



### ***Staff Council Your Voice***

606 Jefferson Building  
Iowa City, IA 52242  
319-335-3600 Fax 319-353-2273  
e-mail: [staff-council@uiowa.edu](mailto:staff-council@uiowa.edu)  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~staff/>

### **Staff Council Agenda**

**Wednesday, February 13, 2008**

**2:30 P.M. – 4:30 P.M., Bean Conference Room, SE 301 GH**

- 2:30 PM Attendance
- 2:35 PM Research Faculty Track, Sheldon Kurtz  
Faculty Senate Past President (Attachments)
- 2:50 PM Review/Approval of Minutes
- January Staff Council Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)
  - January Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (Attachment B)
  - January Executive Committee Meeting w/ President Mason (Attach C)
  - January Executive Committee Meeting w/ Interim Provost Lopes (At D)
- 2:55 P.M. Buck Consultants Report Recommendations  
Susan Buckley, VP for Human Resources  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/hr/classcomp/consultants/index.html>
- 3:25 P.M. Research Salary Survey, Robert Millsap and Trevor Glanz
- 3:35 P.M. Staff Diversity Opportunity Program, Jamie Jorgensen  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/hr/administration/sdop.pdf>
- 3:45 P.M. Committee on Committees, Mary Lee Neuberger
- 3:50 P.M. Award Committee, Martha Greer  
Tentative Date for Nominee Reception – July 8, 2008-Press Box
- 4:00 P.M. Elections, Mary Greer - Nomination for SC Officer 2008-2009  
Officers are elected at March meeting. Nominations will be accepted up to and at the March meeting. Election process is by paper ballot.
- 4:15 P.M. University Libraries Charter Committee - change to charge (attach)
- 4:20 P.M. IPTV Fundraising, Saturday, March 8, 2008, Johnston, IA
- 4:25 P.M. Budget Proposal, Duncan Stewart (tentative)
- 4:25 P.M. Announcements/Adjourn

### **Upcoming Meetings**

- 2:30-4:30 P.M.. SCEC, February 20, 2008, 604 Jefferson Building**
- 8:00-9:00 A.M. SCEC, with President Mason, 101 JH**
- 2:30-4:30 P.M. March 12, 2008 Staff Council Meeting, PBB**

## **Proposed Research Track Policy**

### **January 23, 2008**

#### **10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY.**

**Preamble.** Consistent with the University's need to retain the flexibility to adjust its programs to meet the changing needs of the modern research university, non-tenured research-track faculty may be appointed and promoted as provided below. This policy sets parameters within which individual colleges can develop policies and procedures that permit the hiring of research-track faculty. Operationally that collegiate policy would amplify this policy.

**a. Definitions.** Research-track faculty hold positions through which they contribute primarily to the research mission of the University and hold faculty rank at assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. Research-track faculty are not eligible for tenure. Research-track faculty members can participate in internal college governance by the approval of the tenured/tenure-track faculty but cannot vote on the hiring of tenured/tenure-track or clinical-track faculty. In addition, research-track faculty cannot participate in the University of Iowa Faculty Senate and are not to be appointed to any committees of the Senate or to University charter committees as a faculty representative. They can qualify for awards and can compete for internal research grants in the same manner as research scientists who are professional and scientific staff.

**b. Role of Research-Track Faculty.** Research-track faculty will devote almost all of their time to performing externally supported research and are expected to submit or assist in the submission of research grants. Teaching is an essential function of all faculty, but in the case of the research-track faculty it would occur predominantly in the form of service on doctoral committees with the approval of the Graduate College. Research-track faculty cannot be chairs of doctoral defense committees because this is the role of the tenured/tenure-track faculty. Research-track faculty cannot be assigned to teach courses, but they could be assigned, as needed, to provide auxiliary lectures on areas of knowledge relevant to their research or to engage in other teaching as may be required by the terms of their research grant or contract. Research-track faculty cannot be assigned to perform administrative functions with little or no research obligations as that assignment would be inconsistent with this policy.

#### **c. Collegiate Policies and Changes; Size of Research Faculty**

(1) Every college that plans to offer salaried, non-tenured research-track faculty appointments must develop its own written policy statement with

respect to such appointments consistent with all the terms of this policy. Any policy must address each of the following:

(a) Participation of research-track faculty in collegiate faculty governance, including the appointment, re-appointment, promotion and peer review of other research faculty. Research-track faculty may not participate in any personnel decisions relating to the appointment, re-appointment, promotion, and peer review of tenured/tenure-track or clinical-track faculty.

(b) Procedures for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of research-track faculty.

(c) Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion for research track faculty.

(d) Research-track faculty members may apply for open positions in the tenure track, but they may only be appointed to the tenure track one time during their career at The University of Iowa. Colleges may further define their own policies related to track switching.

(2) Each college adopting a research track policy shall fix the size of its total salaried faculty that may hold research-track appointments. The limit on the number of research faculty in any college shall be the greater of eight faculty members or ten percent (10%) of the tenured/tenure-track faculty (computed in FTEs) of that college.

