FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, October 22, 2013
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

Senators Present:	J. Adrain, T. Anthony, S. Baker, H. Bartlett, C. Benson, J. Brown, J. Buatti, T. Burstain, D. Caplan, K. Chandran, J. Colgan, , D. Dawson, E. Epping, R. Ettinger, N. Fethke, K. Gerken, F. Gerr, C. Getz, E. Gillan, N. Grosland, T. Havens, Z. Jin, K. Kieran, N. Langguth, A. Lee, G. Lee, K. Light-McGroary, K. Markon, J. McNamara, A. Merino, P. Muhly, D. Murry, F. Nothwehr, J. Pendergast, G. Penny, L. Ponto, E. Prussing, S. Richardson, R. Rocha, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, L. Storrs, B. Thompson, T. Treat, M. Voigt, E. Wasserman, M. Young.
Officers Present:	D. Cunning, E. Dove, E. Lawrence, A. Thomas.
Senators Excused:	F. Abboud, I. Barbuzza, S. Daack-Hirsch, A. Kwitek, S. Schultz, J. Solow, E. Ziegler.
Senators Absent:	S. Ali, D. Anderson, L. Ayres, D. Black, C. Bohannan, P. Brophy, F. Durham, E. Ernst, C. Fox, S. Gardner, K. Glenn, B. Hoskins, J. Kolker, G. Lal, J. Murry, J. Paulsen, Y. Sato, W. Schmidt, D. Segaloff, S. Seibert, S. White, D. Wilder, R. Williams, T. Yahr.
Guests:	J. Culshaw (University Libraries), R. Friedrich (Emeritus Faculty Council), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), S. Kurtz (Funded Retirement and Insurance Committee), G. Meyle (*Daily Iowan*), L. Moeller (Tippie College of Business), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), K. Ward (Human Resources), T. Weingeist (Emeritus Faculty Council), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate Office).

I.   Call to Order – President Lawrence called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.10.22.13.pdf.

II.   Approvals
    A.   Meeting Agenda – President Lawrence indicated that one additional item would be added to the agenda, the approval of the external member of the Committee to Review the Office of the Provost. Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Bartlett seconded that the revised agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
    B.   Faculty Senate Minutes (September 24, 2013) – Professor Bartlett moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
    C.   Committee Appointments (Alexandra Thomas, Chair, Committee on Committees)

- David Dick (Radiology) to the Faculty Staff Parking Appeals Committee, 2013-14
    Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Bartlett seconded that the appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
    D. External Member of the Committee to Review the Office of the Provost – President Lawrence reminded the group that at the last Senate meeting, the internal membership of the review committee had been approved. An external member has now been identified. President Lawrence asked the Senate to approve the appointment of the external member, Karen Hanson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota. Prior to Provost Hanson's appointment at the University of Minnesota, she served as executive vice president of Indiana University and provost at IU's Bloomington campus. Vice President Thomas moved and Professor Bartlett seconded that the appointment be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

III.   New Business
- *Funded Retirement and Insurance Charter Committee Update (Shelly Kurtz, Co-chair)*
    Professor Kurtz explained that the Funded Retirement and Insurance Charter Committee is charged with providing advice to the administration regarding the university's health, dental, retirement, and disability plans. He indicated that the committee has recommended a modest increase in dental insurance coverage for orthodontic and prosthetic treatment. Regarding the health insurance plan, Professor Kurtz stated that there would be no increase in premiums for 2014. He added that, given the rise in premiums over the last several years, however, there is some concern that the UI plan might eventually fall into the category of "Cadillac plans" and be subject to a tax under the Affordable Care Act. In response to a question, Professor Kurtz indicated that the UI plans have long met the standards required by the Affordable Care Act.

    In response to questions, Professor Kurtz indicated that there would be no changes to the retirement plans or flexible benefits program next year. Vice President Thomas asked whether the university's wellness programs have had an effect on keeping health insurance premiums flat. Professor Kurtz responded that he had no data to support this view; however, there have been a steadily increasing number of employees engaged in various university wellness programs. Professor Pendergast asked if progress had been made in re-structuring the UI health plan so that care obtained out-of-state (for children in college, for example) was less expensive. Professor Kurtz responded that no solution has been found, but the committee is still working on it. Professor Pendergast also asked about the state of the market for long-term care insurance. Professor Kurtz wondered whether the industry would survive, given the huge costs for long-term care. He noted that the university does make a long-term care commercial insurance product available to employees.

