

Faculty Senate Executive Board
October 16, 2001
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, 16 October 2001, and was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by President Christie Pope.

Attendance: S. Agarwal; J. Cunnally; J. Dana; G. Phye; D. Fowles; C. Heising; T. Hendrickson; D. Hopper; J. Hutter; G. Palermo; C. Pope; M. Porter; C. Post; B. Thacker; M. Wortman.

I. Consent Items

A. Approval of the Minutes:

The minutes of the 10/2 Executive Board meeting were approved as submitted.

B. Approval of the Meeting Agenda:

President Pope noted that a report by Max Porter from the Faculty Governance Council should be added.

II. Announcements

A. President

- 1. Invitation to Reception at the Knoll for 10/25.** Pope said she spoke with Charlie Dobbs about invitations including spouses, partners, etc.
- 2. Meetings between ISU President and FS President.** Pope noted that at our last meeting the Executive Board passed a resolution that the President of the Faculty Senate should have separate meetings with the President of ISU and that Provost Richmond asked to speak with the President about this matter. It is now unnecessary to send the resolution, said Pope, because she has received an e-mail from the President stating that separate meetings will be held.
- 3. Non-tenure Track Faculty.** Provost said he would like to hold off on appointments in Vet Med for Non-tenure Track Faculty, but that the matter cannot be delayed forever. Brad Thacker said his faculty has already approved clinical track policy. Pope said she would ask the Provost and the President to hold off on these until the Senate passes the policy and noted that Vet Med may want to go in as an exception. Thacker said he understands there will be exceptions, but that he does not see them in the policy. According to David Hopper, this was added under #4 of the Revised Motions to Amend the Task Force Report.
- 4. Summary of Faculty Senate Minutes.** Pope announced that we will now send

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

brief, unapproved minutes to the general faculty so that those who ask questions of the Provost will see their answers promptly.

- 5. Review of Vice-Provost of Undergraduate Education.** Pope said she assumes that members of the Executive Board have all received the e-mail questionnaire for the review of the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and the officeholder, H. Shapiro. Members are urged to return them as soon as possible.
 - 6. Open-meeting Law.** Pope sought the advice of the board about sending a statement to faculty senators about the open-meeting law, noting that the Faculty Handbook (page 65) exempts meetings of the Faculty Senate from this policy. Jim Hutter recalled, however, that President Parks placed the Senate under the open-meeting law. Given that so much time has elapsed since the issue about the policy was raised, the Board concluded that such a memo is not necessary.
 - 7. ISU-Comm.** Pope reported that a letter is being sent to ISU chairs asking them to implement the policy and get back in touch with ISU-Comm.
 - 8. Update on Vice-President Bloedel.** In response to the Senate's concern that members be put on important committees, Pope reported that Bloedel has agreed that we should set up an advisory committee with FDAR to advise him on issues; he also has asked for nominees for the Bailey Committee. Porter expressed the concern that the membership of this committee should be senior faculty.
 - 9. Spring Conference.** In talks by Pope and Max Wortman with Provost Richmond about the possibility of a spring conference, the Provost said he does not know if he is interested in doing so at this time, given the budget. Therefore the conference is in limbo, and Pope urged the members of the board to think about whether they believe there should be one.
 - 10. Design of ring for ISU.** The Faculty Senate has been asked for input about the design of a ring for Iowa State. Members interested in this matter are asked to e-mail Pope.
- B. Governance Council Report.** Porter said that the council has met twice to take up issues, one that Hutter gave us on by-law changes plus other changes in by-laws. After discussing the changes, the Governance Council referred them all to the Government Structure and Documents Committee. At the request of the council, Porter raised the issue of whether a furlough is legal. Gregory Palermo said that it is, according to the Office of the Attorney General. Although a furlough is off the table now, Sanjeev Agarwal believes it is an issue that will probably return. RPA seems the likely council to consider the legality of a furlough, and Pope remarked that the presence of four senators on the President's Task Force on Strategic Effectiveness and Budget Priorities gives the Faculty Senate strong representation. *The Executive Board agreed to refer the matter of a furlough to the RPA Council.*

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

C. Judiciary and Appeals Council Report. Dorothy Fowles reported that a faculty judiciary appeals committee met yesterday to discuss a grievance, and that the department involved was not following LAS rules or university rules which stipulate that full professors must be given feedback on performance evaluation. The discussion that followed raised several related issues, including the lack of a position responsibility statement. Sometimes there is one, but the chair does not agree with it, which means that the faculty member is working without one. Clearly, said Wortman, everyone is not following the personnel policies of the college they are in and it is the chairs who are not doing this. Hutter wondered who has the right to make the position responsibility statement binding and urged Porter, Fowles, and Pope to explore this before their meeting with the Provost. Some things we take up, such as marked bicycle paths, are important, said Palermo, but this issue is absolutely central and goes to the heart of the two matters that fall under our purview: personnel and curriculum. Have departments, he asked, delegated away the obligation to do this? In some departments, said Wortman, the statement is only eight lines long and that everybody has the same one, thereby saving the chair a lot of time. He also noted that one person at the judiciary committee meeting yesterday stated that his personal responsibility statement has not been signed. Given that this person is up for promotion, Wortman said it is difficult to know on what basis is he being considered without the chair's signature on this statement.

