

**Faculty Senate Executive Board
Minutes of the Meeting
2 October 2001
3:10-4:50 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics**

[Approved minutes]

Call to Order:

The Executive Board of the ISU Faculty Senate met in 107 Lab of Mechanics on Tuesday, 2 October 2001, and was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by President Christie Pope.

Attendance:

Present: Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Susan Carlson (Associate Provost), John Cunnally (DES Caucus Chair) Janice Dana (FCS Caucus Chair), Michael Duffy (AGR Caucus Chair), Michael Dyrenfurth (ED Caucus Chair), Dorothy Fowles (Chair of the Judiciary and Appeals Council), Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus Chair), David Hopper (ISU Faculty Senate Past-President), Jim Hutter (LAS Caucus Chair), Gregory Palermo (Chair of the Council on Faculty Development and Administrative Relations), Christie Pope (ISU Faculty Senate President), Max Porter (Chair of the Governance Council), Connie Post (Faculty Senate Secretary), Rollin Richmond (Provost), Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair), William Woodman (Chair of the Resource, Policy, and Allocations Council), and Max Wortman (ISU Faculty Senate President-Elect).

Absent: Anthony Hendrickson (Chair of the Academic Affairs Council).

Substitute: No substitute members.

Guest: Liz Allen, Reporter for the *The Tribune* of Ames.

I. Consent Items

A. Approval of the Minutes:

The minutes of the Executive Board meetings of September 4 and 18, 2001 were approved as submitted.

B. Approval of the Meeting Agenda:

Consent Items: The Faculty Senate agenda left out item #5: Reports by Christie Pope and Rollin Richmond. These should be included above old business, which will make a new V with Old Business now VI.

President Pope thanked Provost Rollin Richmond for answering questions in the Faculty Senate meeting of September 18 and said she does not expect there to be as many questions at the next meeting.

President Pope asked David Hopper about sets of minutes for April. A set from last May were approved at the last meeting of the Executive Board.

II. Announcements:

A. President:

1. Administrative reviews: President Pope noted that so far there has been no monitoring of the recommendations made by the Faculty Senate Review Committee in its most recent assessment of the Office of the Provost, even though this is mandated by the Faculty Handbook. Bonnie Glantz, who chaired the Faculty Senate Review Committee when the Office of the Provost was evaluated several years ago, declined a request to follow-up on the recommendations because so much time has elapsed. A member of Glantz's committee, David Hopper, reported that most of the recommendations have been implemented by our new Provost. Provost Richmond volunteered to review the recommendations and let the Executive Board know what has and has not been done. President Pope stressed the importance of having the Executive Board put procedures firmly into place for future administrative reviews.

2. Roster of Committees: President Pope stated that the Executive Board has been working with the Committee on Committees to update the roster of committees, the latest of which was distributed at today's meeting of the Executive Board. The roster was unanimously approved, subject to any revisions. Liaisons to various committees are not always aware they are doing that for the Faculty Senate, so President Pope has called a meeting of these people to remind them of their role. President Pope noted that the Executive Board receives requests, often urgent, to furnish nominees to serve on all sorts of committees in the university. After several members recommended changes in the roster, President Pope suggested that the all the members of the Executive Board review the roster carefully.

3. Primary projects of FS Councils: President Pope reported that she met with the Faculty Senate Council chairs to discuss primary projects and to urge that the councils move forward expeditiously on these. She noted that when she suggested that Faculty Senate meetings be capped at 90 minutes, ways were devised to do this. Instead of council chairs giving oral reports, President Pope recommends written ones in addition to a written annual report. President Pope added that the Executive Board would like to include a half-page report from each Council in the e-mail sent each month to all senators. These half-page reports

should be e-mailed to Sherry Angstrom by 10/3 so that they can be included with the e-mail packet.

4. Requests from Caucus Chairs for Reports on Budget Cuts: Given the drastic budget cuts facing us and the need for the Faculty Senate to take a stand on this issue, President Pope observed that her request for caucus chairs of the Faculty Senate to submit a report on this matter has elicited a response only from LAS. It will be passed on to the Resource, Policy, and Allocations Council so that recommendations can be made. Noting that the Faculty Senate meeting of September 18 just barely started on time, President Pope asked that caucus chairs end their meetings at 7:15 p.m.