(3) Support for research-track faculty, including all start-up costs, shall be funded exclusively by grants, contracts, clinical income, and private donations, and not with general education funds.

(4) The initial policy to create a research track in a college and any proposal made at any time to change that policy within a college must obtain both the approval of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty within the college and the approval of a majority of the research-track faculty within the college by a vote supervised by the Associate Provost for Faculty. Any proposal to adopt or to change a college's research track policy must be approved by The University of Iowa Faculty Senate, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President. Any collegiate policy must be wholly consistent with this policy.

**d. Terms of Appointments.** Research-track faculty are sought and appointed through recruitment processes used to appoint tenure-track faculty.

Initial appointments for research-track faculty are one to three years in duration. After three years or prior to that if a promotion is contemplated, a full-scale,

departmental-collegiate review will be made. This review should take into account the research-track faculty member's effectiveness in fulfilling the research mission and the ability of the research-track faculty member to obtain and sustain extramural salary support. It should also include an evaluation of the departmental, collegiate, and University research goals and the likely role of the research-track faculty member in the future in achieving those goals. To assure adherence to standard procedures, a full central administration review of the departmental-collegiate recommendation is necessary.

After approval of the departmental-collegiate review, research-track faculty will receive terms of appointment consistent with established procedures for non-tenure track university employees; however, appointments cannot be for a period longer than current external support for that faculty member.

Research-track faculty will be reviewed on a schedule commensurate with their appointments, according to written standards of competence and performance defined by their college and departments. Re-appointments are only to be made if the research faculty member has a demonstrated record of successfully obtaining external support to fund the research-track faculty member's research.

**e. Qualifications for Specific Ranks.** The ranks of research-track faculty shall be assigned as defined below, and in accordance with collegiate policies.

(1) Assistant Professor.

- (a) Terminal degree (or its equivalent) appropriate to the field
- (b) Evidence of productive scholarship
- (c) Evidence of ability to fulfill relevant responsibilities in the research enterprise

(2) Associate Professor.

- (a) Terminal degree (or its equivalent) appropriate to the field
- (b) Record of productive scholarship, including evidence of sustained extramural research funding and salary support
- (c) Fulfillment of important responsibilities in the research enterprise

(3) Professor.

- (a) Terminal degree (or its equivalent) appropriate to the field

(b) Record of research excellence, including an established record of continued sustained research funding

(c) Unmistakable evidence of national or international recognition by peers.

**f. Titles.** All titles of research-track faculty shall contain the term "research" as a modifier. Exact titles must be stipulated in college procedures and approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

**g. Promotion.** The question of promotion of research-track faculty may be brought up during any regular promotions cycle. Promotion of research-track faculty will follow University and collegiate "Procedures for Research-Track Promotion Decision Making at The University of Iowa." All recommendations for promotion of research faculty are submitted to the Board of Regents for approval.

**h. Termination and Non-renewal.**

(1) Termination of research-track faculty during the term of the appointment must be for failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University. Each college's written standards must include a description of the role of salary support in the decision to renew or terminate appointments. Limited bridge funding may be available from the department or college from funds other than general education funds but is not guaranteed.

(2) A decision not to renew an appointment of a research-track faculty member may be for failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University, or for changed economic circumstances or program needs such that the position itself is terminated. Non-renewal for changed economic circumstances or program needs may only occur at the conclusion of an appointment and must carry appropriate notice.

(3) Notice of non-renewal of appointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment after a stated period has elapsed, is given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

(a) Not later than March 1 of the first year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

(b) Not later than December 15 of the second year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or the appointment

terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

(c) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service in the institution.

(4) A decision for termination or non-renewal of research-track faculty is subject to the provisions of the Faculty Dispute Procedures (See III-29).

**i.** This policy shall be reviewed not later than five years following its implementation by a committee of the Faculty Senate appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate after consultation with the Executive Vice President and Provost and the review shall be completed within one academic year. Immediately following such review, The University of Iowa Faculty Senate shall vote on whether to renew this policy. Subject to subsection (h) (relating to termination and non-renewal), if the policy is not renewed, the research track shall be abolished.

Proposed Research Track Policy  
10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY  
Executive Summary