III. Old Business

A. Priority #7 on the list of possible priorities for the 14th Session of the Faculty Senate: "Instituting permanent oversight committees for athletics and the foundation"

- 1. Committee on Athletics.** Pope asked the board to focus concern on priority #7 because we must draw up a description of that before the November meeting of the Senate. At its October meeting, noted Pope, the Senate got caught up with student achievement, which is not what she had in mind in establishing this priority. What we are asking for is the creation of some type of committee or body that would look at how well the university is implementing issues driven by the Knight Report, which is fairly broad.

Currently members of the Athletic Committee are elected. Hopper, who is on the Compliance Committee, said that 11 out of 16 to 17 members on it are faculty from across the university, many of whom are former senators such as John Shue. The committee, which has a constitution, has many of the responsibilities you are talking about having the Faculty Senate examine. Richard Horton chairs it, and Hopper suggested the board get in touch with him to see if there is a better way for the Senate to communicate with the Council. According to Porter, we no longer have a liaison with the Athletic Council (at least there is none on our list). Hopper also raised an issue that came out of the Johnnie Majors' incident a few years ago, specifically, the concern of the Athletic Committee that faculty may try to interfere. They don't like "oversight" well, said Hopper, and will wonder who

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

is trying to run whom. Porter suggested that we change the wording and said it would be good for us to elect a member from the Senate to be on the Athletic Affairs Committee.

Pope acknowledged that the impetus for the priority list came out of her experience at Indiana, a university where presidents don't have much leverage to control athletics because there are so many interest groups in the state and therefore strong input from the faculty is needed. In part, said Wortman, the impetus came out of the Academic Affairs Council last spring when Barbara Licklider visited us, at which time she asked for an ad hoc subcommittee to sit down with her to talk about problems she did not want to discuss with the Athletic Department. Now that we have had such a committee for one year, it would be nice to establish a permanent committee to have that kind of leverage from the Senate when it is needed, either by the President or someone else.

Noting that he attended college on an athletic scholarship, Gary Phye said he would just as soon drop intercollegiate sports; however, he thinks we are committing suicide to be concerned about this because it really opens things up for a witch hunt. He therefore recommends that our committee be advisory only and that the person in Licklider's position discuss her concerns with members of the Senate. Hutter, who pointed out that the President gave \$400,000 two years in a row to bail out athletics, wondered if a permanent committee is advisable. According to Wortman, Licklider said that the committee indeed is meeting, but that the Athletic Department has instituted just about everything the committee recommended so it had nothing else to do. The one exception, reviewing grades, was noted by Hopper, who brought a copy of the 95-page ISU Student Athletic Handbook to the meeting.

Motion was passed to remove Athletic Committee from Priority #7 and replace it with a Subcommittee under FDAR that, functioning as an ad hoc committee, will look into the matter further.

- 2. Committee on the Foundation.** In discussing the foundation under Priority #7, Pope said that instead of the word *oversight* we shall say *advisory*. Although the statement refers to foundation in the singular, Porter noted that there are two, the Ag Foundation and the University Foundation, and asked whether the sale of WOI put funds into a foundation. Pope stipulated that the ISU and Ag motion will refer to the university and the Ag Foundation for the formation of this committee.

Hopper reported that the President has formed an Endowment Audit Committee of five persons: three faculty members, including Hopper, as Chair; plus the Comptroller and Internal Auditor. The committee met with the President yesterday to discuss the charge of the committee, which will randomly select records from the Foundation to see if it is in compliance with the wishes of the donor and whether expenditures are compliant. About \$35 to \$40 million are

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

transferred by the Foundation to specific accounts at the university, and what we're conducting is an internal audit to make sure that those accounts are expended appropriately, timely, and in accordance with the wishes of the donors. We will also prepare an annual report to be made public by May 1st. According to Hopper, we need refer to only one foundation because the Ag Foundation is under the University Foundation.

