

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 8, 2009
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

- Senators Present: D. Anderson, N. Andreasen, J. Beckman, S. Bishara, D. Black, G. Buettner, H. Butcher, M. Cohen, J. Cox, E. Ernst, J. Fieselmann, J. Garfinkel, E. Gidal, G. Jogerst, B. Justman, C. Kletzing, J. Kline, D. Look, T. Mangum, C. McCarthy, J. Menninger, F. Mitros, D. Morris, N. Nisly, J. Pendergast, J. Polumbaum, B. Rakel, L. Richman, L. Robertson, M. Sauder, S. Schultz, C. Scott-Conner, V. Sharp, P. Snyder, T. Stalter, R. Valentine, T. Vaughn, R. Wachtel, J. Wadsworth, E. Wasserman, S. Wilson, M. Wilson Kimber, C. Woodman.
- Officers Present: E. Dove, D. Drake, M. O'Hara, K. Tachau.
- Senators Excused: S. Gardner, S. Kurtz, E. Lawrence, S. McGuire, S. Staggs, S. Vincent.
- Senators Absent: J. Bertolatus, A. Campbell, T. Gross, D. Hammond, C. Helms, K. Kader, L. Kirsch, T. Kresowik, D. Macfarlane, B. McMurray, P. Mobily, R. Mutel, J. Reist, G. Russell, T. Schnell, W. Sharp, C. Sponsler, H. Stecopoulos, N. Street, S. Stromquist, M. VanBeek, L. Wang, J. Wilcox, R. Williams, T. Yin, N. Zavazava.
- Guests: B. Eckstein (Office of the Provost), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), S. Kemmet (Student), M. Lauren (Student), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate)

- I. Call to Order – President Drake called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.08.09.09.pdf>
- II. Approvals
- A. Meeting Agenda – President Drake noted one addition to the announcements section of the agenda [AAUP Reading Group]. Professor Bishara moved and Professor Vaughn seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 28, 2009) – Professor Robertson moved and Professor Justman seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - C. Committee Replacements (Ed Dove)

- Jill Beckman (Linguistics) to fill the unexpired term of Catherine Ringen (Linguistics) on the Senate, 2009-10.

Professor Cohen moved and Professor Mitros seconded that the replacement be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. New Business

- *Report on Faculty Council/Administration Retreat (David Drake)*

President Drake explained that the annual Faculty Council/Administration retreat had been held on Thursday, August 20. The theme of the retreat was “Where we are now – Where we have been – Where we want to go.” After Provost Loh gave a presentation on “The Iowa Roadmap,” there was a discussion with the chairs of the six Strategic Initiatives Task Forces (<http://provost.uiowa.edu/work/strategic-initiatives/>). The retreat continued with a session on learning communities and retention of undergraduate students. Finally, faculty from the School of Art and Art History and the School of Music gave compelling presentations on their experiences living with the aftermath of the flood. President Drake stated that he wanted to keep their continuing struggles and concerns in the forefront over the coming year. The retreat concluded with a budget report from Senior Vice President and Treasurer Doug True, who indicated that at this point there is no additional information about the future budget situation. The Revenue Estimating Conference will meet again in October. The Faculty Senate officers remain in close contact with administrators regarding the budget.

- *Update on Administrative Searches (David Drake, Mike O’Hara)*

Vice President for Strategic Communication: President Drake stated that the search committee has received over 200 applications. [The search committee’s website can be found here, <http://www.uiowa.edu/vpsc-search/committee/index.html>.] The search committee chair, Keith Carter (Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences), has indicated that the committee hopes to have candidates on campus late this fall, with a report to the administration to follow by the end of the year.

Associate Provost for Faculty: President Drake indicated that he and CLAS Executive Associate Dean Raúl Curto are co-chairing this search committee, the membership of which is being finalized.

Chief Diversity Officer/Associate Vice President for Diversity: President Drake reported that a job description and job qualifications are being developed for the position. The Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials will be consulted for faculty to serve on the search committee. The current Chief Diversity Officer will be stepping down in January.

Ombudsperson: Past President O’Hara stated that Faculty Ombudsperson Lois Cox will be stepping down at the end of the year. The search committee is being chaired by Professor Nancy Hauserman. A job description has been approved and there should be an announcement going out to faculty to solicit candidates very shortly. This is a half-time position with a four-year fixed term. Past President O’Hara encouraged those with an interest in the position to apply or to identify suitable applicants.