- Research-track faculty shall be funded (including all start-up costs) exclusively by grants, contracts, clinical income, and private donations, and not with general education funds. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, c. (3) )
- Each college's faculty determine whether to adopt the hiring of research-track faculty by obtaining the approval of a majority of the tenured/tenure-track faculty within the college and the approval by The University of Iowa Faculty Senate and others. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, c. (4) )
- Research-track faculty contribute to the research mission of the University and devote their time exclusively to performing externally supported research. Following this:
  - ✓ Research-track faculty cannot be elected to the Faculty Senate but can participate in departmental and college governance to the extent allowed by the collegiate policy. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, a.)
  - ✓ Research-track faculty can provide auxiliary lectures on areas of knowledge relevant to their research or as may be required by the terms of grant or contract, and may serve on but not head doctoral committees. Research-track faculty will not teach courses, though. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, b.)
  - ✓ Consistent with current university practice, research track faculty will not participate in the vote to hire tenured/tenure-track or clinical-track faculty. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, a.)
- Research-track faculty will be initially appointed for one to three years. Re-appointment reviews will evaluate the faculty member's ability to obtain and sustain extramural salary support. Appointments cannot last longer than the faculty member's external support (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, d.).
- Research-track faculty hold faculty rank at assistant professor, associate professor, or professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, e.)
- The number of research-track faculty in a college cannot exceed the greater of eight research-track faculty members or ten percent (10%) of the tenured/tenure-track faculty (computed in FTEs). (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, c. (2) )
- This policy will be reviewed no later than five years following its implementation. The Faculty Senate will then vote on whether to renew the policy. If not renewed the research track terminates. (10. x RESEARCH TRACK POLICY, i.)

**DRAFT**  
**Staff Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**January 16, 2008, 2:30 p.m.**  
**Shambaugh Auditorium, Main Library**

**Present:** Chris Anderson, Joyce Baker Linda Bergquist, Robert Brown, Stacy Coffman, Nancy Davin, Janet Duncan, Nancy Fick, John Forys, Matthew Gilchrist, Martha Greer, Mary Greer, Kimberly Hammen, Diane Hauser, George Hospodarsky, David Johnson, Glenn Kell, Kathy Klein, Kathy Last, Robert Manders, Patricia Mason-Browne, Virginia Miller, Mary Lee Neuberger, Janette Pettus, Deb Pfab, Sandra Reed, Kathleen Renquist, Paul Ruff, Gary Sanborn, Heather Schnoebelen, Amber Seaton, Julie Sexton, Karen Shemanski, Kristine Sigsbee, Duncan Stewart, Eileen Sullivan, Sarah Tallman, Kristina Venzke, Carlette Washington-Hoagland, Diane Wasson, Michelle Wiegand, Al Young; Marsha Adolph

**Absent:** Lori Bassler, Mohammed Filali, Helen Jameson, Jill Kordick, Marian Muste, Laura Prince, Mark Schmidt, Michael Schueller, Anne Sopher, Jeffrey Wasson, Rhonda Weaver,

**Administrative Liaisons:** Kevin Ward, Executive Associate Director of Human Resources

**Guests:** Tom Koeppel, Dispute Resolution Committee; Rethy Krishnamurthy, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences; Craig Porter, M.D., Office of the Ombudsperson; David Ricketts, Director, UI Parking and Transportation Department

**The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.**

**1. Attendance and Announcements:**

- a. Kathy Klein took attendance.
- b. Klein acknowledged and thanked Rethy Krishnamurthy with a bouquet of flowers, for helping design the posters for the MLK kick off event, which was sponsored by Staff Council.
- c. Councilors were asked to consider running for an officer position on the Executive Committee for terms beginning April 1.

**2. Review/Approval of Minutes:**

- a. Staff Council Meeting Minutes, December 12, 2007, were reviewed and approved with the following corrections: 1) Sandra Reed was listed as both present and absent; she was absent; and 2) in Section 2.d. Interim President Mason will be changed to President Mason.
- b. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from December 19, 2007 were reviewed without comment. Klein explained that the Verizon contract cancelled due to lack of use and the Palm Treo will be sent to Surplus.
- c. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with President Mason, December 19, 2007. Meeting minutes were reviewed without comment.

**3. Outline of Basic Parking Rates FY 2006-09:**

- a. David Ricketts from Parking presented the UI Approved and Proposed Permit, Metered, and Cashiered Parking Rates for 2006-2009. He explained reasons driving the rate increase including a 3% annual growth rate in demand for parking, continued loss of existing surface lot capacity, and the need to replace those spaces with a structure or commuter parking. Additional effort has been given to increase van pool and bus program usage.

- b. Ricketts explained that the hospital's master plan includes plans to expand to the northwest of the main entrance and it's likely that Ramp 1 (45 years old, heavily used) will probably be demolished. In addition, it's possible that Ramp 2 will be torn down and a larger ramp be built to replace both.
- c. Parking has a \$15 million budget with operations accounts of \$9-10 millions; other funds go to debt service and capital projects. Next year's budget will have a major component of ramp maintenance. In addition, lot 48 will be resurfaced. They're attempting to acquire additional land south of the railroad tracks behind USB due to the loss of 150 spaces (due to construction of the Wellness Center).
- d. Ricketts answered questions from staff. Answers included:
  - i. Lot 11 is affected by the new Wellness Center. He explained that for years the lot had no waiting list and it now has a list of about 30 names. They're working on moving some UI vehicles out of that lot to make more space, but there are no plans to build a ramp.
  - ii. A councilor asked if there were plans to add a shuttle service from the Main Library to lot 36; darkness is a problem. Ricketts indicated he would speak with city officials regarding lighting possibilities.
  - iii. A councilor expressed opinion that the Family Care Center spaces in Ramp 4 lower level are inadequate and difficult to maneuver. Ricketts indicated that it won't be changed and is that way because FCC initially indicated that's all the space they'd ever need.
  - iv. Someone asked the costs for parking at UNI and ISU. Ricketts said they aren't comparable because they don't have the employee base, level of visitors, etc.
  - v. Compliments were given regarding the addition of Parking on self-service.
  - vi. A staff member asked if it's true that Oakdale staff don't pay for parking and the answer is yes, because Parking does not manage the parking at Oakdale. A councilor indicated this is an equity issue. Ricketts said that there is so much development planned for the area that it may be inevitable that parking will need to be managed.
  - vii. Councilors recommended increased advertising of bus passes to staff.
  - viii. The number of motorcycle permits has increased from 239 to 805, likely due to the increase in fuel prices.
- e. Ricketts indicated they are planning an additional commuter lot along North Dubuque Street and will know more in the next 90 days. There is a big demand for grad student parking near the arts campus.

