provost)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:36.

II. Approval of Agenda

Prof. Berman moved and Prof. Bills seconded the following

MOTION: To approve the agenda. The motion passed.

III. Approval of Minutes, April 2 Faculty Senate Meeting

With an amendment requested by Prof. Tachau, the minutes were accepted as distributed.

IV. New Business

A. University Smoking Policy Amendment (Carolyn Colvin)

President Bhattacharjee reported that this amendment was endorsed unanimously at last council meeting.

Prof. Menninger moved and Prof. Kurtz seconded the following:
MOTION: To endorse the smoking policy amendment.

Prof. Menninger asked what the purpose was of designating an entrance as “nonsmoking.” Prof. Colvin explained that “outdoor space” as specified in the current policy needed to be clarified. There were people who raised concerns last year that many entrances had many smokers. By adding this one line, which comes as a follow-up from last year’s discussion, there will be an entrance to each building that will be smoke-free. Prof. Menninger objected to the lack of language describing what can be done when smoking nevertheless takes place at main entrances. Prof. Colvin agreed that the amendment does not address that, but thought that it at least allows Facilities Planning to monitor where smoking occurs. A great concern has been the main entrance of the hospital. Prof. Aikin was not clear about how big the space would be where no smoking can occur. Prof. Colvin responded that they considered specifying this, but in some cases even a modest smoke-free area would put smokers out in the street. Rather than writing a policy that could encompass the entire campus, she and the other authors of the amendment chose to rely on the clear thinking of people on campus. The nonsmoking areas at each building is expected to be worked out on a building-by-building basis.

Prof. Menninger continued with his objections, finding that the term “immediate” is not useful if one wanted to enforce the policy. A new senator pointed out that at the hospital where there already was a sign, but no security nearby, the sign was completely ignored. Prof. Seaba observed that at Oakdale Hall there is a single entrance. A smoking area there may need to be identified. Another new senator thought that it was useful to have a sign to point to, even in absence of security. Prof. Porter thought that it would be remiss not to pass this amendment, and leave the implementation to Facilities Planning. Prof. Berman suggested that it would be more useful to have an identified smoking entrance. Prof. Colvin answered that they had discussed such an option last year and decided that it was more positive to do it as written.

Prof. Bills called the question, with a second from Prof. Kurtz. *The motion carried.*

MOTION: (from above) To endorse the smoking policy amendment. *The motion carried.*

V. Reports and Announcements

A. Report of the Budget Planning Advisory Committee (Jonathan Carlson)

Prof. Carlson introduced his report by explaining that the Budget Planning Advisory Committee had been set up by President Coleman. It consisted of the members of the Senate and Staff Budget Committees, as well as three other members. The committee was originally charged in August of 2000 with considering whether and

how university budget processes might be improved for better strategic planning. In the spring of 2001 with the cut to the budget, the charge was changed to considering how to deal with cuts. In the fall, the committee returned to its original charge. The committee has four main recommendations, as outlined below.

First, the committee recommended that existing budget processes be maintained as they are. They had looked at other public universities, and considered some other alternatives. They concluded that at present the way the University of Iowa does it is good. Every unit gets what it had last year, plus some increment if there is additional revenue. In that way, the units don't have to start from scratch each year. If the budget is cut, units are cut, but disproportionately. What they liked was the combination of stability and flexibility provided by the current practice. Units can plan ahead, which gives them autonomy, but at the same time there is flexibility with incremental money or in cuts when the budget pools are held centrally. The committee viewed this system as basically pretty good and better than the alternatives.

The committee also perceived some weaknesses. Firstly, the current techniques for reporting expenditures don't do a good job on the consequences of decisions to do one or another thing. So, the committee recommended employing activity-based budget reports, which would provide the financial results of strategic decisions. By doing this, decision makers would have the information that was relevant to future plans to expand or contract certain activities.

A second recommendation is that the UI explore ways to reward units that make choices that enhance revenue or cost reduction. The committee recommended that the university explore mechanisms and experiment to see if such a practice would lead to desirable changes. A second weakness that they perceived was in decision-making to enhance or diminish financial support. In many cases the criteria had looked good, the process looked good, but when came to academic units, it seemed liked the criteria were not working as had been hoped. The committee thought that the activity-based accounting would help there, too. With that, one could find out how a new activity had affected the financial state of a unit.

