

FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, September 2, 2008
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

Present: D. Asprey; G. Buettner; H. Butcher; A. Campbell; M. Cohen; D. D'Alessandro; J. Fiesemann; J. Garfinkel; E. Gidal; T. Gross; G. Jogerst; L. Kirsch; C. Kletzing; S. Lutgendorf; D. Macfarlane; T. Mangum; C. McCarthy; J. Menninger; S. Moorhead; A. Morris; N. Nisly; M. Noonan; F. Nothwehr; B. Plapp; J. Polumbaum; L. Richman; C. Ringen; L. Robertson; T. Schnell; K. Schuh; C. Scott-Conner; C. Sponsler; T. Stalter; H. Stecopoulos; N. Street; K. Tachau; J. Tansey; R. Valentine; T. Vaughn; R. Wachtel; J. Wadsworth; L. Wang; E. Wasserman; J. Wilcox; R. Williams; M. Wilson Kimber; S. Wilson; S. Wolfe; J. Woodhead; T. Yin.

Absent: D. Anderson; L. Ayres; G. Bergus; J. Bertolatus; M. Donovan; G. El-Khoury; C. Helms; K. Kader; T. Kresowik; S. McGuire; P. Mobily; R. Mutel; G. Russell; M. VanBeek; C. Woodman.

Excused: S. Bishara; L. Boyle; D. Hammond; B. Justman; E. Lawrence; F. Mitros; J. Reist; W. Sharp; J. Tomkovicz; S. Vincent.

Officers

Present: D. Drake (Vice President); M. O'Hara (President); V. Sharp (Past President).

Officers

Excused: S. Stromquist (Secretary).

Guests: K. Cunningham (*Daily Iowan*); C. Drum (University Relations); R. Friedrich (Emeritus Faculty Council); S. Johnson (Office of the Provost); P. Kenner (Human Resources); A. Mattson (Journalism student); B. Morelli (Iowa City *Press-Citizen*); K. Ward (Human Resources), and L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President O'Hara called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Ringen moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (April 22, 2008) – Professor Richman moved and Professor Nisly seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

C. Committee Replacements (David Drake) – Vice President Drake read the list of committee replacements:

- Catherine Ringen, Linguistics, to replace Jeff Cox, History, on the Faculty Council for the Fall 2008 semester.
- Christine McCarthy, Educational Policy & Leadership, to fill the unexpired term of Susan Lagos Lavenz, Educational Policy & Leadership, 2008-10, on the Faculty Senate.
- Michel Laronde, French & Italian, to replace Katina Lillios, Anthropology, on the Diversity Charter Committee for the Fall 2008 semester.
- John Fuller, Urban & Regional Planning, to replace Sue O’Dorisio, Pediatrics, on the Financial Aid Advisory Charter Committee, 2008-09.
- Dan Quinn, Chemistry, to fill the unexpired term of Stephen Wieting, Sociology, on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2008-09.
- Lon Moeller, Management & Organizations, to fill the unexpired term of Steve McGuire, Curriculum & Instruction, on the Presidential Committee on Athletics, 2008-11.
- Two new appointees to the Faculty Judicial Commission: Nicholas Colangelo, Belin-Blank Center, and Mark Young, Chemistry.
- Tung Yin, Law, to fill a vacancy that the Committee on Committees had not filled earlier on the Awards and Recognitions Committee, 2008-11.

Professor Cohen moved and Professor Fieselmann seconded that the committee replacements be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. New Business