#### 4. Consensual Relations Policy:

- a. Dr. Craig Porter and Tom Koeppel presented the changes to the UI Policy on Consensual Relationships Involving Students as proposed by the UI Dispute Resolution Committee. Both were members of the committee.
- b. The history of the policy was presented. Porter explained that they are not discouraging healthy relationships, but romantic relationships between faculty and students need to be discouraged. The committee recommended a modest expansion in scope of the policy to protect students outside the traditional classroom setting. Important revisions include:
  - i. The policy now speaks of instructors and students – the definition of instructor has been expanded and the definition of student has been clarified.
  - ii. The policy now includes postdoctoral fellows, medical residents, and summer camp students, among others. They will be revising the definition of students further to include individuals who come from other campuses for outside internships.
  - iii. The definition of instructor has been expanded and includes staff members who serve as academic advisors, coaches, and residence hall professional

- staff, and are prohibited from engaging in romantic or sexual relationships with those whom they are advising or coaching.
- iv. Previously there was a section on discouraged relationships with the intent to set the stage for what relationships could be viewed as a relationship that could become prohibited – this was deleted because it's difficult to define and manage.
  - v. They revised the investigation of the complaint resolution process. They have eliminated an obligatory reporting to Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity and emphasized the importance for instructors to disclose the relationship. Following disclosure, if investigators believe there is an instructional context and the relationship falls under this policy, then the management plan essentially is directed at modifying the instructional context. The policy manages the relationship by disconnecting the instructional relationship.
- c. A councilor expressed thanks for the important enhancement to realizing settings outside the classroom. For example, this would include geology field trips or instruction at the Lakeside Lab (off campus) in which an instructional context applies.
  - d. Thanks were given to Dr. Craig Porter, who is leaving the Office of the Ombudsperson.

#### **5. Research Letter to Administration:**

- a. Klein gave the background back to the original letter in 2005. Kris Sigsbee presented the proposed letter which Research reps would like to send on Staff Council letterhead.
- b. Sigsbee's presentation emphasized that research is important to teaching; and maintaining research staff is important to the strategic plan for the next few years. Many on campus don't realize how research staff contribute. Many research staff have written their own research proposals for grants and are not funded through faculty members. Many are doing public outreach projects or have taught as adjunct faculty.
- c. Sigsbee noted that research staff are different from other groups in that they have diverse educational backgrounds, are highly specialized, and have a variety of different duties. She stated that knowledge and technology are constantly evolving. It's difficult to keep up with scientific literature in order to remain competitive. Most research staff are not funded through the General Education funds but are funded through NIH, NASA, or NSF, and each agency has rules about what money can be used for, who can propose a research grant, as well as the duration. The end result is that research staff face a lot of challenges that other staff members don't, including job security on soft funded positions. One way to resolve these problems would be to have a comprehensive bridge funding plan in place that would cover a staff member's salary from the end of one grant until the start of another. Another problem is a lack of professional development courses for research staff because a lot of skills cannot be attained on a computer, but need to be learned in a lab. In addition, often there are software packages in research for which there are not classes available.
- d. Sigsbee further presented the perception that there are inconsistencies in how research staff are compensated and classified and that the current system doesn't recognize the value of advanced degrees or specialized skills.
- e. Research staff want to meet with President Mason, VPs Hay, True, Buckley, and Robillard in an effort to accomplish improved job security by making it easier for people to attain career status even with a lapse, and identify a clearly defined university bridge funding plan. They want to ensure that the professional development program is further developed and they want to give feedback on the program's development. They also hope for appropriate classification to be made to the job's function and experience and that salaries be competitive on a broader market. They will keep the council updated.
- f. A councilor asked if there are any models at other CIC institutions. Sigsbee indicated they haven't looked at other institutions, but there is a proposal for initiating a faculty research track which was voted down last year.

- g. Duncan Stewart expressed his opinion that if the letter is sent on Staff Council letterhead, then it's an issue that concerns all of us. Therefore, he recommended that non-research councilors or officers sign the letter to show support.
- h. There was a motion to approve the letter to be sent on Staff Council letterhead, the motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed with one councilor opposed.