- *Course Approval Guidelines for MOOCs (Beth Ingram, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education; Lon Moeller, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs, Tippie College of Business)*
    Prior to the presentation by Associate Provost Ingram and Associate Dean Moeller, President Lawrence indicated that the document distributed to the Senate did not propose any

new policy. Instead, this guidelines document drew together pieces of relevant existing university policies to aid a faculty member who wished to offer a massive open online course (MOOC) or massive online course (MOC). Associate Provost Ingram then explained that last spring Provost Butler had requested that she form a committee to examine how MOOCs and MOCs might intersect with existing university course approval policies. Associate Dean Moeller added that the committee had determined that no new separate policy on MOOCs and MOCs was needed; existing university policies were sufficient to cover these types of courses.

Associate Dean Moeller pointed out that the document divides courses into three types, with Type I encompassing the variety of courses that most faculty teach (regular, online, hybrid, and guided independent study). These courses are offered by the university for credit and go through the proper university channels for course approval. Type II includes courses offered by the university, but for which the university does not give credit. Various types of continuing education courses, professional development training, and outreach programs fall into this category, along with university-offered MOOCs and MOCs. Type III courses are offered by UI faculty and staff, but are not approved by the university. This type of course is considered "outside professional activity" and is governed by the university's Conflict of Commitment and Conflict of Interest policies.

Turning to a discussion of issues that arose at the recent Faculty Council meeting, Associate Dean Moeller explained that the phrase in 4. c) *MOOCs and MOCs delivered by or awarded credit by other institutions are not awarded transfer credit at the University of Iowa*, does not take the responsibility of determining course equivalency away from faculty members. This phrase refers to credit awarded by third-party providers and for which students may seek to obtain UI approval. Professor Young brought up a situation he had encountered in which a student had transferred into the UI with a MOOC on his/her transcript that had been approved by his/her previous institution. This was not a course for which the UI would have granted approval, however. Associate Provost Ingram explained that if, for example, the University of Illinois offered a MOOC, and a student transferred from Illinois to the UI with this MOOC on the transcript, then the UI would approve the credit. If, however, the MOOC had been offered by a third party, but appeared on the Illinois transcript, it would be at the UI's discretion whether or not to approve that credit. This is current university policy and reflects concerns about testing integrity and other aspects peculiar to MOOCs.

- *Video Surveillance Policy Update (Kevin Ward, Assistant Vice President for Human Resources Administration)*
  Mr. Ward reminded the group that the Video Surveillance policy had come before the Senate for approval in April 2012. At that time, Senators had requested that they receive a report a year or so later on how implementation was proceeding. Mr. Ward referred the group to the policy document and explained that the policy applies to "use of video equipment for the purpose of surveillance." There are a number of exclusions, related to instructional and research purposes and video conferencing, among others. Another section of the policy outlines principles and rationale behind the policy to promote a safe campus but prevent unnecessary intrusions. The policy also provides for the formation of an administrative committee to monitor application of the policy and the establishment of an approval process for installation and use of video

surveillance equipment and systems. The administrative committee is made up of representatives from Human Resources, Information Technology Services, Facilities Management, Office of the General Counsel, and UI Health Care. The approval process requires that the vice president of the unit making the request consult with Human Resources, Information Technology Services and the Department of Public Safety.

Mr. Ward indicated that the policy was implemented in August 2012 and the campus was informed of this through a variety of means, such as the D(eans)D(irectors)DEO(s) listserv. A process for obtaining approval of video surveillance equipment was then developed. The process begins when a unit indicates a desire to install such equipment to staff from the Department of Public Safety and Information Technology Services. Staff from those departments help the unit determine if video surveillance is the proper solution for their concerns. The unit also engages in conversations about the financial aspects of video surveillance, such as costs for implementing and maintaining the system. The request then comes to the administrative committee, which determines whether the request is consistent with the policy. Mr. Ward noted that the university is migrating surveillance cameras to a new integrated system and phasing out stand-alone cameras, adding somewhat to the costs involved for a unit. The administrative committee has developed retention standards (video footage can be retained for 14-30 days, but certainly no more than 90 days) and confidentiality agreements, which will need to be signed by those working with the systems either in the units or the central offices. The committee is also developing a best practice guide for future requests. Senators had earlier suggested that signage be placed in areas with cameras, alerting people to their presence. This is an effort yet to be undertaken, but is being explored. Thus far, there is no plan to revise any part of the policy, which seems to be operating as intended.

