FACULTY COUNCIL
Tuesday, August 26, 2008
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Commons Room (302 Schaeffer Hall)

MINUTES


Councilors Absent: A. Morris.

Guests: J. Carlson (President’s Office), C. Drum (University Relations), R. Friedrich (Emeritus Faculty Council), D. Heldt (Cedar Rapids Gazette), J. Jew (PCA, COIA rep), S. Johnson (Provost’s Office), G. Kell (Staff Council), P. Kenner (Organizational Effectiveness), D. Kieft (President’s Office), W. Loh (Provost), J. Modestou (EOD), 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 3:30 pm.

II. Approvals

A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Cohen moved and Professor Hammond seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

B. Faculty Council Minutes (April 1, 2008; June 24, 2008) – Professor Cohen moved and Professor Woodhead seconded that the April 1, 2008, minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved. Professor Cohen moved and Past President Sharp seconded that the June 24, 2008, minutes be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

C. Draft Faculty Senate Agenda (September 2, 2008) – Past President Sharp moved and Professor Mobily seconded that the draft agenda be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

D. 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.

Past President Sharp moved and Professor Mangum seconded that the committee replacements be approved. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. New Business
• Working at Iowa presentation (Kevin Ward, Executive Associate Director, Human Resources; Pat Kenner, Program Consultant, Organizational Effectiveness)
Mr. Ward explained that the first Working at Iowa survey was conducted in 2006, to capture a sense of the engagement of faculty and staff at the university. Engagement is an indicator of how the university is doing in terms of work culture and creating a productive climate. Results of the survey are being used to guide improvements. The survey is a tool to find strengths as well as areas for improvement. The 2008 survey will measure progress. The same survey tool that was used in 2006 will be used in 2008. Survey questionnaires for faculty and staff will be separated so that appropriate terminology can be used for each group. The purpose of the 2008 survey is to measure progress, determine where to put improvement efforts, and determine how to support excellence by supporting engagement. The first survey had a response rate of 43% university-wide; among faculty it was 31.9%. Human Resources would like to see the faculty response rate increase in 2008.
As a follow-up to the 2006 survey, Susan Johnson (Associate Provost for Faculty) and Sue Buckley (Human Resources) met with the dean and the senior human resource leader of each college to talk about using those results to guide future planning. The survey indicated that the top five areas needing improvement were performance management, communication regarding budget
issues, conflict management, workload distribution, and confidence in the university’s future. The 2006 survey came out shortly after President Skorton’s resignation, which may have influenced results in the last category. Various improvements have been made since 2006. Regarding performance management, compliance with performance reviews has been stepped up, and HR has provided additional training to people who do performance reviews. Education on difficult conversations has been offered for supervisors in cooperation with the Office of the Ombudsperson. The UI Lead Program is also available for supervisors to improve their leadership skills. This program utilizes 360 assessments and individual coaching. Improvements have been made to conflict management systems; web-based resources and training opportunities are more readily available. Regarding workload distribution, resources on business process improvements are available to departments. A related issue to workload distribution is absenteeism. A philosophy statement regarding attendance and use of leave has been developed and is available to departments. In 2008 HR is looking forward to being able to measure change. HR also wants to build enthusiasm for acting on the survey results. Mr. Ward concluded his presentation by asking the Council how greater faculty participation in the survey might be encouraged. Professor Tachau asked how long it would take to fill out the survey. Ms. Kenner responded that it would take less than ten minutes. Professor Tachau suggested that a brief report on the results of the last survey be made available to faculty, as one method of encouraging participation. Mr. Ward commented that he will be communicating with HR representatives in the colleges about how results from the previous survey were used. Professor Hammond commented on the need to identify one’s department on surveys. Mr. Ward added that the confidentiality of the survey will be stressed. It is necessary for respondents to give their HawkID’s so that it can be determined whether they are eligible to take the survey and whether they filled out the survey before. In 2006, reports were not generated for units with less than 30 individuals in any group or category. For 2008, the threshold will be lowered to 15. This should be enough to protect anonymity. Professor Ringen commented that she had participated in a pilot for the original survey. As a DEO, she had been unsure how to respond to questions about “relationship with DEO.” Ms. Kenner responded that the revised language for the 2008 survey (for faculty) will ask about the relationship with DEO or Dean. Past President Sharp asked if individuals in departments with fewer than 15 employees should fill out the survey. Mr. Ward answered that small units that cannot be given separate reports will still be included in the overall collegiate report. Ms. Kenner stated that the point of the survey is not to zero in on problem units; the point is to see what the level of engagement is. Mr. Ward added that there will be drawings for prizes during each of the three weeks that the survey is open. HR will also utilize “survey ambassadors” to encourage participation and answer questions. Ms. Kenner asked how the word could be gotten out to faculty. Professor Tachau suggested that a message be sent to DEO’s explaining why the survey is useful.
University Strategic Planning (Michael O’Hara)