#### **6. Human Resources**

- a. Kevin Ward announced that the letter from Sue Buckley, Associate VP and Director of HR, regarding progress in HR issues that is sent twice yearly will be sent in the next week and will address the health plans, total compensation statements, and the philosophy statement on attendance. This latter is a statement that was developed within HR to consistently support health, wellness, activity, and maintaining good attendance on the job. It is hoped that the statement will be used in orientation, conversations, and staff meetings to set forth both the guiding principles and expectations of staff members and their departments.

#### **7. Hancher Charter Committee:**

- a. Margaret LeMay-Lewis wasn't able to attend the meeting. Klein asked councilors to review the proposal in the packet. A motion was made, seconded, and approved.

#### **8. Elections Committee:**

- a. Mary Greer announced that nominations for Staff Council are now open and an email will be distributed; the nomination form is on the SC website. The form asks for name, address, and short 150 word statement as to why they think they ought to be elected to SC. Last year only about 20% of constituents voted and Mary asked councilors to push "get out the vote". They will be sending a paper campus mailing to staff and an email will be sent soliciting participation. Councilors were asked to encourage people to vote via departmental meetings, etc.

#### **9. Committee on Committees:**

- a. Mary Lee Neuberger announced that an email should go out this week about applying for charter committees. A second email will be sent on February 4; applications are due by February 18. Applications are encouraged even if there aren't openings on a committee due to unintended vacancies.

#### **10. Announcements:**

- a. Staff Council is looking for ways to be more visible at UIHC. Staff Council is no longer part of UIHC orientation. Send ideas to Kathy Klein.
- b. A councilor emphasized staff to advertise the discounts available to staff. A link to the site will be sent to all councilors.
- c. Klein asked councilors to be thinking of nominees for Outstanding Staff Awards.
- d. The legislative group will meet this week.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm. The Darwin Turner Action Theater presented an outstanding program entitled "The Presence of Justice." A reception was held following the program.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Nancy J. Davin, Secretary

**DRAFT**  
**Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**January 23, 2008, 9:30 a.m.**  
**603 JB**

Present: Nancy Davin, Mary Greer, George Hospodarsky, Kathy Klein, Janette Pettus, Amber Seaton, Karen Shemanski, Duncan Stewart, Sarah Tallman, Marsha Adolph

Absent:

Guest: Kathy Last

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

**1. Review/Approval of Minutes:**

- a. Staff Council Executive Committee meeting minutes from December 19, 2007, were approved with no change.
- b. Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with President Mason minutes from December 19, 2007, were reviewed with one change. The fourth sentence in section 1.a. was removed.

**2. President's Reception:**

- a. Each year the University President hosts a reception for past and new councilors. This year's reception will be April 21, which will be after the new councilors' first meeting.

**3. Awards Committee:**

- a. Kathy Klein announced that the reception for all SC Excellence Awards nominees (and a guest) will be July 8; President Mason has been notified and the Press Box has been reserved from 5:00-6:30 p.m. The Awards Committee attends the reception, but the SCEC does not. Winners will be announced at a later date following the reception.
- b. Later in the meeting, Martha Greer, Awards Committee Chair, presented the progress to date on the reorganization of awards. The committee was charged earlier this year with reviewing the process from the call for nominations, award definitions, through the publicity and selection process for the following reasons:
  - i. Awards criteria didn't match the ratings criteria;
  - ii. Publicity wasn't targeting the right audience (supervisors aren't always in the position to nominate);
  - iii. The selections committee models weren't being followed;
- c. Greer recommended to SCEC that the Awards Committee be selected by Committee on Committees, that a different rating form be developed for each award based on the criteria. In addition, SC should choose the selection committee membership.

**4. Elections:**

- a. In November, all P&S non-bargaining staff were sent an email asking them to verify their category (Academic/Administrative, Research, etc.) is accurate. Approximately 25 responses were received and must be approved by SCEC, then Bob Millsap will make the necessary database changes. The following changes were made:

| Name             | Current Category | Change to        |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Braun, David     | Research         | Academic & Admin |
| Elder, Joseph    | Healthcare       | Academic & Admin |
| Friell, Lee      | Healthcare       | Research         |
| Hess, Gene       | Academic & Admin | Research         |
| Houser, Doug     | Academic & Admin | Research         |
| L'Heureux, Jamie | Academic & Admin | Research         |
| Marcy, Jennifer  | Academic & Admin | Healthcare       |
| Piker, Chris     | Academic & Admin | Research         |
| Thomas, Stuart   | Healthcare       | Academic & Admin |
| Trump, Kathryn   | Healthcare       | Academic & Admin |

- b. Nominations for Staff Council are now open. An announcement will be made in the *FYI*, a news release has been issued, and there will be a mass email. Nominations close February 4, and the elections will be open online February 11-25.

**5. MLK Celebration:**

- a. Klein distributed the MLK Celebration final report from the committee.
- b. The reception ran a little short on food. The event was very well attended.
- c. Klein will request a DVD of the program be placed at the library.

