
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 19, 2005

- 1) The meeting was called to order by Dean Butler at 3:34pm in 112 Macbride Hall. In attendance were: Dean P.B. Butler, EFC Chair J.M. Reinhardt, and about 30 to 40 faculty.
- 2) Minutes of Dec. 13, 2003⁴ were approved by voice vote, motioned by J.S. Marshall and seconded by A. Kusiak.
- 3) J.M. Reinhardt brought up for discussion the EAC Resolution on Tenured Faculty Course Release, dated March 22nd, 2005. Reinhardt noted that the EFC had discussed the resolution and was looking for faculty input in helping to formulate a response to the Dean. Reinhardt outlined the process history and then went through the three main items in the resolution.
 1. Delivering, and codifying, a nominal teaching responsibility for tenured faculty of 12 credit-hours per year (changing from the current “expected” load of 9).
 2. Changing the course buy-out policy to 5%, 12.5%, 12.5% for buying out of a first, second, and third class, respectively, from the current 12.5%, 12.5% for a first and a second class, respectively.
 3. Funding and operation paradigm of the college.

Dean Butler then went through slides outlining and discussing the rationale for the proposal. The main points were:

- State and national budget realities and funding priorities
- Board of Regents reallocation plan
- Response to the RMC report
- Tuition limits and disparity in tuition income based on courses taught
- Strategic planning
- Growth plan for the college

Dean Butler then discussed how this teaching load/funding model would operate and possible outcomes in terms of net dollars generated and courses offered based on current faculty buy-out. Currently, the faculty has 60.5 tenured faculty. If they all bought out of an additional class to keep their current teach load the same, the proposal would generate about \$500K for the various departments in the college. If no one bought out, approximately 60 more classes would be taught. Dean Butler’s estimate was that the proposal would bring in approximately \$250K to \$300K.

With the presentations over, the floor was opened for discussion with various members asking questions with Dean Butler (typically) and other faculty (occasionally) responding. Since many questions were raised in short order, this is a summary of the points made and discussed.

The discussion started with a faculty member asking what current tasks should faculty drop in order to perform the additional of a requirement of teaching a 4th course. Dean Butler responded that if more classes were taught by the college, the college could request, and probably get, more General Education Fund (GEF) support. The specifics of adjusting work priorities and load is an individual matter.

Discussion moved on to questions of how this would play-out vs. changes in enrollment and can we grow the college. Dean Butler responded that enrollment has been flat, but that if we did grow the college we would see a slow increase in GEF support, but because the current fiscal analysis (as determined by the central administration) is based on tuition generated per course delivered, we will continue to look disproportionately expensive compared to other colleges. Faculty responded that this is not an appropriate methodology because per enrolled student, the college generates more tuition money that it gets back in GEF support, that it costs more to educate our students, and our students are required to take course in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Dean Butler responded that this is the central administration's position.

Next came question about impact on ABET accreditation and the views of the Iowa Legislature. Dean Butler responded that ABET is up to each department and that the impact on the Legislature is unclear.

Faculty brought up that adding additional constraints does not encourage increases in faculty productivity. Discussion followed about why the university has not focused on cutting university-wide offices and increasing overhead. Also, warnings were made that the current cuts are likely to lead to more cuts. Dean Butler responded that the university has already cut \$2 million from the administrative side and will cut an additional \$10 million through the GEF Reduction Task Force.

Discussion moved to college income and spending, with some faculty asking that if they didn't want to spend the 5% from their research funding, would they lose 5% of their paycheck. Dean Butler said no, and that if the faculty do not like this proposal, then it will not be implemented, but the financial problems will remain. Some faculty then asked why we don't use indirect cost recovery as a method to supplement core funds. The college generates a significant amount of indirect cost funds, and those could be directly used to address the current financial situation. Dean Butler responded that the college as a whole receives \$1.20 per \$1 of overhead contributed to the pool. Changing the current structure would result in a net loss of funds. Faculty argued that this would not be so because of how the funds are currently used, with the funds not going to directly supporting the college (core funds) and returned overhead funds only serving members of institutes to whom the funds are returned. One of the (institute) directors responded that the institutes spend 20% on secretaries and staff (that the college would otherwise support), 20% on building maintenance and upkeep (which has to be done), and the remaining 60% on investment in new faculty start-up and equipment and support for labs.

Discussion progressed to faculty suggesting that the college needs a new model for financing that would offer more options. Others mentioned that a recently released national report states that teaching loads of 35% to 40% are common, and that the college is currently at 40% with 9

credit-hours. Dean Butler responded that none of this changes the fact that we will still have a budget shortfall. Faculty responded that this will make Iowa State more competitive, but the Dean responded that this proposal will make it easier to argue for more support from the Provost and the Regents. It was also mentioned that if people are doing federal and corporate research, it is reasonable to ask them to subsidize the state-paid for research time, which is 40% of faculty time allocation. Discussion returned to the general issue of funding models, and that all of the discussion has been assuming a certain funding model going forward and questions were raised about what would happen if the model turns out to be different. Dean Butler responded that this has been the model since 2001.

Discussion progressed to tuition question. Faculty asked why not raise tuition, especially since we are undervalued as a college, \$6K/year tuition vs. at least \$9K/year competition. Dean Butler said that the President and the Board of Regents won't approve separate tuition and that the college is trying to advertise how great of a value we are. Faculty then asked why we have to follow tuition rules, pointing out that other schools have moved away from this. Dean Butler pointed out that the state of Iowa still pays about 50% of the cost. Faculty asked about raising fees, but the Dean replied that we need on the order of \$1500 per student and the fees, which are being added, will be only in the \$10's range.

Faculty brought up that this is going to have an impact on research since we are divesting, according to estimates, between \$250K and \$300K. Dean Butler responded that there definitely are downsides to this proposal. Other faculty asked about copying the faculty bonus program in the College of Medicine. Dean Butler said that the president has put a moratorium on that, so that is not an option.

There was next a question of how the decision to go or not to go forward will be made, with the Dean responding that it is up to the faculty. If the faculty say no, then each department will have to do other things to make-up the loss in funding. Faculty asked if this had to be voted on, and a member of the EFC said that this is an administrative matter, so there is no faculty vote. The EFC would provide a recommendation to Dean and it would be his decision on how to proceed.

The discussion ended with faculty asking that if this proposal will only fix this year's budget shortfall, where would the college be in 5 years? Dean Butler responded that it is hard to say.

4) Announcements: Dean Butler encouraged all faculty to attend the faculty & staff recognition lunch on April 26, 2005.

5) Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Ratner
Secretary