

The University of Iowa  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
December 4, 2001  
100 Phillips Hall

**Members Present:** J. Aikin, J. Berg, D. Bills, P. Chang, D. DeJong, C. Dungy, L. Dusdieker, B. Fallon, L. Geist, R. Hamot, J. Jew, V. Kumar, S. Kurtz, K. Marra, A. McCarthy, J. Menninger, R. Miller, S. Moorhead, B. Muller, G. Parkin, A. Qualls, M. Raymond, C. Ringen, T. Schmidt, H. Seaba, L. Snetselaar, C. Sponsler, W. Stanford, S. Stromquist, K. Tachau, L. Troyer

**Members Absent:** K. Abdel-Malek, J. Altman, N. Bauman, C. Berman, T. Boles, R. Bork, M. Browning, H. Cowen, K. Diffley, V. Grassian, R. Hegeman, R. Hurtig, M. Klepser, S. Larsen, J. P. Long, T. Mangum, J. Moyers, W. Nixon, I. Nygaard, T. O'Dorisio, J. Polumbaum, P. Rubenstein, R. Slayton, R. Valentine, S. Vincent, R. Weir, P. Weller

**Members Excused:** S. Armstrong, Z. Ballas, D. Brown, C. Colvin, J. Cowdery, J. Desmond, P. Heidger, L. Hunsinger, P. Kutzko, R. LeBlond, P. Lloyd, C. Lynch, D. Manderscheid, P. Muhly, C. Porter, J. Ringen, E. Wasserman, J. Westefeld

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

**Guests:** Jim Jacobson (*Iowa City Gazette*), Alan Nagel (Cinema and Comparative Literature), Heather Woodward (*Press-Citizen*), Mark Braun (Government Relations), Derek Willard, Ruth Wachtel (Anesthesia/ AAUP), Jim Andrews (AAUP), Steve Collins (Electrical Engineering), Vicki Hesli (Faculty Assembly), David Skorton (Research), Bill Decker (Research), Doug True (Finance), Ted Yanecek (Finance and University Services), Don Szeszycki (Office of the Provost), Lee Anna Clark (Office of the Provost), Christopher Squier (Office of the Provost), Julie Thatcher (Faculty Senate Office), Kristin Clark (Faculty Senate Office), Jael Silliman (Women's Studies)

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:37.

II. Approvals

A. Meeting Agenda

Prof. Raymond moved and Prof. Miller seconded the following:

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

B. Minutes

The minutes were approved by consensus.

### C. Recommended replacements

The recommended replacements were accepted by consensus.

## III. Reports

### A. Report of the Faculty Senate President (Amitava Bhattacharjee)

President Bhattacharjee reported to the Faculty Senate how the across-the-board budget cut from the Governor has been distributed across various units on campus. He began by reminding the Senate that the cut distributions were governed by a set of principles that had been established by President Coleman and the Vice Presidents' group, with consultation from the Senate Budget Committee, chaired by Prof. Muhly. Among the principles, items 4, 5, and 6, especially the four-year graduation plan, have been questioned by a number of faculty. Other principles, such as that of protecting financial aid or the ability to garner external support, have not been controversial.

President Bhattacharjee presented a pie chart illustrating the budgeted revenue for the General Education Fund. The chart showed that state appropriations are nearly 58% of that budget. The largest portion of that fund covers salaries. The General Education Fund is a small part of university budget, in which the component coming from state appropriations works out to 19%. President Bhattacharjee observed that this 19% leverages a lot more income. This money goes a very long way, yet any reduction will make us less public and more private. Turning to a table showing "Appropriated Units," President Bhattacharjee reported on how the \$13.3 million cuts had been distributed among the units. Some 80% of the cuts occurred in the General Education Fund. He pointed out that this is where we can find the "potholes."

The table also listed the strategic plans that will be specifically affected by the cuts, which were particularly substantial in both the Office of the Provost and in the Office of the Vice President for Research, the latter suffering a cut of \$4 million. This forced the Vice President for Research to suspend five of his six internal competitions. All six are expected to be restored next year, or else in the long run we lose ability to attract new faculty. Vice President Skorton added that the decision to suspend was made by him and Vice President True, and that this action provided a third of the amount that was needed to cover the budget cut. This savings of \$1.2 million for competitive grants is out of \$7 million that his office provides. Principle 6 had been written very carefully by President Coleman. Whether or not to suspend a program depended on two criteria: the least amount of direct impact on faculty, such as providing summer salary, and having no effect on the ability "to put grants out the door."