5. Meetings of the Faculty Senate President with the President of the University: President Pope reported that she had her first meeting with President Geoffrey, which traditionally is held on a monthly basis. Right now President Geoffrey plans to meet separately with the President of the Senate and the President of the P&S Council and the following month with both of them. By meeting together with both presidents, President Geoffrey believes the Faculty Senate and the P&S Council will better understand each other's needs. Acknowledging the possible benefit, Bill Woodman stated that such a meeting could take place but it need not necessarily be with the President. Take P&S out, said Woodman, and the university can run; take out the faculty, and all you have is a well-run hotel. Woodman therefore proposed a resolution affirming that the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate believes faculty issues should be discussed by the President of the university and the President of the Faculty Senate. The resolution was approved but later placed on hold (see final page of the minutes under "Adjournment").

6. Ex-officio status for Faculty Senate President on DEO cabinet: President Pope stated that she is an ex-officio member of the DEO cabinet, which is keenly interested in the matter of non-tenure track positions.

7. New Microsoft licensing agreement. Dorothy Lewis called with the new Microsoft licensing agreement.

B. Provost

1. Budget reduction: Provost Richmond said that the budget reduction this year will be \$18.6 million. An additional 4% would bring this to a total of 11%. He noted that the Task Force on Strategic Planning will meet this Thursday.

2. Augmented Review Committee: Provost Richmond thanked President Pope for responding to his request for names of faculty to add to the Review Committee for appeals. Professor Cornelia Flora (Sociology) Professor Jane Farrell-Beck

(Textiles and Clothing), and Professor James Roth (Vet. Microbiology) have been added to the President's Administrative group to review faculty dossiers.

3. Licensing agreement with Microsoft: Provost Richmond reported that Microsoft came to ISU a month to a month and a half ago to announce a change in licensing policy. If ISU participates, it must buy into the new license. So far ISU has not decided on a license to serve students because we would need a \$200,000 increase to do this, although it could be partly recouped by turning to units with separate agreements with Microsoft. On the matter of mandatory upgrades, the Provost said that according to Dorothy Lewis upgrades will be available on CDS. Woodman conceded that such is the case for XP. The Provost stated that he has been advised to proceed on this matter because not to do so would be even more costly. Right now the agreement with Microsoft seems to be our best option, and our decision must be made in six weeks. UNI, he said, has already decided to go with the new license. Although Lewis believes this license will save ISU money, Pope wonders if this is possible if it fails to take upgrades into account. Provost Richmond reminded the Board that there is an alternative system out there. Pope concluded the discussion of the new licensing agreement by announcing that she expects to get details about it from FDAR and then have it discussed by caucus chairs.

4. Disseminating information about awards

In response to the Provost's questions, Max Wortman mentioned the August 13 memo sent by the Provost's office to deans, directors, and DEOs regarding Provost awards. Wortman pointed out that it is not clear how this information gets to the faculty members in order for them to make recommendations. Apparently, said Wortman, some faculty members are unaware that they can make recommendations for University Professor and Distinguished Professor; he noted that Regents' awards, in contrast, are not sent down to the faculty for suggestions. Associate Provost Susan Carlson reported that Jane Henning says these memos go to deans, directors, and DEOs, who in turn distribute them. Provost Richmond said he will solve this by asking the deans to disseminate the information, and that he and Associate Provost Carlson will work with IT people to insure that this happens. President Pope volunteered to have the Faculty Senate office send the notice out. Porter recalled that at the March meeting last year we passed a resolution that two new committees, one for Distinguished Professor and another for University Professor, be formed for these awards. In the past this was a Provost's committee; now it is not.

5. Budget

Hutter inquired about the level of state support in 1999-2000 and asked if we were cut in 2000-2001; if so, was this a real cut? Provost Richmond stated that all money from the state actually went up a bit but only because of salary funds mandated by the state. Without those, the funding actually went down. Richmond noted that we took a 3% reduction for 2001-2002 before the current round and that we now face a reduction of \$18.6 million, which is a 7% cut.