The final weakness had to do with faculty and staff involvement in budget deliberations. Most of the members of this committee had been members of other budget committees, and it was their experience that participation was neither as effective or as informed as it should be. Committees are often too big, and with separate committees of staff and faculty, this doubled the time that the central administration spent interacting with them. Fast turnover of committee membership results in members leaving the committee as soon as they became familiar enough to be effective. The committee suggested revamping the budget committee's structure. There are discussions ongoing to develop a proposal to bring to staff and faculty governing bodies. Prof. Carlson concluded his report by admitting that these were modest suggestions. The committee had been tempered by ever-declining budgets, and might have been more courageous if budgets had been going up.

President Bhattacharjee reported that President Coleman had asked him to draft a proposal for a new budget committee. He did so, gave it to her, and it has gone to the Vice Presidents for consideration. This proposal is still in progress, but the intent is to have a deeper interaction among faculty, staff, and administration in making budget decisions.

Prof. Aikin was struck by the report's lack of requirement that transparency be available to whole faculty and not just budget committee. Prof. Carlson agreed that that was the case. Prof. Berman understood there are two parts to activity-based reporting: what revenue comes in as well as what activities there were. Prof. Carlson corrected her, clarifying that its aim is to look at activity. Prof. Berman was concerned about departments where no activity generates revenue except teaching, fearing that that would shape allocations. Prof. Carlson dismissed that fear, explaining that there is no activity that does not generate revenue. If you have collegiate leadership that is driven primarily by financial considerations, they will make decisions based on that, whether or not they know the truth. The committee's view was that it was better that they know the truth. They did not make recommendations on funding, but just wanted to have the financial repercussions of decisions be included. Prof. Cox found that this was a rhetorical distinction in many departments. It's hard to sort out the activities without corrupting the activities. Prof. Carlson responded that the committee had some confidence that that sort of activity reporting would have some benefit. But, they also realized that those data are sometimes quite artificial. Prof. Porter agreed, and gave his experience in the College of Medicine as an example. When he sees a patient, this can be teaching as well as getting data but it is also viewed as service. It is very difficult to ferret out how to report on these activities, which they must do for billing purposes. Whereas there is no fraud, it is nonetheless very hard to report accurately. Having meaningful, activity-based accounting for the university may be virtually impossible. Prof. Carlson clarified that the accounting would not be done by individuals, but by departmental accountants. The preceding phrases imply that departmental accountants aren't individuals; please clarify! Furthermore, such practices can't be so inaccurate or else faculty wouldn't let the universities use that to determine salaries from it. Prof. Porter cautioned that there is lot of variation in the extent to which activity reports are used to determine salaries.

President Bhattacharjee pointed out that the administration uses quantitative data all the time. It just may not be clear that faculty realize it. Prof. Berman thought that with all that being true, if the university were to use this kind of accounting, the faculty would need to think about it carefully, and suggested that the recommendation go to the Faculty Council. Prof. Lloyd asked whether the committee considered personnel issues, who will do this accounting, and how much would it cost. Prof. Carlson answered that they had, as the administrators who attended their meetings were constantly reminding them that this could be a hugely expensive change. That's why they suggested some trial implementation, with baby steps to discover what it would cost and whether it should be implemented at all.

Prof. C. Ringen shared Prof. Berman's concerns but nonetheless was in favor of reporting on outcomes of any policy changes. Prof. Kurtz asked what the steps would be that would result from the implementation of this report. Prof. Carlson replied that the recommendation not to change, of course, wouldn't require anything. The other recommendation may require action on the part of the Faculty Senate. Prof. Berman asked whether there is any action from the Senate required at present. Prof. Carlson answered that there is not. Prof. Berman asked whether one could move that more action be taken. President Bhattacharjee responded that if the Senate were to take this up, it should go to the Faculty Council first. This will come up when the formation of the new committee as suggested by President Coleman goes to the Faculty Council in the fall. He had asked Prof. Carlson to report to the Senate on the committee's recommendations at this time simply because this is such an important topic that he felt that the Senate needed to hear about it.

B. Membership of the 2002-2003 Faculty Senate and Faculty Council (Connie Berman)

Prof. Berman reported that an election was held. This was the last election for Faculty Senators and Councilors that will be conducted with a paper ballot. In the future elections will be held electronically. The membership approved of the election.

C. 2002-2003 Committee Appointments (Jeffrey Cox)

Prof. Cox thanked all those who volunteered for a committee. He asked anyone who had volunteered but was not appointed to volunteer again in the future. All committees are currently filled, except for two vacancies on the Judicial Commission.

Prof. Cox moved and Prof. Berman seconded the following

MOTION: To approve the committee appointments. The motion passed.