A senator noted that the policy contained an exclusion for patient care, but not for staff safety. She gave the example of the cyclotron in her unit. Cameras are posted there not for surveillance, but to determine that there is no one inside the hall when the cyclotron is about to be operated. Mr. Ward commented that since cameras are used in this situation as a mechanism to ensure worker safety, the policy would most likely not apply to them. The senator asked if the policy only applied in situations in which recordings were retained. Mr. Ward responded that this was not the case. The committee which had developed the policy wanted to document the existence of surveillance cameras whether or not recordings were retained. Professor Havens raised questions about the security of the servers on which recordings were retained. Mr. Ward responded that with the integration of the surveillance systems underway, the security of those servers should be increased. At this time, departments are given parameters for the use and retention of recordings.

- *Open Access (John Culshaw, University Librarian)*
In introducing Mr. Culshaw, President Lawrence noted the important role publications play in the careers of tenured and tenure-track faculty and commented on the increasing visibility of open access publications. Mr. Culshaw began his remarks by indicating that this is Open Access Week, the sixth such annual celebration to disseminate information about open access and to inspire participation in the effort to make open access the "new norm" in scholarship and research, http://www.openaccessweek.org/. He commented that changes in copyright, access provisions, and funding structures have complicated the world of scholarly communications,

leading to the emergence of a new mode of knowledge-sharing, with open access at its core. Beyond collecting and curating, the university libraries are uniquely equipped to continue supporting the scholarship of faculty members. Mr. Culshaw continued, saying that the current system of research dissemination places commercial interests above scholarly interests, rather than finding a balance between the two. The transfer of copyright from author to publisher allows for this situation to occur. Digital publications are significantly less expensive to produce than are the print versions. Therefore, the transfer of copyright is no longer necessary in order to sustain the publisher's operating costs. The Author's Addendum, endorsed by the Senate in 2007, allows for authors to retain copyright of their works by instead licensing those works to a publisher. Librarians can assist with this negotiation.

Digital technologies, Mr. Culshaw added, have accelerated the rate at which scholarship can be shared. Open access is about the availability of scholarship and the retention of copyrights. Mr. Culshaw explained that there are two primary forms of open access. The first is open access archiving. Scholars submit their publications to a subject or institutional repository, such as the university's own Iowa Research Online (IRO), http://ir.uiowa.edu/. The IRO is a digital publishing service dedicated to supporting and preserving the research output of the university. The IRO can host and provide technical support for academic journals, UI-sponsored conferences, and personal author portfolios. It can support journal articles, books, multimedia, data, and conference proceedings. The National Institutes of Health now require all publications produced as a result of their grants to be submitted to PubMed (a subject repository). Other federal agencies are soon expected to enact similar policies. Most publishing agreements allow for this. The other model is open access publishing, which uses a peer review process to make scholarship widely available. Some open access journals require a processing fee, which can be covered by grant funding or institutional support. The UI's Open Access Fund was created by the Office of the Provost and the University Libraries to provide funding for authors to make their work openly available.

Professor Pendergast asked whether an article should be deposited in the IRO if it is already located in an accessible electronic archive such as PubMed. Mr. Culshaw responded that the IRO would gladly accept publications that are also located elsewhere, to increase the likelihood that the publication will be discovered and accessed. Secretary Cunning asked what percentage of online journals are deemed to be of high quality. Mr. Culshaw responded that academic departments should make the determination of the quality of individual online journals. Liaison librarians can also determine if specific journals are legitimate. Professor Young observed that one marker of journal quality is impact factor. He asked if online journals, many of which are very new, will begin accumulating impact factors. Karen Fischer and Chris Diaz of the UI Libraries commented that, like print journals, online journals must go through the process of garnering citations. Online journals do submit themselves to various indexing services. There is usually a one to two year delay before a citation appears in an index. A senator observed that there is still somewhat of a stigma attached to open access journals. He asked if there was any data available indicating that the rate of publication in open access journals is rising. Mr. Culshaw responded that open access is a growing arena; requests to the university for funding to publish in open access journals are increasing. He stressed that nationwide, institutional infrastructure for this new phenomenon has only recently been created. And, promotion and

tenure committees are also beginning to look at how open access publications fit into departmental expectations for faculty productivity.