- Working at IOWA *presentation (Kevin Ward and Pat Kenner, Human Resources)*

Mr. Ward stated that the *Working at IOWA* survey was first administered in 2006. It was a confidential survey, administered to both faculty and staff, asking people how they feel about their working environment. It will be administered again this year from October 14 to November 3. Administering the survey a second time will allow Human Resources (HR) to measure progress, to find areas for improvement and to assess the strengths of the university. Last time, the most agreed-upon statements were “People find effective ways to do their work; they know what is expected of them; they understand how their job fits the mission of the university; their workplace has a strong focus on excellence; and they have the resources to do their jobs.” Areas for improvement were also indicated, and HR took steps to make those improvements. Following this second administration of the survey, HR would like to set the course for new initiatives. Some of the issues addressed following the previous survey included performance management, conflict management, and workload distribution. Regarding performance management, HR has increased support of performance evaluations, both in compliance in doing them and in the quality of those done. Education and skill training in performance evaluation were included in ongoing leadership training. In the area of conflict management, HR has partnered with the Office of the Ombudsperson to provide training for having difficult conversations. Process improvement training was

provided to improve workload distribution. There have been various customized initiatives within each college and org. The *Working at IOWA* survey is not intended to find out where our problems are, it is more designed to discover opportunities for improvement, how to take advantage of our strengths.

Last time there was a response rate of 43% overall; among the faculty it was around 32%. HR would like to increase participation overall to 60%. Mr. Ward stated that he would like for the senators present to take the survey and encourage others to do the same. As an incentive, during each of the three weeks that the survey is open, there will be drawings for prizes such as gift certificates. There will be a prize awarded to a faculty, merit, and P&S employee each week.

Professor Wilcox questioned the validity of presenting this survey to faculty, and expressed concern that surveys of this type have the tendency to generate cynicism among the faculty, as they do not directly impact the faculty's mission of teaching and research. He requested that Mr. Ward convey this opinion to HR. Professor Tachau requested clarification why the survey was not looking for problems, but rather opportunities for improvement. Mr. Ward explained that the issue was confidentiality. The survey will not collect data for a unit-specific report on units with less than 15 individuals in a particular classification. This will prevent individual analysis of many departments. A university-wide report will be available online, and college and org reports will be given to deans and vice presidents. Professor Tachau also asked, in light of Professor Wilcox's comment, what information will be obtained from the survey that will be relevant to faculty. As an example, Mr. Ward indicated that questions regarding the DEO/faculty member relationship will be asked. Professor Tachau expressed concern that the survey questions would not elicit information of relevance to faculty. Professor Macfarlane requested an example of a survey that had produced a specific change on campus. Mr. Ward responded that this survey is built upon other survey models and research on engagement and may not touch upon some issues specific to the University of Iowa, and is intended to support the university's reach toward excellence.

- *University Strategic Planning (Michael O'Hara)*

President O'Hara indicated that the Board of Regents is beginning a strategic planning process this fall, and has asked the three Regents institutions to initiate planning processes of their own that will eventually line up with this plan. President Mason has requested that Provost Loh oversee this process on our campus, and identify areas of focus with consultation from faculty, staff, and students. President O'Hara directed the group's attention to a handout showing the tentative structure this process will take. This will not be a traditional strategic planning exercise, since the foundations of the current plan, the *Iowa Promise*, remain sound. The intention is rather to identify new areas of focus, for which resources would be available. The task forces on the chart represent the areas of focus; these task forces will produce recommendations. The overall Strategic Initiatives Committee (SIC) will prioritize the recommendations and look at resources available for implementation. The Faculty Senate leadership has been asked to suggest individuals to serve on the task forces and the overall SIC; please send these suggestions to President O'Hara.

Professor Wadsworth indicated that his department has been working on a strategic plan as part of their re-accreditation process, and is frustrated by the changing nature of the Regents' overall planning structure. President O'Hara responded that we are past