Vice President Skorton continued that, as indirect costs are returned in part to colleges and departments as incentives, there was no sense cutting that. Using the same reasoning, he has also maintained support for central research facilities. He

also did not touch grant-matching funds, as doing so would inhibit the ability to submit grants. Bridging funds (used when a PI loses a grant, barely missed funding, and would be resubmitting the proposal) were also left untouched. That left competitive grant programs, such as CIFRE and AHI. [This year's AHI funding, which had already been planned, was maintained (for summer 2003)]. The only impact on faculty subsistence from cutting CIFRE is funding for summer salaries; however, CIFRE is rarely used for that. Vice President Skorton admitted that the loss of CIFRE does affect programs where there is no real source of external funds, adding that there is no question there is pain on that front. Next year, the Research Council will have a look with his office at all of the competitive grant programs, and review them to see if they should be streamlined, lumped into interdisciplinary programs, etc.

Prof. Tachau voiced her concern that, especially in humanities and the arts, there are aspects of the university that legislatures do not understand. She asked whether there is a danger that internal competitive grants won't be reactivated. Vice President Skorton answered that AHI receives \$60,000 out of the CIFRE fund, adding that the parts of campus that will be hurt most will be everything except arts and humanities. Prof. Tachau asked whether the funding will be restored in '03. Vice President Skorton responded that whereas they don't have a budget yet, it is a very high priority, to President Coleman as well as to his office. They are working to ensure that there can be close to complete funding next year. Unfortunately there were three new initiatives that were pulled only 3 weeks after being announced, thus have no track record, but as those programs were from faculty initiatives, rather than top down, it is likely they will be preserved. Other programs that his office supports have long track records.

President Bhattacharjee then addressed the four-year graduation plan, explaining his reasons for supporting it. There is a strong connection between faculty lines and the budget. If the four-year plan is taken away, we will lose faculty lines, especially in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. With budget cuts there are a number of problems: faculty lines are not filled, and visiting professors are not hired. Class sizes increase, yet the TA number does not, and, as a result, assigned work in classes will decrease. With the four-year graduation plan, we will not suffer further erosion in numbers of faculty lines. Also, there is a high correlation between the four-year graduation rate and quality of a university. Furthermore, students are already feeling the pain of the cuts. As we rely more and more on tuition, it is important to provide a quality product. "Potholes" are not where one might expect them but they are all over. Efforts have been made to make them as painless as possible. He finds some consolation in the levels of cuts to college budgets, which ranged from 1.05-2.96%, which is considerably lower than the overall cut. Also, library acquisitions have been preserved.

President Bhattacharjee then opened the floor to questions. Prof. Tachau, reporting that she had heard that we have lost 170 faculty positions, then asked how many of those were in Liberal Arts. She is worried about Item 2 of the cuts to

the Provost's Office, a \$4.7 million reduction. It is a question of what we can afford versus what is needed for quality education and faculty research. We need to know what we are talking about in the mix of tenure-track and nontenure-track. Prof. DeJung asked whether the state and governor has decided what they will do with higher education. Vice President True, responding first to Prof. Tachau, said that, assuming there is a turnaround, they will be using revenues to increase faculty numbers, whether the funds come from state appropriations or from tuition. The state revenues do not look good at present, but we will find out more in January. He is optimistic, as our local representatives to the state legislature, Joe Bolcolm, Mary Mascher, Bob Dvorsky, and Dick Myers, did an excellent job in restoring funds after the governor announced his earlier targeted cuts. He added that the four-year graduation plan is very popular among Iowans. Whereas that is not a pedagogical reason, it is an excellent political reason to protect it. President Bhattacharjee reported that everyone facing this ordeal has worked with the best wishes for the university in mind, and urged the Senate to look ahead and move forward, and to view this current process as one that may guide us through future catastrophes.

Don Szeszycki (Office of the Provost) answered Prof. Tachau's question, reporting that about 20 faculty positions were lost in Liberal Arts. Overall, 190 positions, including faculty and staff, have been lost, and of those, 80 positions were faculty.