- *Faculty Activity Report (Tom Rice, Associate Provost for Faculty)*

Associate Provost Rice reminded the group that every two years, a portion of the faculty members at the Regents institutions are surveyed about their teaching, research, and service activities. The Board of Regents, State of Iowa office then prepares a public report based on this survey. The prior version of the survey primarily requested only the amount of time spent on those three activities. Recently, however, a more nuanced survey had been developed and administered that fully captured the wide range of these activities in which faculty members are engaged. This online survey allowed the responder to provide a detailed account of how s/he spent her/his day for a period of one week. There was a 65% response rate at the UI this time, slightly lower than the response rates at ISU and UNI. In past years, staff at the Regents office would take the individual reports from the three institutions and re-write them into one consolidated report. This time, however, Associate Provost Rice and his counterparts at the other two institutions took on the task of writing the complete, joint report, with only minor edits made by Regents office staff.

Associate Provost Rice drew the group's attention to a chart within the report illustrating the survey results. He pointed out that UI tenured and tenure-track faculty reported spending an average of 10.35 hours per week on "classroom teaching, preparation, grading/evaluation" under the category of "student instruction." Other entries within this category allowed faculty members to report additional instruction-related activities not covered under classroom teaching, preparation, and grading/evaluation, such as "non-classroom teaching and instruction (independent studies, etc.)," "mentoring student research," and "communicating with students outside the classroom." When all instruction-related activities were considered, the total average hours faculty members spent on student instruction rose to 21.80. The total average hours per week that tenured and tenure-track faculty members at UI spent on all categories of their work was 57.57. Associate Provost Rice indicated that answering Regents' questions regarding data in the previous faculty activities report was difficult and he had to resort to anecdotal evidence to illustrate the range of activity. This new report, however, provides comprehensive data on faculty activity and has been well-received by the Regents. Associate Provost Rice thanked faculty members who filled out the survey for their efforts and reminded the group to expect the survey every two years.

Professor Pendergast asked if the median hours per week in this report differed from those of previous years. Associate Provost Rice responded that the figure has been similar for some time. Professor Pendergast questioned whether a median work week of nearly 60 hours was a desirable or healthy goal for faculty members. She expressed concern that there was a cost to this high productivity, such as burnout. Associate Provost Rice commented that we can use this data to raise that question, particularly for junior faculty members. He added that a median faculty work week of 60 hours was consistent with other institutions around the country. Professor Pendergast noted that excessive work hours may discourage young people from pursuing a career in academia. She also commented that faculty members now need to spend

time on administrative tasks that previously were done by support staff, but staffing levels have been reduced through budget cuts.

Professor Havens suggested that in the future the data should be broken down by college. Associate Provost Rice responded that this collegiate data was already available, as was data broken down by faculty rank. Professor Pendergast suggested that the range or interquartile range of total hours worked per week be provided. A senator observed that the survey relies upon faculty members self-reporting their hours worked. He asked how the accuracy of the data was guaranteed. Associate Provost Rice acknowledged that the survey was not perfect in this regard, and there might be a slight amount of inflation of hours, but he said that the survey had helped immensely in illustrating faculty activity to the Regents. President Lawrence praised the survey for bringing to light the many hours that faculty members devote to teaching.

IV.   From the Floor – There were no items from the floor. President Lawrence urged senators to bring issues of concern to the Faculty Senate officers.

President Lawrence announced that Past President Ed Dove, along with Professor Susan Johnson, had received the Michael J. Brody Award for Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa. There was a round of applause for Past President Dove.

President Lawrence thanked senators for their nominations for the Ad Hoc Online Evaluation Committee. That committee has now been formed, with representatives from nearly every college. The committee will consider issues of system implementation and accessibility of information and then make recommendations to the administration.

V.   Announcements
  • The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, November 19, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2390.
  • The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 10, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.

VI.   Adjournment – Professor Havens moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Lawrence adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.