President O’Hara explained that the Faculty Senate officers had been asked to identify faculty to serve on the university’s new strategic initiatives planning committee. He welcomed Provost Wallace Loh to the meeting. Provost Loh stated that the Board of Regents has begun a strategic planning process that will be completed in April. They have identified four major themes: affordability and access, education and research, sustainability, and accountability. The Regents want the universities to come up with campus plans that dovetail with the Regents plan. President Mason has asked Provost Loh to begin the University of Iowa’s strategic planning process. Provost Loh referred the group to a handout distributed at the meeting – a chart showing the organization of the overall Strategic Initiatives committee and its various task forces. The final report will be delivered to President Mason on April 1. Each task force is expected to produce one or two recommendations in very short, practical, and specific reports. These recommendations will be brought to the overall committee, which will prioritize them and send them on to President Mason. Provost Loh would like feedback from the Council regarding whether the task force topics are appropriate and also regarding faculty members to serve on the task forces. All the task forces will address undergraduate education; graduate and professional education; research; and patient care, as appropriate. Funds will be provided to carry out the recommendations.

Professor Tachau suggested that the “Sustainability and Economic Development” task force be re-named simply “Sustainability.” She referred to former Iowa governor Vilsack’s efforts to encourage the university to engage in economic development by seeking patents and creating small companies. These efforts were not greeted positively by many faculty, especially those in fields that do not lend themselves to patents. President O’Hara commented that he believed the Board of Regents and the legislators still have economic development expectations of the university. Professor Tachau suggested that the university create its own program of public engagement. Professor Mangum noted that the university’s best contribution to economic development is educating the citizenry. She added that public engagement could mean many different things in different fields. Secretary Stromquist commented on the absence of a task force for basic research. President O’Hara responded that research, along with education and patient care, will be considered by each task force. Professor Tachau commented that in the past strategic planning committees were chaired by faculty members, so that this process can be perceived as a bottom-up process, rather than top-down.

President O’Hara requested that names for the committees be sent to himself or the Faculty Senate office by September 3. There will be faculty, staff, and student participation on all committees.

Provost Loh stated that our traditional missions will still be carried out as before. The question is: will we make additional investments in limited areas? Sustainability is also mandated by the Board of Regents, and President Mason has also made this a priority. The concept of economic development, however phrased, should be included, as well. Diversity is already a priority at the
university. Student wellness would include binge drinking, which should be addressed. Long-term rebuilding is a necessary consequence of the flood. Resources and process improvements are linked to budgeting strategies. The structure of the Strategic Initiatives Committee reduces the scope of the committee to a handful of issues.

- **Update on Search for Vice President for Research (Michael O’Hara)**
  President O’Hara announced that a search will soon be underway. Members of the search committee are currently being sought. Please send any suggestions to President O’Hara. President O’Hara introduced David Kieft, new staff member in the Office of the President. Mr. Kieft’s title is Administrative Search and Strategic Initiatives Coordinator. In his position, Mr. Kieft will be staffing vice presidential search committees, and also assisting with special projects for the Office of the President.

- **Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) Annual Report (Jean Jew)**
  Professor Jew distributed two handouts and referred the group to the first document, *Report to Faculty Council*. She explained that the university has joined the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), which is “an alliance of Division 1A university faculty senates that provides a faculty voice in the national debate over the future of college sports.” COIA seeks to improve the integration of athletics into the overall academic mission of universities. There are 56 member schools, out of 331 Division 1 institutions.
  Professor Jew attended the COIA annual meeting in Athens, Georgia, May 30 – June 1. She noted three major components of the meeting: education of the members by the keynote speakers, work sessions on the National Ranking System document (Professor Jew provided a draft of this document), and discussions regarding strategies to recruit more universities into COIA and collaborations with other related organizations. Professor Jew commented briefly on the remarks of the two keynote speakers. Brit Kirwan (Chancellor of the University of Maryland and co-chair of the Knight Commission) suggested that an “athletic budget should not grow at a rate any greater than the university budget.” Chancellor Kirwan expressed concern over several issues: there should be resistance to lowering the standards of the Academic Progress Program; faculty are “becoming disengaged;” and “athletics expenses are getting out of control.” Myles Brand (President, NCAA) stated that the NCAA penalized one third of Division 1 teams this year. He advocated carefully analyzing layers of data to see if and where academic improvement has really taken place.
  The National Ranking System document is a draft of a questionnaire based on COIA’s position paper. It ranks schools based on different criteria, e.g. how much of a role faculty have in determining admissions policy, etc. COIA envisions having faculty senate presidents fill this out. There is some resistance to this ranking system, as schools don’t want to receive low scores. This is a dilemma for COIA.
  Professor Robertson asked for clarification about the impact of lack of support for academics on athlete graduation rate. Professor Jew responded that this referred to academic support for student athletes.
Professor Jew requested feedback on the draft. Professor Tachau requested an electronic copy of the document to facilitate making comments.