Although Pope noted that this committee has been set up by the President to deal with the current controversy, Wortman stated that the committee ought to be under the RPA. This priority was drawn up broadly because every year there may be different issues with the foundation, said Pope, who emphasized that the committee will function as an advisory committee by advising the Faculty Senate. Palermo asked about the faculty voice in establishing funding priorities, pointing out that the university presumably gets its priorities from somehow but that he does not know how they emerge. This is the problem that needs to be fixed, Pope said. Our main concern is that with a capital campaign, you conduct it for purposes that are listed. Who, though, asked Pope, makes up that list? The Faculty Senate should have a strong list of what the priorities are, and a Foundation Committee is a way to ensure this is done. One issue the committee can address, said Hopper, is whether designated scholarship money is being honored when it is designated for need or for anything else.

Motion by Porter to broaden the committee to cover two foundations, not just the university foundation, passed.

In the discussion that followed, Hutter, who wondered whether the committee will be ad hoc or permanent one, recommended that we just say priorities. Palermo pointed out that unless we change the wording to say, "insure faculty have a voice in," then we need to say "committee".

Our intent, said Pope, is probably to put it under FDAR because it is the only way we can operate and see that these priorities can be brought forward.

Motion by Hutter was passed to amend the motion by deleting the heading for Priority #7, "instituting permanent oversight committees of athletics and the foundations," and replace it with the following: "Insuring that the faculty have a voice in."

B. Evaluation of Teaching

Discussion followed about the letter to the FS President from Jack Girton about the formation of a committee to discuss how teaching should be evaluated at ISU. First, though, Bill Woodman noted that there has been considerable pressure from the GSB to publish student evaluations. Pope said she and Wortman intend to meet with the committee that made recommendations about this, and reported that she has discussed the issue with the President of the GSB. According to him, this is an issue of the

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

previous president and is not something he personally is interested in; he noted, however, that Howard Shapiro wants it to go forward. Wortman said Howard does not appear to be on the same wave length as the faculty are, regardless of rank, and that he would be happier if these initiatives were coming from Girton.

Girton, said Woodman, is asking an important question, whether we have the stomach to evaluate other than by simply filling in the blank. He is also concerned about the rejection of holistic scholarship, according to Palermo. At issue here is where the initiatives originate, said Pope, who notes that Howard wants to start initiatives from his office, get the Faculty Senate to start studying them with him, and together fashion principles to be brought up in the spring.

The task force that Jack is proposing in the second paragraph of the letter is something that the Faculty Senate should set up, said Hutter. Instead of CTE serving as members on it, he recommended that it be an ad-hoc committee under Academic affairs.

Motion was made by Woodman to replace the original proposal with one that makes the task force an activity of the Faculty Senate, which will form a body to take care of this and work with the Vice Provost. This motion was withdrawn, and a motion to work on it further was passed.

C. Other matters.

- 1. Breakfast at the Knoll, 7:30 a.m., October 25.** To prepare questions to bring forward to the President, Pope solicited the Board for suggestions. Porter said the status of the foundation would be his choice of topic. For Hutter, it would be the freedom to express concerns of the Senate without doing so simply by submitting questions; he also has questions about a furlough. Pope stated that she and Wortman are always invited and can bring three or four persons with them; Board members were asked to e-mail her if they can attend the breakfast.
- 2. Cuts.** At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate a resolution was passed about not having additional faculty cuts. Pope announced that she has decided to establish a task force to deal with consultant reports and restructuring. Although last summer the Senate succeeded in getting a seat at the table for budgeting and restructuring, Pope said she wants the Faculty Senate to have its own independent voice. Pope announced that she wants each caucus head to ask for someone to serve on the task force to deal with consultant reports and restructuring and that she would like the task force to begin its work as soon as possible. Pope noted that three members of the Senate--herself, Fletcher, and Woodman--serve on the Task Force on Strategic Effectiveness and Budget Priorities, and that a fourth senator, Palermo, is on it but as a representative from the College of Design.
- 3. Giving Tree.** With the recession, the Giving Tree is probably even more necessary, said Pope. Hearing no objections, she stated that the Board will do

Minutes of 10/16/01 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting
this.

- 4. Ombudsperson.** In all of the discussion about an ombudsperson, Pope said it is clear that a lot of the faculty do not know what their rights are. Some, for example, are unsure about their rights when they sign licensing agreements. Pope reported that Paul Tanaka agrees that it makes sense to put up a website about the rights of faculty. It was agreed that the site will be a link from the Faculty Senate page under “ Faculty Resources”.
- 5. A note of thanks.** Hutter thanked Hopper for working with him on the Task Force for Non-Tenure Track faculty, and Hopper in turn thanked Hutter.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Constance J. Post, Secretary