**6. Salary Proposal FY09:**

- a. At the recent Joint Faculty/Staff Budget Committee meeting, Sue Buckley encouraged Klein and Greer to work with President-Elect Duncan Stewart on the salary proposal for FY09. Last year the proposal was presented in March and voted upon by the new Council in April.

**7. Research Letter:**

- a. The letter was approved at the January SC meeting.
- b. Kris Sigsbee has been asked to participate on the L&D Research Professional Development Committee. Klein will ask Sigsbee to speak to SC about progress on the project to date. Janette Pettus expressed some concern about L&D staff expecting staff to conduct the development, but staff anticipated that L&D staff would be leading the program.
- c. Sarah Tallman talked recently to Maureen McCormick, the former director of L&D, who indicated she could be involved in the development and she has ideas about doing continuing education courses.
- d. A meeting should be requested with Associate Dean Wurster in the Graduate College to re-initiate discussions about an interdisciplinary master's program for staff.

**8. Peer Support Group:**

- a. Three individuals have expressed interest the group. A motion was made and passed unanimously to accept all three individuals.

**9. Research Faculty Track:**

- a. To date, SC has not weighed in on this discussion. It was suggested that Kris Sigsbee voice an opinion to Faculty Senate who will vote on the issue in two weeks. Research faculty would not have tenure.
- b. If the proposal is approved, Faculty Senate will not let research track faculty be part of their group.

- c. Interim Provost Lopes' description of the research faculty track is that the University financially supports a tenure track faculty position; To support a research or clinical faculty without tenure is a college commitment.

**10. Research Letter:**

- a. The Research reps will come to council next month to discuss a letter they wish to send to Administration.
- b. There was discussion regarding L&D's Professional Research Development project that was presented at council several months ago. SC provided \$5,000 and there is concern that since Maureen McCormick left that the project has stalled. Kathy will talk to Sue Buckley about this.

The next meeting will be February 20, 2008, 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nancy J. Davin, Secretary

## **DRAFT**

### **Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with President Mason Meeting Minutes January 23, 2008, 8:00 a.m. 101 JH**

Present: Nancy Davin, Mary Greer, George Hospodarsky, Kathy Klein, Janette Pettus, Amber Seaton, Karen Shemanski, Duncan Stewart, Sarah Tallman, Marsha Adolph

Absent:

Administrative Liaison: Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

#### **1. President Mason's Comments:**

- a. President Mason had the opportunity to interact with Governor Culver twice in the past week, first at the State of the State speech, and later in West Branch for the wind turbine plant opening. In addition, she was asked to entertain some of his guests from Spain at her home.
- b. The Governor intimated that the UI College of Engineering has the technical skills to be at the forefront of the wind energy program. She briefly discussed an idea presented recently of making Oakdale campus sustainable on renewable energy. She will be sitting on two major national committees related to sustainable energy.
- c. Mason will be testifying at the State Appropriations Committee next week.
- d. Duncan Stewart raised the concern of community college funding in the state, as well as the plan to cut library aid by 20%. He expressed concern that there is a \$300 million shortfall between what they have to spend and revenue.
- e. She will be making her annual visits to colleges this semester and plans to spend at least a half day in each academic unit. The visits give her a better sense of the collegiate endeavors and allow her to share stories highlighting the campus activities as she travels across the state.
- f. Nancy Davin inquired about the status of the decision on the proposed smoking ban. Mason anticipates a decision in the next week or two.

#### **2. Provost Search:**

- a. Sarah Tallman, a member of the Provost Search Committee, reported the committee is getting ready to do airport interviews with 12 candidates in February, with possibly an additional weekend scheduled for several more candidates. The committee is fairly large and plans to break into two groups and meet with each candidate for one hour. President Mason indicated she was impressed with the strong candidate pool.

#### **3. Fair Share Bill**

- a. Kathy Klein reported that the Legislative Group met last week when Mary Braun was in town. They discussed the Fair Share Bill, which was introduced last year. The bill will be reintroduced and may change, but last session it called for non-dues-paying union members (i.e. those who benefit from the AFSCME contract, but are not union members) would pay their "fair share" or approximately 90% of full dues.
- b. Klein indicated that it's not clear if Confidential staff are included in the bill.

#### **4. Provost's Task Force on Alternative Activities for Students:**

- a. Interim Provost Lopes convened two groups to come up with ideas for alternate activities for students to provide things to do other than go to bars.

- b. Membership of the committee was discussed and President Mason shared Lopes' reasoning for choosing the committee membership -- that is to "think outside the box" and include new people other than the usual people who have worked on this issue over the years. Specifically, executive committee members expressed concern that there wasn't a staff representative from Health Iowa, from the city, or from the bar owners.

**5. Appointment of Jonathan Carlson:**

- a. Jonathan Carlson has been appointed as Senior Associate Vice President. He will be assisting Mason on such issues as the smoking ban, sustainability issues, and helping her get up to speed on certain matters.
- b. Mason offered adding Carlson's attendance the SCEC monthly meeting.