the midpoint of the current plan, and it is time to work on another one. He added that the current strategic plan has a very wide scope. This new strategic process will aim at specific initiatives, for which funding should be made available. Professor Menninger requested clarification of the mission, “Research enterprise and interdisciplinarity.” (The task forces will all address how their recommendations will advance the missions of undergraduate education; graduate and professional education; research enterprise and interdisciplinarity; and patient care.) President O’Hara, Professor Tachau, and Professor Ringen described that mission as “scholarly and creative activity, including that which crosses interdisciplinary boundaries.” Professor Vaughn asked for clarification regarding the issues to be addressed by the task forces. President O’Hara explained that “student success and wellness” refers generally to the issues of academic progress and binge drinking. “Long-term rebuilding of UI” refers to our long-term relationship with the river. He added that the task force members will most likely have a role in defining their topics. Professor Nisly commented that during Provost Loh’s visit with the Charter Committee on Diversity, which she co-chairs, he had stressed that the strategic initiatives will be specific projects that we do as a group over the next five years. Professor Gidal expressed concern over the timeline – is it possible to do this much in such a short period of time (the SIC will present its final report to President Mason on April 1)? President O’Hara responded that the Board of Regents is expecting us to do this. Also, the task forces will have a relatively narrow scope of focus. Professor Macfarland, in referring to the title of task force six, “Economic Development and Civic Engagement” expressed concern that this would not encompass areas such as music or the libraries, that perhaps do not make money but certainly have value. President O’Hara responded that economic development is expected of us by the Board of Regents. Past President Sharp noted that civic engagement would cover areas such as those referred to by Professor Macfarland. Professor Nisly commented upon Provost Loh’s stress on the impact of the university on the community during his visit to the Committee on Diversity. Professor Wilcox expressed concern that, while the previous strategic planning process had involved the input of hundreds of people across campus, this strategic initiatives process seems to involve so few people. It appears that these six topics have been given to us without our consultation. President O’Hara replied that the strategic initiatives process will most likely involve extensive consultation with the campus community. These are the areas the provost has identified as critical, but building on the *Iowa Promise*. Professor Tachau commented on the perceived political reasons for including economic development in the title of task force six. She suggested an alternative title, Civic Engagement and Development/Impact, with economic development to be included. Professor Ringen suggested, Civic and Economic Impact, which would encompass the training of the work force. Professor Mangum expressed concern that resources that would go toward these initiatives would then not be available for other worthy initiatives and projects. She suggested that we try to think of topics not listed here, and then try to include them in some way in this strategic initiatives process. Professor Vaughn asked what role the Faculty Senate might have in shaping and setting priorities. President O’Hara responded that he anticipated that faculty would have a key role in driving this process. Faculty should give input and serve on task forces if the opportunity arises. He stressed that Provost Loh is very receptive to faculty input.

- *Update on Search for Vice President for Research (Michael O'Hara)*

President O'Hara noted that Professor Jordan Cohen has served admirably as Interim Vice President for Research. A search will now get underway for a permanent person in that position. The search committee will most likely have co-chairs. David Kieft, Office of the President, will staff the search committee. Please contact President O'Hara or Professor Jonathan Carlson, Senior Associate to the President, if you have suggestions for possible candidates. President O'Hara added that it was his understanding that the current reporting structure for the Office for the Vice President for Research will remain the same, as this structure will most likely attract the best pool of candidates.

Professor Menninger asked if the Faculty Senate Committee on the Selection of Central Academic Officials would be involved in this search. President O'Hara responded that it would be. Professor Macfarland asked if the Office of the Vice President for Research was reviewed every five years, and if so, does this review include the VPR's reporting units. President O'Hara responded that in general, it is the responsibility of a vice president's office to review its reporting units. Past President Sharp explained that the overall review of a vice presidential office is a public document and should be available on the office's website. The review of a vice president, however, is confidential. Professor Menninger added that in his past experience on the Research Council, all of the VPR's reporting units were reviewed.

- *Research Track Proposal for Carver College of Medicine (Michael O'Hara)*

President O'Hara reminded the Senate that last spring the Senate had voted to implement a research-track policy. This policy would allow a college to decide for itself whether or not to implement a research track. Any collegiate policy must be fully consistent with the university policy, and implementation would require a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The Carver College of Medicine (CCOM) has developed a policy, which the Faculty Senate officers have reviewed and the Faculty Council has approved, with a few edits to clarify wording. President O'Hara expressed confidence that the CCOM policy is consistent with the university policy. In the CCOM vote on whether to implement their own research-track policy, out of 543 eligible voters, 297 (55%) cast votes. Two hundred and forty-seven (83% of voters) voted yes, and fifty voted no.

Professor Cohen moved and Professor Richman seconded that the proposed Carver College of Medicine research-track policy be approved.