D. Motion Summary 2001-2002 Senate Session (Jeffrey Cox)

Prof. Cox reported on the outcome of motions passed by the Faculty Senate in 2000-2001. He found that in every case there has been a change, either in the Operations Manual or on a website. He did find one motion that was not carried through. He will contact the Provost to notify him of the omission with expectation that this one will also be implemented.

Prof. Nixon moved and Prof Aikin seconded the following

MOTION: To approve of the motion summary. *The motion carried.*

E. Bake Sale Report (Wilfrid Nixon).

Prof. Nixon reported that there would be a faculty bake sale at Hubbard Park. He has received many commitments for baking from the central administration. There will be publicity with the hope of getting the attention of politicians and the public for increased support of public higher education in Iowa.

F. Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence and Brody Awards (Amitava Bhattacharjee)

President Bhattacharjee announced the winners of the 2002 Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence and Brody Awards. Susan Birrell, Jon Carlson, and Warren Piette will receive Brody awards. William Buss, Martha Craft-Rosenberg, Robert Forsythe, Philip Kutzko, Peter Rubenstein, and David Soll will receive Regents awards. President Bhattacharjee and the Senate congratulated the winners.

G. Concluding Remarks of the Faculty Senate President (Amitava Bhattacharjee)

President Bhattacharjee shared his reflections on the past year. He first thanked Carolyn Colvin, who had persuaded him to run for (vice) president. He thanked Vice President Cox for support and insight to the political landscape. He also thanked Erin Irish and Julie Thatcher for their skillful stewardship of the Senate. Faculty Senate is the voice of the faculty. President Bhattacharjee had come with searching questions, and came out with answers. Every policy we have considered this year has preserved academic integrity. This has been a full year, as well as the year of 9-11. It was also a year of serious budget cuts. These withering cuts have put the historic commitment of Iowan to public education at risk, not just here but across the country. We cannot have a great state of Iowa without great public universities. We must have discussions beyond what to cut, or what sort of salary increases will we receive. We must engage and inspire faculty, who are more concerned about the long term fate of the university than about short-term exigencies. What will we do to ensure that this remains a university of excellence? How do we leverage our excellence in research to maintain it? How do we support our full range of academic efforts? He concluded observing that there are more questions than answers: this is the journey.

VI. Adjournment

Prof. Nixon moved and Prof. Colvin seconded the following **MOTION**: To adjourn the meeting. *The motion carried.*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42.

University of Iowa
FACULTY SENATE
2002-03 Senate Organizational Meeting
Tuesday, April 30, 2002
4:45 p.m.
100 Phillips Hall

Members Present: J. Aikin, P. Alvarez, S. Armstrong, Z. Ballas, C. Berman, T. Boles, P. Chang, J. Cowdery, M. Deem, D. DeJong, K. Diffley, E. Dove, L. Dusdieker, S. Franklin, M. Graber, C. Green, R. Hegeman, P. Heidger, R. Herman, J. Jew, R. LeBlond, P. Lloyd, P. Lutgendorf, C. Lynch, M. Maktabi, T. Mangum, K. Marra, J. Moyers, P. Muhly, B. Muller, T. O'Dorisio, H. Paarsch, J. Polumbaum, C. Porter, R. Randell, C. Ringen, J. Ringen, P. Rubenstein, R. Slayton, K. Southard, L. Snetselaar, S. Stromquist, K. Tachau, T. Tuong, R. Valentine, P. Weller, J. Westefeld, J. Woodhead

Members Absent: K. Abdel-Malek, J. Altman, D. Brown, C. Creekmur, C. Dungy, B. Fallon, G. Hamot, A. Hansen, J. Hochstrasser, W. Johnson, M. Klepser, S. Kurtz, J. P. Long, U. Malik, S. Moorhead, A. Nugent, L. Oakes, B. Phillips, A. Qualls, D. Quinn, M. Reno, C. Wanat, D. Whitaker, H. Winfield

Members Excused: J. Gratama, A. McCarthy, R. Miller, R. Weir

Faculty Senate Officers in Attendance: Jeff Cox, President; Margaret Raymond, Vice President; Amitava Bhattacharjee, Past President; Erin Irish, Secretary

Guests: Charlie Drum (University Relations), Bob Engle (Emeritus Faculty Council), Jim Andrews (Emeritus Faculty Council), Kathryn Wynes (Provost Office), Courtney Greve (*Press-Citizen*), Julie Thatcher (Faculty Senate Office), Jon Whitmore (Provost)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:42.