#### B. Report of the Interdisciplinary Committee on Faculty Issues.

President Bhattacharjee introduced this discussion by explaining that whereas it came up at the last meeting of the 2000-2001 Senate, the discussion never ended as the quorum question had been called. The discussion was of the Report of Interdisciplinary Committee on Faculty Issues, the committee having been chaired by Alan Nagel, with Lee Anna Clark serving as an *ex officio* member. Lois Geist was among the committee members. Now with a new Senate this is technically a new issue. The Faculty Council has addressed this report already. Appendix A (p. 12) is now up for further consideration Prof. Jew asked whether this is a motion or something we can discuss. She offered the following changes in language, which she hoped would clarify the document without changing its intent.

#### **AMENDMENTS 1-4:**

I. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make *0% budget*, ~~renewable~~ faculty joint appointments from the university faculty, generally for a term of one year ~~or longer~~, not to exceed five years, **and renewable**.

II. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make

*adjunct* (up to 3 years, ~~renewable~~, at less than 50%, and renewable) faculty appointments for purposes of demonstrated teaching or other needs.

III. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans, or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make ~~renewable~~, budgeted *non-clinical-track*, non-tenure-track faculty appointments, generally **for a term of one year, not to exceed three years and not renewable after a total employment period of three years.** ~~or longer, for a specified term.~~ *Such appointments may be made only to approved types of non-tenure-track faculty positions (e.g., lectureships, or visiting appointments).*

IV. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make ~~renewable~~, budgeted faculty joint appointments from the university faculty, generally **for a term of one year or longer, not to exceed five years, and renewable.**

Prof. Nagel acknowledged that at least some of the proposed changes were in the spirit of what of the committee wanted, and agreed to moving “renewable” in items 1 and 4 if that makes them less ambiguous. He added that the Senate should take the report as a recommendation from the committee. Prof. Qualls wanted to know the purposes of Prof. Jew’s changes. Prof. Jew replied that they would make the language consistent and less ambiguous. Especially in item 4, it is not clear how renewable the appointment would be. For item 2, again it would make the language consistent. With regard to adjunct appointments, Prof. Jew did not understand why one would not use the same language as used before in talking about a term of one year. Associate Provost Clark explained that it was written that way because adjunct positions are made for up-to-3-year periods. Prof. Nagel added that it would be cumbersome to make one-year appointments, a burden that speaks against the innovation that should be encouraged by this document. This would be especially important for a new unit that is likely to be small.

Prof. Ringen asked whether Item 4 specified a single term of five years, and that is it. Associate Provost Clark responded that no, such a position can be renewed. Prof. Raymond asked whether term “unit” excludes departments or, if this report goes forward, it will constrain departments. Prof. Nagel pointed out that, as indicated by the appendix title, this policy specifically is for nondepartmental units and does not affect departments. The committee had tried to diminish the impediments for interdisciplinary activity and the lack of policy was the biggest impediment.

Prof. Ringen asked whether the appendix covers all possible appointments, or just the ones that are listed. Prof. Nagel replied that it does not try to define new types of appointments that do not yet exist. Prof. Ringen continued that this means there are no possible appointments in nondepartmental units. But there exists such

appointments. LSA, POROI, etc. are nondepartmental units. Prof. Aiken added that she didn't understand what a nondepartmental unit is – is it a departmentalized unit? Prof. Ringen asked whether accepting the policies described in this report will cause appointments in an existing nondepartmental unit to become illegal. Associate Provost Clark answered that it would not. Prof. Ringen asked her to clarify what is a nondepartmental unit. Associate Provost Clark directed her to paragraph 2, where it is defined. She added that there would have to be unit bylaws and a faculty steering committee that oversees these appointments.

Prof. Tachau asked whether there is in this report a list of which units count as nondepartmental units for the sake of reporting to the Regents. Associate Provost Clark responded that at present there are no nondepartmental units who are eligible to appoint faculty under this policy because the Provost has not yet approved any. Prof. Nagel explained that what the committee has done is to specify the procedure. Associate Provost Clark continued that at present there are no appointments to nondepartmental units; rather, there are affiliations. LSA is a departmentalized unit. The point is to get the horse attached to the cart and get moving.