Professor Plapp expressed concern with inconsistencies in the document. He noted the phrase, "[Research-track faculty] may compete for internal funding opportunities..." and asked what type of funding opportunities this would be. This conflicts with the phrase, "Research-track faculty will devote almost all of their time to performing externally supported research..." He also commented on the phrase regarding research-track faculty "teaching in the laboratory setting." In the CCOM, professors are allowed to report as teaching only time spent delivering lectures; time spent working with post-docs or undergraduates in the laboratory cannot be counted. The policy does not define the research-track faculty position in a clear way. Professor Ringen, who serves on the Research Council, also expressed concern about research-track faculty competing for internal funding. If, for example, the Research Council were to exclude research-track

faculty from a particular funding opportunity, could someone point to this policy and dispute that decision? It is not appropriate for the CCOM or Faculty Senate to have a say in eligibility for funding opportunities provided by the Office of the Vice President for Research. President O'Hara read the following phrase from the university policy, "[Research-track faculty] can qualify for awards and can compete for internal research grants in the same manner as research scientists who are professional and scientific staff." Therefore, the CCOM proposal is consistent with the university policy. We understand this to mean that in this particular instance (eligibility to compete for internal funding), research-track faculty will be treated like research scientists, who are Professional & Scientific staff. If an internal funding opportunity is only available for faculty, then research-track faculty would not be eligible to apply. Professor Ringen responded that this is not stated here. President O'Hara stated that the governing policy is the university policy approved last spring. A collegiate policy can be more restrictive, but not more liberal than the university policy. It cannot undermine the intent of the university policy. Professor Cohen said the intent is to allow research-track faculty the opportunity to apply for some, perhaps all, internal funding opportunities in the university, as they are faculty and should have that right. Research scientists are allowed the opportunity to apply for internal funding. Since some research-track faculty may come from the ranks of research scientists, it does not make sense to exclude them from this opportunity. The main point, however, is that the CCOM policy is consistent with the university policy, which is the issue we are examining here. President O'Hara added that the CCOM policy states "They may compete for internal funding opportunities **as defined by collegiate and University guidelines**," and the University guidelines are very clear on this issue. Professor Tachau suggested that an opening clause such as "To the extent that the Research Council opens the competition..." be added to the sentence, "They can qualify for awards..." This would make clear which university guidelines are referred to and who makes the decision about eligibility. Professor O'Hara cautioned against altering the university policy, and instead suggested inserting a parenthetical reference in the CCOM policy to the university policy, "(See chapter 10.a. Definitions)." Past President Sharp reiterated that the university policy supersedes any collegiate policy. A professor asked if someone could hold dual appointments as a research-track and as a tenure-track professor. President O'Hara responded that this was not allowed. Professor Menninger questioned the procedure for obtaining external funding for candidates for research-track assistant professor positions. He also noted that the document referred to on page three of the CCOM policy, "Procedures for Research-Track Promotion Decision-Making at the University of Iowa" does not exist yet; shouldn't we wait until it has been written before we vote? He then read a quote from a colleague regarding the successful fusion of teaching and research at the American university. Susan Johnson, associate provost for faculty, commented that it was her recollection that the criteria for promotion of clinical-track faculty were developed after the clinical-track was approved. Professor Wilson Kimber asked if the one-year term referred to in the CCOM policy was consistent with the university policy. President O'Hara responded that it was.

Professor Cohen called the question. In a voice vote, the Senate voted to end debate on the proposal.

In a voice vote, the Senate voted (with one abstention) to approve the CCOM research-track policy with the edit to insert in the third paragraph, “(see Chapter 10.a. Definitions) after the phrase “collegiate and University guidelines.”

IV. From the Floor

President O’Hara welcomed Provost Loh to his first Faculty Senate meeting. Provost Loh stated that he was thrilled, delighted, and honored to be with the Senate today.

There were no issues from the floor.

V. Announcements

- Lee Anna Clark (Psychology) will chair the Committee to Review the Division of Student Services.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, W401 PBB.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, October 21, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Macfarland moved and Professor Morris seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 pm.