II. Approval of Meeting Agenda

Prof. Porter moved and Prof. Tachau seconded the following:

MOTION: To approve the agenda. *The motion carried.*

III. Election of Officers (Chair of Elections Committee, Constance Berman)

President Cox thanked candidates, whose statements had been included in the distributed packets. Gene Parkin of Engineering and Margaret Raymond of Law were the candidates for Vice President. Candidate for secretary were Rebecca Hegemann and Craig Porter.

With no nominations from the floor, ballots were distributed.

IV. Inaugural Address (Jeffrey Cox)

President Cox yielded the floor to Prof Tachau, who offered the following resolution:

I rise to offer the following resolution for affirmation by the Faculty Senate.

- Whereas our Faculty Senate President has capably and steadily articulated as well as exemplified the values of academic freedom and faculty tenure throughout the academic year 2001-2002, a period in which the continuing effects of September 11 have posed uncommon challenges for our nation, our state, and for our university; *and*
- Whereas our Faculty Senate President has worked wonders large and small to amplify and reinvigorate the openness and transparency of, and participation in, the decision-making upon which Faculty Governance depends, thereby making such governance more effective; *and*
- Whereas our Faculty Senate President has prepared the Faculty to navigate among the economic straits in which our State and we find ourselves by briefing the Senate on a regular basis concerning our evolving budget crises, thereby also making our governance more effective; *and*
- Whereas our Faculty Senate President has introduced to us new possibilities of Faculty activism, authority, and influence; *and*
- Whereas our Faculty Senate President is, in the published words of his daughter, "pretty cool, but then he lives with 5 women, including the dog, so he has no choice;"

- We therefore express in this resolution our gratitude, admiration, and [high respect](#) for the exemplary commitment and leadership that our Faculty Senate President Professor Amitava Bhattacharjee has exercised on behalf of the Faculty and, indeed, the entire community of the University of Iowa.

President Cox then yielded the floor to Prof. Mangum, who offered the following:

MOTION: The members of the Faculty Senate gratefully commend the exemplary service of Erin Irish, secretary of the Faculty Senate in 2001-2002.

On behalf of my Senate colleagues and the larger University community, I am delighted to have the opportunity to thank Erin Irish for her work as secretary this year. Erin leaves a clear account of our activities for posterity, an account that records our deliberations in lively, energetic prose that will be a happy surprise for readers. Very importantly, from a senatorial point of view, she stages our meetings and animates our characters with wit and wisdom, leaving our non sequiturs in the wings and throwing a spotlight on our more inspired dialogues. Behind the

scenes, Erin, along with our current, out-going, and in-coming presidents-- Amitava Bhattacharjee, Carolyn Colvin, and Jeff Cox--has spent long hours in meetings, tirelessly and thoughtfully laboring on behalf of the entire faculty. For the gift of so many hours of her time and for turning our hours into minutes, we offer sincere thanks and all good wishes. *The motion carried.*

Prof. Cox began his inaugural remarks by recounting an encounter with some locals in a tavern during a recent visit to a small village in Europe. After clarifying that Iowa was not, contrary to their assertion, famous for potatoes, he asked why shouldn't Iowa be famous for education? We have both a Big 12 and a Big 10 research university, and thus a lot of money for research comes here. He urged us to stop taking the local legislative delegation for granted. We need a strong pro-education voice. It's the biggest industry in our district. We need to get into a conversation with the legislation and not just as a special interest group, protecting our jobs. We are committed to teaching, with accessibility to our students. We have had great leadership, but can't have a great state without great state universities. There are real limits to what we can do with political education and lobbying. What we can do is maintain our high standards of teaching and scholarship: it's what faculty governance is about. How do we sustain excellence? First, with academic freedom. It is often confused with the First Amendment, but academic freedom is something different. The ultimate goal is to maintain quality in the classroom. Academic freedom is heavily dependent on a second element: tenure. Tenure does not mean a job for life, but rather it is a lifetime commitment on the part of the faculty and university. A third principle of excellence is shared governance as an essential mechanism for maintaining our professional autonomy. The corporate standards of measuring outcome will ultimately destroy the quality of research and teaching. The fourth element is fair procedures and fair dealing, with protection from arbitrary behavior. These four principles are very good conservative practices protecting the achievement of those who have gone before us.

V. Announcement of Election Results

The new vice president is Margaret Raymond. Craig Porter was elected secretary.

VI. Adjournment

Prof. Kurtz moved and Prof. Bhattacharjee seconded the following

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. *The motion carried.*

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10.

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Irish, Secretary