President Bhattacharjee thought he was hearing concerns that this report will provide the flexibility to make appointments that are not currently permitted by the Operations Manual. Prof. Jew stated that language is very important, as *intent* of the authors of the report may not be clear five years in the future. President Bhattacharjee asked whether we should just add a sentence to clarify that the intention is not to make appointments that the Operations Manual doesn't allow. Prof. Nagel added that, given the discussion, paragraph 2 on page 11 is not doing its job. Prof. Cox suggested a sentence (below) to be added as the third sentence of that paragraph (before “Unless...”)

**AMENDMENT 5:**

All appointments authorized under this section, budgeted or nonbudgeted, must meet all university policies and procedures governing such appointments, including limitations on percentage appointment, renewability, and maximum length of appointment.

Prof Geist was not sure how this adds to sentence just before it. She thought that the intent was already specified; but, she had spent a lot of time with the report. Prof. Seaba, inquired whether the intent in Item 1 is that one could make an appointment for one or two or three years, etc., and that appointment could be renewed? That is, that there would be no limit to the number of renewals? She felt that it is still not clear, and suggested that it be stated that the original appointment could be renewed. Prof. Nagel suggested inserting a period after “year” and adding the sentence, “This appointment is renewable.” President Bhattacharjee asked Prof. Jew whether Prof. Cox’s sentence addressed the concerns behind her amendments. Prof. Jew asked whether this section creates

another nontenure-track faculty appointment, and was told that this was not the intent. Prof. Jew then asked whether these were the only kinds of nontenure-track appointments. Associate Provost Clark responded that there are several others, seven altogether, but the others are rarely used. President Bhattacharjee added that it seems cumbersome to list them all, and better to refer to the Operations Manual. He also thought that while Prof. Geist is correct in finding that Prof. Cox's new sentence does repeat, it emphasizes different things, and thus would be useful. Prof. Tachau suggested that this is not a case of "either/or" with respect to Profs. Jew and Cox's amendments, since they both make the document clearer. She thought that redundancy is a good thing if it provides clarity, and suggested that we think of Florida's election laws and the mess last December.

Prof. Nagel suggested adding Prof. Cox's sentence to paragraph 3. The sentence should make clear that this document does not allow the creation of a new kind of position that doesn't already exist. Prof. Ringen voiced her concern that administrators wouldn't know what a nondepartmental unit is.

Prof. Tachau made moved and Prof. Ringen seconded the following:

**MOTION:** To accept the report as amended by Profs. Cox and Jew.

Prof. Hesli spoke as a member of the Interdisciplinary Committee, the only holdover from the previous Interdisciplinary Committee, and Chair of Faculty Assembly in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. She felt that the amendments to Items 2 and 3 do change the document. She suggested separating them out, as she is in favor of amendments to Items 1 and 4 but would like those to Items 2 and 3 be considered more carefully, as those changes would limit renewability. Prof. Jew agreed to this, as she had been unaware that adjunct appointments could be made for more than 3 years. Associate Provost Clark clarified that it is the case that *visiting appointments* cannot be longer than 3 years, though there are some that have been grandfathered in. Lectureships can be indefinite. Prof. Tachau suggested that she drop the amendment to Item 3 from her motion. Prof. Geist seconded this friendly amendment, and both Profs. Tachau and Ringen agreed to the friendly amendment. Prof. Ringen asked for a clarification that the vote is on the amendments only, and that the whole report would be voted on later, which President Bhattacharjee affirmed.

Amended **MOTION:** To accept the amendments proposed by Prof. Jew to Items 1, 2, and 4 and by Prof. Cox. *The motion carried.*

Prof. Tachau suggested we discuss item 3 at the next meeting.

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

**MOTION:** To table the discussion until the next meeting.

Prof. Nagel then made a point about Item 3: there are important differences in the Senate about renewable, nontenured appointments. He suggested that trying to resolve that in item 3 of this report may be missing the boat, and that the Senate should be directing itself to this issue in the Operations Manual, rather than bogging this document down over that broader concern. Prof. Seaba suggested that as there are seven kinds of appointments that vary with regard to renewability, they be listed in Item 3. Associate Provost Clark responded that it is not necessary to get into that kind of detail for this report. Prof. Ringen felt that Item 3 looked contradictory and suggested striking “may make renewable.”