- *Update on Status of Faculty Senate Constitution (David Drake)*

President Drake explained that the Committee on Rules and Bylaws had worked on the revision of the constitution and bylaws for over a year, and that the resulting document was brought twice to the Faculty Council for discussion and edits before being sent to the Faculty Senate, where it was approved. Faculty subsequently approved the constitution in a university-wide referendum. It was then approved by President Mason and sent to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa for consideration at their August 5 meeting. The Regents had three issues of concern about the constitution.

The first issue arose regarding the passage:

Faculty members who represent their colleges on the Senate or Council should arrange their teaching and patient care responsibilities and other obligations so as to facilitate their regular attendance at the meetings of the Senate or Council. University administrators who set the teaching schedules and other obligations of faculty members who represent their colleges are expected to arrange those schedules in ways that facilitate the faculty members' participation in meetings of the Senate or Council.

Regents objected that teaching, research, and patient care responsibilities should take precedence over Senate or Council meetings. President Drake had explained to the Regents that the intent of this passage was not for the meetings to take precedence over the above responsibilities, but instead to encourage the arrangement of schedules, to the extent possible, to allow faculty members not only to carry out their teaching, research, and patient care but also to attend Senate or Council meetings.

The second issue of concern among regents was the Faculty Senate having any role in the selection of such non-academic central administrative officials as, for example, the General Counsel. In response to this concern, President Drake advocated for a faculty voice in the search process for these individuals while assuring the regents that faculty are, of course, aware that the final decision for selection of these individuals is with the administration and the Board of Regents. The reason for faculty having a say in the search process is that such non-academic central administrative officials do work closely with faculty.

The final concern was whether the Faculty Senate is in violation of the State of Iowa Open Meetings Law [Iowa Code Chapter 21] and if not, whether the Faculty Senate *should* be subject to it. A regent suggested at this point in the conversation that the constitution be withdrawn for further revision, and President Drake had decided to follow this course of action.

When President Drake had finished summarizing the regents' concerns and opened the Senate floor for discussion, Professor Vaughn asked how these three concerns could be addressed. President Drake responded that he believed he had addressed the first concern at the meeting and that an argument will need to be developed to address the second point. Regarding the third concern, the Faculty Senate Officers had sought and have received confirmation from the Iowa Attorney General's office that the Faculty Senate is not subject to the Open Meetings Law. As to whether the Senate should be subject to this law, President Drake thought it should not, since the Senate is only an advisory body and, moreover, very rarely goes into closed session. Secretary Tachau noted that even government bodies that are subject to the Open Meetings Law can go into closed session for specific reasons. This is a simple technical issue of the law: is the Faculty Senate the sort of body subject to the rules governing open meetings, or is it, rather, an advisory body not subject to the Open Meetings Law, and thus like many other such committees on campus that are not subject to it.

Professor Wadsworth asked what would happen if the revised constitution were eventually rejected by the Board of Regents. President Drake responded that the Senate would operate under the old version of the constitution. Professor Menninger asked if there was the perception among the Regents that the faculty want actually to make the decisions whom to hire to central administrative positions rather than just give advice regarding hiring. President Drake answered that a Regent had commented that the passage regarding the faculty role in selecting central academic officials sounded more like self-management than shared governance, although in general the Regent response was mixed. Professor Pendergast suggested that a basis for an argument could be found in the job descriptions of the non-academic vice presidents, as those job descriptions indicate extensive interaction with faculty. Also, faculty make up only a small percentage of the membership of search committees. Secretary Tachau suggested that background information be provided to the Regents when the issue comes up again. President Drake indicated that the supplementary information provided by the Board office about the constitution may have been misleading. Professor Menninger asked if student participation on the search committee for General Counsel is mandated anywhere. Professor Pendergast noted that students have served on that search committee in the past. Secretary Tachau requested that ideas regarding appropriate context of this issue be sent to the Faculty Senate Officers.

Professor Bishara asked what the proposed timetable is to resubmit the constitution. President Drake responded that there is no timetable at this point. Professor Pendergast suggested that clarifying information on all these issues be sent soon so that the Regents' anxiety about these issues can be reduced.