**6. Shared Governance:**

- a. The Shared Governance Council will be meeting with Mark Braun at their next meeting to plan a "field trip" to meet with Iowa Legislators toward the end of March.

**7. UIHC Reorganization:**

- a. After the December SCEC meeting with President Mason, Mary Greer met with Vice President Robillard. In addition, the councilors affiliated with healthcare met with Robillard and excellent progress is being made in communicating changes across the house.
- b. Vice President Robillard would like to meet regularly with the group and incorporate it into the shared governance plan, and Council may revamp the former UIHC Ad Hoc Committee to serve as this group.
- c. They are rolling out a new internal communications program called One Vision: One Future. Approximately 100 people have been identified to serve as "Ambassadors". The kickoff begins this week.
- d. Klein advised that it would be good to communicate to the east side of the river as well. Also, the possibility of having VP Robillard or a designee report to Staff Council as the reorganization progresses or just prior to new announcements.

**8. UI QuickCare:**

- a. The UI QuickCare Clinic at Old Capitol Center opened several days ago. There will be no co-pay for those who are participating in UI Choice and CHIP 2.

**9. Associate VP Buckley's Comments:**

- a. Sue Buckley asked Klein to remind councilors to review the Buck Report in advance of the February meeting in order to participate in a definitive conversation regarding the recommendations. If they don't have time to review the entire report, at least review the summary sheet of key points and Q&A's.
- b. The biannual letter from Human Resources to all staff should be distributed in the next couple of days.

**Announcements:**

- a. Charter Committee nominations are being solicited. Klein reported that over 40 people had applied in the first couple of days.
- b. Some staff may have received a solicitation from All State Insurance. Addresses were received through a recent Open Records Request.

Respectfully submitted by,  
Nancy J. Davin, Secretary

Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 27, 2008, 8:00 a.m., 101 JH

**DRAFT**  
**Staff Council Executive Committee Meeting with Interim Provost Lopes**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Wednesday, January 10, 2008, 9:00 a.m.**  
**111K JH**

**Present:** Nancy Davin, Mary Greer, George Hospodarsky, Kathy Klein, Janette Pettus, Amber Seaton, Karen Shemanski, Marsha Adolph

**Absent:** Duncan Stewart, Sarah Tallman

**Administrative Liaison:** Sue Buckley, Associate Vice President and Director of Human Resources

Staff Council Executive Committee members introduced themselves to Interim Provost Lopes.

**1. Interim Provost Lopes's Comments**

- a. Lopes has been working with Faculty Senate officers on developing a proposal for a Research Professor track and thinks that it's likely they have an acceptable proposal for approval by Faculty Senate. She's also been working with the Gender Equity Task Force to produce a document that makes more uniform the conditions for modified duties for faculty in the event of a new child in the house.
- b. Lopes discussed her effort in gathering information regarding the writing university task force. There has been a suggestion to professionalize the *Iowa Review Journal* and they have identified and will recruit a candidate to do so. She also discussed the Writer's Workshop and concerns related to the increase in competitive programs around the country that have been successful in establishing substantial endowments in comparison to the UI which has almost none. She discussed program needs and the desire to build the program so it can compete more effectively.
- c. The accreditation team has turned over their report to professional designers; Tom Rocklin and his team did a terrific job.

**2. Appointment to Fill Lisa Troyer's Position**

- a. Barbara Eckstein has been appointed Associate Provost to replace Lisa Troyer. She is the former chair of the Campus Planning Committee and has worked on space projects. She described several challenging upcoming space projects. She will also be involved in pandemic planning and oversight and coordination of academic reviews.
- b. The lack of a campus tornado siren policy was discussed.

**3. Research Track Faculty**

- a. In response to some questions posed to Kathy Klein from research colleagues, Klein asked Lopes why faculty in the research track wouldn't be represented by Faculty Senate if the research track is approved. The history of the proposed research track was discussed as well as possible reasons why either Faculty Senate or Staff Council would represent this group. Lopes said it was likely that this group would be represented by Staff Council, at least initially, and that as the program grows this will be re-evaluated as challenges arise. The proposal will be on the next VP agenda and unless they have objections it will go to Faculty Senate for discussion and vote.

**4. Research Staff Development**

- a. Klein described the research staff development proposal. The research group is meeting regularly and would like to have an opportunity to speak with the VPs and Provosts about several issues including staff development, job description, etc. Sue Buckley discussed the staff development program and how Maureen McCormick's departure from L&D affected its progress. Laura Reed hopes to implement the program this Spring.
- b. Janette Pettus brought up the previously discussed proposal of an interdisciplinary master's program for research staff. Klein reported that Dean Wurster is the individual to approach regarding this issue. Buckley suggested forming a small group whose only charge is to develop this program.

**5. Consensual Relationship Policy**

- a. Klein reported that Craig Porter was going to discuss this policy at the last SC meeting, but didn't due to illness. This has been rescheduled for the January meeting.

**6. Recognition for Faculty and Staff on behalf of Diversity Efforts (report dated 11/7/07).**

- a. Klein expressed thanks to Lopes for providing the introduction for the Darwin Turner Action Theater presentation at the MLK event kickoff.