*The motion to table the discussion failed.*

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

**MOTION:** To strike “renewable” from the second line of Item 3.

Associate Provost Clark made the friendly amendment that it be written at the end of the first paragraph, with “renewable” removed from the first line:

“These appointments are renewable, if consistent with university policy.”

Prof. Tachau asked whether we want to specify any limits to such nontenure-track appointments in nondepartmental units. Associate Provost Clark responded that this gets at Prof. Nagel’s point, that this is a larger issue beyond this document.

David Bills called the question to vote on the amendments. *The motion passed.*

**MOTION** (from above): To accept the amendments. *The motion passed.*

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

**MOTION:** To accept the report as amended. *The motion carried.*

#### IV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 5:21.

Respectfully submitted,  
Erin Irish  
Secretary



## **APPENDIX A**

### **POLICY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS TO NON-DEPARTMENTAL UNITS**

*A vital part of University of Iowa traditions has long been the furthering of innovation in service, teaching, and research. The University, especially with its increased emphasis on interdisciplinarity, carries the burden of providing sufficient faculty resources for all academic units.*

*To facilitate appointments in non-departmental units, we recommend the following policy.*

#### **FACULTY APPOINTMENTS TO NON-DEPARTMENTAL UNITS**

Appointments in non-departmental units may serve the needs of students, faculty members, and academic units alike, both meeting individual needs and recognizing common interests between units and departments. Other types of short-term agreements, e.g. "buyouts," for a semester or a year also contribute to productive interdisciplinarity without the formality of appointment.

Non-departmental units may make faculty appointments, budgeted or non-budgeted as specified below, for such reasons as specific curricular needs, special projects such as grant-funded programs, and the regularizing of unit responsibilities. Such appointments are subject to all university policies and procedures regarding faculty appointment and review and must meet the approval of an established overseeing faculty body of the unit, such as a faculty steering committee or executive committee, according to the unit by-laws, as approved by its college(s) and the Office of the Provost. Unless otherwise specified, all appointments noted below must receive the approval of the collegiate dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans, or the appropriate vice president, and the provost.

Budgeted faculty appointments are usually longer term and may recognize significant divergence between a faculty member's efforts in a department and those in a non-departmental unit, for example, interdisciplinary teaching and research.

I. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make *0% budget*, faculty joint appointments from the university faculty, generally for a term of one year, not to exceed five years, and renewable.

Terms of such appointments will be set in a letter of agreement, signed by the faculty member's DEO, the director of the unit, the dean(s) or vice president and the faculty member, specifying the faculty member's privileges and responsibilities with respect to the unit, frequency and procedures for review and renewal, allocation of funds, and the expected activities and percentage of effort allocated to the unit in teaching, research, and service.

II. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make *adjunct* (up to 3 years, at less than 50%, and renewable) faculty appointments for purposes of demonstrated teaching or other needs.

Terms of such appointments will be set in a letter of agreement, signed by the appointee's DEO (if any), the director of the unit, the dean(s) or vice president, and the appointee, specifying the appointee's privileges and responsibilities with respect to the unit, procedures for review and renewal, allocation of funds, and the expected activities in teaching, research, and service.

III. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans, or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make renewable, budgeted non-clinical-track, non-tenure-track faculty appointments, generally one year or longer, for a specified term. Such appointments may be made only to approved types of non-tenure-track faculty positions (e.g., lectureships, or visiting appointments). All appointments authorized under this section, budgeted or nonbudgeted, must meet all university policies and procedures governing such appointments, including limitations on percentage appointment, renewability, and maximum length of appointment.

Terms of such appointments will be set in a letter of agreement, signed by the director of the unit, the dean[s] or vice president, and the faculty member, specifying the term of the appointment, the faculty member's privileges and responsibilities with respect to the unit, procedures for review and renewal, allocation of funds, and the expected activities in teaching, research, and service.

IV. A unit, with the approval of its dean, or if involving more than one college the several deans or the appropriate vice president, and the provost, may make, *budgeted* faculty joint appointments from the university faculty, generally for a term of one year, not to exceed five years, and renewable.

Terms of such appointments will be set in a letter of agreement, signed by the appointee's DEO, the director of the unit, the dean[s] or vice president, and the faculty member, specifying the faculty member's privileges and responsibilities with respect to the unit, procedures for review and renewal, allocation of funds, and the expected activities and percentage of effort allocated to the unit in teaching, research, and service.