- **Research Track Proposal for Carver College of Medicine (Michael O’Hara)**
  President O’Hara reminded the Council that the Senate had approved a university research-track policy in spring 2008. The Carver College of Medicine (CCOM) then shared drafts of their collegiate policy with the Faculty Senate officers, who reviewed these drafts and determined that the CCOM policy was consistent with the university policy. The collegiate policy was then put forward for a vote within the CCOM. Because of some confusion regarding whether tenure-track (rather than just tenured) faculty would be allowed to vote, assistant faculty were not given the opportunity to vote. They have now been given the opportunity to participate in a new vote, the results of which are not yet in, but will be available before the September 2 Senate meeting. Results of the first election indicated overwhelming approval of the CCOM research-track policy among tenured CCOM faculty. What is proposed at this time is to consider the CCOM research-track policy, contingent upon the results of the CCOM tenure-track faculty vote. (Although we know that even without the assistant professors’ votes, the policy would still have passed.)

Past President Sharp moved and Professor Cohen seconded that the Carver College of Medicine research-track policy be approved with the proviso that the CCOM tenure-track faculty also approve the policy.

Professor Justman requested clarification of the date of the CCOM proposal. President O’Hara responded that the December date on the document was an oversight, and that the CCOM proposal had been developed with reference to the university policy. Professor Tachau drew attention to the sentence “[Research-track faculty] may compete for internal funding opportunities as defined by collegiate and University guidelines.” She commented that debate on the university policy had sought to prevent the use of general fund money for research-track faculty. President O’Hara responded that research scientists are eligible to compete for this funding, and it did not seem proper to prevent research-track faculty from doing so. Professor Woodhead added that this was compatible with the university policy, and quoted the following from that policy, “They can qualify for awards and can compete for internal research grants in the same manner as research scientists...”

Professor Tachau then drew attention to the sentence “No more than 10% of the total salaried College tenure-track or tenured faculty (FTE) may hold such appointments.” She made a friendly amendment that the following edit be made for clarification: “The total number of research track faculty will not exceed that equal to 10% of the total salaried College tenure-track or tenured faculty (FTE).” Professor Ringen questioned whether the CCOM has the ability to decide who is eligible to compete for internal funding. The Research Council has usually determined this. President O’Hara responded that the funding body determines
who is eligible to apply for funding. A collegiate policy cannot supersede a university policy.

Professor Robertson pointed out that while the university policy states: “Research-track faculty cannot be chairs of doctoral defense committees because this is the role of the tenured/tenure-track faculty,” the CCOM policy is more limiting: “Research-track faculty cannot be primary mentors of graduate students because this is the role...” Associate Provost Johnson responded that it most likely was not the intention of the CCOM to make their policy more stringent. An edit will be made to the CCOM policy (friendly amendment).

Professor Robertson then drew attention to the phrase “Research-track faculty cannot be assigned to teach courses...” He commented that it would be appropriate for them to teach a research seminar, where research results are presented. Is it the intention to prohibit research-track faculty from directing seminars? President O'Hara responded that the intention was to exclude research-track faculty from teaching courses for which they would have primary responsibility. However, they would not be excluded from participation in teaching on their specific area of expertise.

Professor Cohen called the question. The Council unanimously approved the Carver College of Medicine research-track policy with two friendly amendments regarding wording (stated above) and contingent upon the vote of the CCOM assistant professors.

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

V. Announcements

- The Chair of the Committee to Review the Division of Student Services will be Lee Anna Clark (Psychology).
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, September 2, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, October 7, 3:30-5:15 pm, W401 PBB.

VI. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.