Hutter asked if it is fair to say the total is 10%, and wondered if it is true that we should not be hiring faculty because of this. The Provost responded that he does not know, adding that he cannot stop trying to make this university as good as it can be. The Board was reminded that so far this is only a recommendation of the Governor and that it awaits passage the legislature, which apparently is not going to hold a special session. Should the legislature mandate cuts across the board, our cut would be only 3%. Richmond said that the Task Force on Strategic Planning meets this Thursday to make recommendations to the President, who will issue guidelines for the 2003 reductions. On the matter of tuition increases, the Provost noted that although the recommended tuition increase stands at 11.5%, the Board may come up with 15%. Even with a 20% increase, he said our operating budget would still suffer. Porter, who reported that the DEO of his department has asked for a 15% reduction in curriculum, wondered if the Provost is seeing this across campus. Provost Richmond said a 15% reduction is not a recommendation from his office. According to Carolyn Heising, associate deans in the College of Engineering are allowed to do what they want and therefore are not doing something uniformly. In her department, faculty members are now asked to pay for their phone, fax, and xerox expenses. She wonders, though, how these budgetary issues are perceived by junior faculty and what impact do they have on women. Provost Richmond reported that he has told deans that we ought to look hard at our curriculum to determine what is essential to what we do. Other things, he noted, are important but not necessarily essential. Professor Heising wondered then if each department is supposed to find its own way.

III. Council and Caucus Reports

The position of ombudsperson is being worked on, and the Governing Council is trying to sort out the matter of Distinguished Professor and University Professor.

IV. Old Business

- A. Non-Tenure Track Task Force.** David Hopper reported that the recommendations we received in our senate packet are still under debate, noting that Jim Hutter is the only one who has made proposals regarding this matter. If we create these lines, then non-tenure track faculty should have representation in the Faculty Senate and we should abide by the AAUP limits. The caps of 15% and 25% have been accepted by Hutter.
- Item #7 describes the type of non-tenure track appointments. In a telephone conversation on 10/2 with Jonathan Knight, General Counsel for the AAUP, Hopper and Hutter were told that if we adopt AAUP guidelines, the percentages will stand as well as the protection of the person after the probationary period is over. For example, if a person is renewed for a second five-year period, it would be tantamount to tenure; however, the person does not get other perks. In the matter of selecting and reviewing colleagues, Hutter and Hopper asked Knight what happens if renewal is denied when there is no money. Knight said AAUP would consider that inappropriate but admitted that the AAUP stipulates that lack of money is just cause.

As we deliberate this matter, Hutter expressed the hope that our Task Force will reverse #5, thereby allowing non-tenure track faculty to have representation although subject to a limit on number. For item #7, said Hutter, the following will be substituted: “In conjunction with their individual position responsibility statements, all non-tenure track teaching employees, regardless of title or other basis for hiring, will be evaluated for both probationary and continuing appointments according to the most recent ISU promotion and tenure policies, as approved by the Faculty Senate, and the most recent professional standards of the American Association of University Professors.”

The Non-Tenure Track Task Force discussed one other issue, the proposal from colleges regarding non-tenure track positions with a recommendation to President Pope. Pope has been asked by the Task Force to communicate with the administration about withholding this until the Faculty Senate can act on the recommendations before the body. The Task Force feels unanimously that just as we have a policy on tenure-track positions, we need to have a similar policy on all levels for non-tenure track positions

President Pope reported that when she called the President of the Faculty Senate at the University of Iowa today, she learned that the issue of non-tenure track positions was debated for an entire year and that caps had been ignored by the university hospitals. UNI has capped the number of these positions, which have been limited to 3% for LAS at the University of Iowa. The term, “clinical” is used for everybody who is not tenure track.

Given an abundance of documents regarding representation, Porter wondered if all of these will have to be redone. According to Hopper, faculty in non-tenure track positions would serve on the Faculty Senate, which would therefore require changes in the documents. Porter noted that the entire faculty would have to vote on it, and so would the Board of Regents. Gregory Palermo stated that he has proposals, but that they are contingent on those of Hutter.