- *Presentation by Provost Wallace Loh*

President Drake introduced Provost Wallace Loh, who, having given a presentation at the Faculty Council/Administration Retreat on some aspects of his vision for the university, was here at President Drake's invitation to make a similar presentation to the Faculty Senate. Provost Loh began by stating that he would like to present a very preliminary draft addressing the question of where the university should go in the next five years and how we should get there. To this end, he reminded the Senate, there are currently about 70 faculty, staff, and students serving on six different task forces to create the "road map." According to Provost Loh, there is no great enthusiasm for an entirely new strategic planning process at this time, but there is a sense that the current strategic plan could be refined given our new era of budget constraints. We can think of this refined plan as *The Iowa Promise Part II*. A primary legacy of *The Iowa Promise Part I* was an increase in faculty salaries, as a result of which the University of Iowa has moved from the bottom of the Big Ten to its median in this regard. This move was essential to recruit and retain the best faculty. Although this was the correct direction to take, there was a need for a trade-off because of limited resources: about 100 tenure-track faculty lines were lost at a time when undergraduate enrollment increased by about 7%. Another focus of *The Iowa Promise Part I* was that significant strides were made in increasing diversity among faculty, although less so among students. This progress, Provost Loh believes, should be continued. A third focus was student success – the retention and graduation rate of undergraduate students. Here, however, there has been very little change in the statistics of retention and six-year graduation rate over the past fifteen years. Some initiatives have been carried out, such as the creation of living/learning communities, freshman seminars, common courses, improved advising, etc., but as these efforts were of necessity on a small scale (since there was no money for major initiatives), little progress was made. Our retention rate is currently at the bottom of the Big Ten, at 83%. Provost Loh holds that we should be able to increase that rate to 88%. Through studies undertaken by the provost's office, we have learned that few students leave because of financial reasons. What students mostly indicate is that they

do not feel connected to the campus – neither to the faculty nor to their fellow students. The purpose of many of the student success initiatives that Provost Loh envisions is “to shrink the size of the university” psychologically for incoming first-year students and to create small communities in which students can thrive.

Provost Loh continued by offering his sense of the larger picture in which our efforts are taking place. From his vantage point, four major issues face higher education throughout the country. The first of these is finances; over the past twenty years, state appropriations have gone down while tuition has gone up. While the University of Iowa is doing well in acquiring research grants and gifts, this success does not tend to affect undergraduate education because the salaries of most faculty teaching undergraduates are paid out of the general fund. It is unlikely that state appropriations are going to increase significantly in the near future, just as it is unlikely that tuition will increase substantially because – and this is the second issue – people want to come to public research institutions for the quality education, but the average taxpayer currently is unwilling to pay more for this education. Cost, access and quality are the “iron triangle.” The third major issue is demographic: the population in Iowa is declining, but the U.S. population is increasing and becoming more diverse. According to the Census Bureau, as Provost Loh noted, by 2040 there will be no minorities. Additionally, many immigrant minorities, especially Latinos, are moving to smaller cities in the Midwest rather than to larger “gateway” cities. This means that we must increase affordable access for the Latino students of Iowa. Finally, the nature of research is changing to some degree. Traditionally research has been individual-driven and discipline-based. Now, Provost Loh asserted, it is increasingly problem-driven and interdisciplinary, responding to what the National Academy of Engineering calls “Grand Challenges” [<http://www.engineeringchallenges.org/>] These are pressing societal, global issues, such as sustainability, that can only be solved using the resources of multiple disciplines. These four issues must be taken into account as we create our vision for the next five years.

The first priority under *The Iowa Promise Part II* is preservation of salaries. We must maintain previous gains made in faculty salaries. Any increases in the General Education Fund will go primarily toward faculty and staff salaries. The next priority will be focused excellence. If we have additional funds, where should we direct them? One area is research and graduate education and the other is undergraduate student success. Regarding the former, we must identify the “Grand Challenges” to the solutions of which we want to contribute. The Research and Graduate Education Strategic Initiatives Task Force is currently identifying the interdisciplinary areas towards which the university will direct resources. President Mason has already stated her intention to restore the one hundred faculty lines previously lost; those lines will be restored in the form of cluster hires for these interdisciplinary “Grand Challenges.” Regarding undergraduate education, the plan is for every first-year student to attend a freshman seminar with a faculty member. Additionally, the goal is for every first-year student to be placed in a living-learning community, which will permit groups of students to take courses together and have academic and career advising together. Every 1% increase in retention translates to two million dollars. If we increase retention and recruitment gradually over the next few years, we would have the money for 100 new faculty lines (in rough numbers). Another area that the task forces are exploring is increased accessibility for place-bound, non-traditional students throughout the state. To this end, we are forming partnerships with community colleges. Finally, the Task Force on Strategic Budgeting will look at ways to realign collegiate budgets with our strategic priorities.