**7. Enrollment numbers up (11/7/07)**

- a. Lopes reported that UI enrollment numbers are up. President Mason has proposed increasing the number of faculty by 100 due to the losses in the last decade, a proposal which will cost approximately \$10 million.

**8. Electronic Background Check Storage**

- a. Klein brought up the proposal for electronic storage of pre-employment background checks. This issue was visited several years ago and decided to stay with paper. However, the General Counsel's office is running out of space and is advocating for electronic storage, which is likely more secure than paper storage. This is an ongoing discussion.

**9. Confidential Conversations**

- a. Kevin Ward recently distributed a short set of guidelines for HR reps and supervisors about how to determine whether conversations with staff are confidential in nature and how best to handle them so the person understands the ramifications.

**10. Associate VP Buckley Comments**

- a. Buckley reported that the bi-annual letter to staff groups will be sent on January 21. The letter will review positive changes affecting staff.

**Next meeting: Wednesday, March 5, 2008, 9:00 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted by,  
Nancy J. Davin, Secretary

October 20, 2006

Sheldon F. Kurtz  
Faculty Senate President  
Percy Bordwell Professor of Law  
604 Jefferson Building

Dear Professor Kurtz:

In response to your letter of June 22, 2006, the Universities Library Committee met on September 8 and October 6 to discuss the charge to the committee as requested. The results of our deliberations follow.

We suggest that the first charge to the committee be modified as indicated.

a. Advise on policy regarding the size, scope, nature, and growth of the collections housed by the University Libraries resources and services the University Libraries provide.

Rationale: Increasingly “collections” are electronic in nature rather than print and thus access to resources and services are emphasized.

The second charge to the committee could remain unchanged.

b. Advise on policies regarding the assignment of facilities within the libraries and the availability of services which render the libraries more useful to members of the University community and the public.

We suggest that the third charge to the committee be amended as indicated.

c. Advise on the coordination of the decentralized branch libraries and their collections services and resources with those of the Main Library and the Hardin Library for the Health Sciences. its collection.

Rationale: As noted above the present emphasis is shifting from print to electronic services. At the same time the branch libraries are increasingly part of the Main Library through electronic communication. To speak of collections, print media, does not cover the total range of resources and services provided by the Library System.

We suggest that the fourth charge be amended as indicated.

d. Advise on the use and development expansion or substantial modification of library facilities including the Main Library, the Branch Libraries, and off-site storage.

Rationale: The committee views the Branch Libraries as integral parts of the Main Library and suggests that such development of facilities include them and increasingly common long term “dead” storage facilities.

The Committee had three opinions on the fifth charge.

e. Hold joint meetings at least once a year with representatives of various departmental and divisional library committees in order to understand their needs for library services.

This seems to be a charge which was added when the branch libraries’ direct representation on the University Libraries committee was eliminated.

One change suggested was a modification so that any meetings with Branch Librarians or Administrative Heads of such libraries be carried out over a two year period and not within a single academic year.

Hold joint meetings with representatives of various branch libraries as necessary (approximately every two years) in order to understand any special needs required by their library constituencies.

Rationale: As noted in the 2005-06 Annual Report of the University Libraries Committee it was not possible to arrange meetings of all such libraries within a series of 6 committee meetings To keep the committee involved in the branch libraries a 2 year series of such meetings would be better.

A second change suggested was to classify the branch libraries in terms of their operational independence of the Main Library.

Rationale: Such a classification the committee thought would reduce the number of branch libraries to be invited to committee meetings during the year by leaving those which operate quite independently out of the loop.

The third change proposed in our meeting of October 6 and agreed to by consensus was the elimination of the fifth charge in its entirety.

Rationale: The committee felt that given the increasingly integrative relationships between the branch libraries and the Main Library as noted above that such meetings were unnecessary.

The committee also addressed five specific questions included in the letter of June 22, 2006.

1. Whether you believe your committee is properly structured, and if not, how its structure might be revised? This might relate to the composition of faculty, staff, and students.



The committee felt, that with one possible exception, that committee structure adequately represents various interest groups on the campus. The one exception was a suggestion that a faculty representative from the Arts might be added to the faculty groups represented.

2. Whether there are any particular issues relating to continuity from year to year?

The committee believes that the staggered terms of members, the presence of the University Librarian, and the new web site where minutes, agenda, and reports are stored, adequately ensures that there is an institutional memory. Over the long haul, however, it might be a good idea to store those materials, from the distant as well as close past, with the new Shared Governance Council (SGC).

3. Whether your charge should be reduced or expanded?

The prior discussion addresses those changes suggested.

4. Whether you are liaised with the appropriate administrative office on campus?

The committee answers this in the affirmative.

5. Any other matters the committee thinks appropriate.

There are none.

The committee thanks the Faculty Senate for their interest. If any of the above materials are incomplete or unclear please contact me for clarification or addenda.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. Charlton,  
Professor  
Chair of the University Libraries Committee, 2006-2007

cc. Committee Files