Pope stated that the debate will go on for several more Faculty Senate meetings.

Hutter pointed out that item #5 in the original Task Force proposal says the Faculty Senate will consist of tenure-line faculty. Hutter stated that what we have now is okay -- adjunct and tenure track -- so proposed that we delete #5.

As for #7, which provides a classification of non-tenure track faculty, Hutter noted that there is nothing to stop people from creating these classifications. The problem is with the second point. AAUP says non-tenure track do not have tenure but do have recourse for due process. Hutter admitted he has a problem with the adjunct part, so he proposes dropping both #5 and #7 and adding the 25% and 15% caps. Professor Thacker pointed out that even if you are tenure track, you can be let go if there is no money when you come up for tenure. Hutter

responded that for the third-year review, the burden of proof is on the candidate. Beyond the sixth year, in the case of non-tenure track positions, the burden is on the university, which can let you go for budgetary reasons. According to Knight, ISU, unlike CUNY, is not in dire straits.

Dorothy Fowles remarked that we will need to develop a document that reflects non-tenure track positional responsibilities. The University of Iowa, according to Pope, has made a clear distinction between the two positions. Hopper said the important thing is for everyone to understand what we're saying: both tenure-track and non-tenure track positions have legal implications albeit different ones. The Vet College passed a non-tenure track proposal that states clearly there are no scholarship requirements for promotion at assistant, associate, and full clinic professor. We need to explore the implications of this for governance and for our by-laws. The administration, the Faculty Senate, and the general faculty may not agree on what all these terms mean.

At this point in the discussion, Provost Richmond expressed his concern about inflexibility. He also stated he does not believe it is accurate to say that non-tenure track faculty automatically reduce quality. The Provost's office, he noted, could report each semester on the number of these faculty at all levels in order to have an on-going assessment of the matter. Provost Richmond expressed his willingness to put together a report for the Faculty Senate on any of these things. Woodman thanked the Provost for his help in this matter, but noted the need to take a long view of the matter rather than the short. As it stands right now, said Woodman, we reward administrators for cutting faculty lines and putting them into non-tenure track lines.

V. New Business

- A. **Meeting the threat of reduction of tenure lines.** Pope noted that last year we lost 30 faculty; this year, 70. According to Hopper, figuring out how to protect faculty lines and not lose any more is critical. For that reason, he believes that the Executive Board should make a very clear statement to the administration that any further cuts of faculty are unconscionable. To deal with our all-time high enrollment, there are only 1077 tenured faculty but 4000 in other positions. Hopper therefore made the following resolution:

We recommend to the Administration, the President, and the Provost that there be no further cuts of faculty positions, tenure or tenure track, at ISU.

In discussing the resolution, Carolyn Heising noted the keen competition for women and minorities in her department and its concern that these faculty be retained as well as white males. Although the senior level design course is now being taught by a temp, said Heising, what the department does not want is to have temps doing all the teaching.

The resolution proposed by Hopper passed unanimously, and President Pope said that it will be put in the agenda for the next meeting as a special order before Old Business or the first thing of new business. Porter noted that it should be voted on the same night, and Wortman wondered if we must suspend the rules to do that.

Hutter asked if the Task Force is going to draft new language for non-tenure track faculty before going to the Faculty Senate, and Hopper said it was possible. Woodman said he did not hear anything in the AAUP stuff that goes against the Task Force. Hutter voiced his objection to the idea of an individual on the Task Force bringing something up, to which Hopper responded by saying that the only change is a change in representation at the Faculty Senate. Pope reminded the Board that last spring the Executive Board agreed not to debate these things, opting instead to have the Task Force bring these matters to the Faculty Senate.

Adjournment:

It was moved and seconded that we adjourn. Before doing so, Woodman read his resolution.

Provost Richmond said he would like to talk further with President Geoffrey about the concern of the Executive Board that the President of the Faculty Senate have monthly meetings with Geoffrey rather than combining some of them with the President of the P&S Council. President Pope said the Board would hold off on delivering this resolution until the Provost has a chance to meet with the President. This was approved with two opposed and none abstaining.

The meeting of the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Submitted by C. Post
10/8/01