Professor Menninger asked about the teaching load of the new faculty – freshman seminars as well as normal teaching load, given that course offerings were cut when faculty lines were

lost. Provost Loh explained that we would need to create about 200 seminars in order to offer seminars to all freshmen. The University has approximately 2,000 tenured and tenure-track faculty. This would mean that a faculty member would teach a one-credit freshman seminar on a topic of his/her expertise once every five years. There were many faculty volunteers this year and we hope this enthusiasm would continue.

Professor Cox asked for clarification regarding a projected decrease in state appropriations along with a projected increase in the General Education Funds in one of Provost Loh's slides. Provost Loh responded that any incremental increases in GEF over the next five years would go to faculty and staff salaries. Professor Cox commented that Iowa has an advantage over our competitors in that we are among the top ten states with the highest percentage of state funding going to higher education. Given the state's traditional commitment to higher education, we may be in a position to appeal for some relief from the budget cuts. While Provost Loh agreed with the philosophical position of that argument, he commented that it would not be good strategy to ask for budget relief by claiming that higher education is more deserving of it than are other state institutions. It would, however, be useful to stress the value added that would justify an increase in tuition. We should also stress our efforts at student retention and improved graduation rates. Students can have the best of both worlds – small college *and* Big Ten experience by participating in a living-learning community. Packaging our requests this way would be more effective with legislators and the public.

Professor Vaughn commented that the incentives for doing research and obtaining grants vary among colleges. If we intend to tackle some of these interdisciplinary Grand Challenges, what will be the incentives for faculty to reach across collegiate boundaries? Provost Loh answered that the task forces are looking ways to foster inter-collegiate collaboration. The Strategic Budgeting Task Force is looking into how faculty who do bring in outside funding can be rewarded.

Professor Kletzing said that it was his understanding that a large budget cut this year was filled by stimulus funding; however, next year we will face the same large budget cut without this extra funding. Provost Loh reminded him that the size of the cut to the General Education Fund was not as large as the size of the diminution of appropriations, because out-of-state tuition made up for some of the lost revenue to the GEF. Last year out-of-state students had a substantial increase in tuition. To a certain degree, therefore, non-residents are subsidizing the university – although, of course, some of the new out-of-state tuition dollars were applied to increasing financial aid. Provost Loh added that we have also had a big increase in undergraduate international students recently. These students come from the middle class in emerging countries where there are not yet world-class universities, but where the families have the money to pay for higher education abroad. We are currently recruiting in 25 different countries. Perhaps we can eventually set aside some of the international undergraduate student tuition to fund study abroad for Iowa students.

Professor Menninger asked about the 100 new interdisciplinary faculty hired to study the Grand Challenges: after seven years, Professor Menninger noted, these faculty will have tenure, and after ten years, these particular Grand Challenges may be obsolete. What will those faculty do then if they were hired “from above” to work on particular problems? Provost Loh responded first by stressing that the faculty at issue will not be hired “from above;” the colleges will be asked what they need. As an example, Provost Loh pointed to the roughly 20 faculty already working on issues of water sustainability at the university, and stated that while we might hire 10 more faculty in that area, an issue like sustainability is unlikely to be obsolete after ten years. Professor Wadsworth asked, if we already have excellent programs in various areas, why don't

we simply support those programs to a greater degree? Provost Loh responded that the Task Force on Graduate Education is currently reviewing all the graduate programs.

President Drake thanked Provost Loh for his presentation and noted that the chairs of the six task forces will be invited to present their work to the Faculty Council and Senate.

IV. From the Floor – There were no issues from the floor.

V. Announcements

- The Obermann Graduate Institute on Engagement and the Academy (Teresa Mangum). Professor Mangum explained that this institute is for graduate students in any discipline who want to build public engagement into their scholarship or teaching. The application deadline is October 21.
- AAUP Reading Group (Marian Wilson Kimber). Professor Wilson Kimber, president of the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), explained that the AAUP focuses on shared governance, tenure, academic freedom and due process. The local AAUP chapter will be hosting a series of reading groups, with the first to take place on Monday, October 5, at 6:30 pm at the home of Professors Frank and Gigi Durham. This will be a potluck dinner also, but attendees are not required to bring a dish. The group will be reading the September/October 2008 issue of *Academe* which focuses on the future of tenure [<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2008/SO/>]. The AAUP will also be having a membership drive in October.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 6, 3:30-5:15 pm in the Penn State Room (337) of the IMU.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 20, 3:30 – 5:15 pm in the Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was unanimously approved. President Drake adjourned the meeting at 4:54 pm.