

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD
4 December 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, 4 December 2001, and was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by President Christie Pope.

Attendance:

Present: S. Agarwal; J. Cunnally; D. Fowles; C. Heising; T. hendrickson; D. Hopper; J. Hutter; G. Palermo; G. Phye; C. Pope; M. Porter; C. Post; R. Richmond; S. Carlson; M. Wortman.

Absent: J. Dana; M. Duffy; B. Thacker; W. Woodman.

I. Announcements

A. President Pope

1. **Giving Tree.** President Pope said that the Giving Tree is in the office and that members of the Executive Board can either leave money or take a blue card from the tree, buy the suggested items, and bring them to the office. Sherri Angstrom and her colleagues will wrap the packages. The recession, added Pope, makes this project even more timely.
2. **Taser Gun Decision.** Pope announced that President Geoffrey has asked to speak to the Faculty Senate about his decision regarding the tasers. Later, however, he called to say that he must make this recommendation before the Board of Regents meets next week and that there are others he must tell before us. Consequently, he may not be able to tell us about the decision at our meeting. President Geoffrey assured Pope that he would keep his remarks short.
3. **Name Change for Department of Public Safety.** Given that the deadline for input about changing the name of the Law Enforcement Division of DPS has elapsed, Pope reported that it appeared that the matter did not need to be placed on the Faculty Senate agenda for 12/11 under Old Business. Pope reported, however, that President Geoffrey informed her that the name change has not yet been decided. Therefore, the matter will appear under Old Business for the December 11 meeting of the Faculty Senate.
4. **New Task Force on Diversity.** For a task force to advise President Geoffrey on diversity issues, Pope stated that Geoffrey has asked her to suggest two or three persons, not necessarily from the Faculty Senate. Pope added that she

urged the President to include religious diversity as well, and that he informed her of his plan to pool the names he receives. Pope asked for recommendations from the Executive Board, and the following were suggested: Bob Baum, Gary Tartakov, Carly Tartakov, Ryad Meahyi, Lynn Paxon, and Alfred Ho. Noting that many faculty in Sociology are doing diversity, Max Wortman said such a list would also include the President of the Faculty Senate.

5. **Other Task Forces.** Without going into any detail, Pope reported that the Faculty Senate representatives are supporting Faculty Senate interests on the President's Task Force on Strategic Planning and Budget Priorities headed by Provost Richmond. Commenting on the further delay of the MGT America Task Force Report, Pope asked Richmond when it will be made public. He said he doesn't know and noted that there are problems with it because of the uncritical use of data, especially as it relates to the productivity and function of faculty. This concern about flawed data, which is shared by all three universities, was expressed to MGT after a recent meeting of the Regents. Whatever is finally released, said Richmond, will be much sanitized. Responding to Palermo's question about flawed data, Richmond explained that it included a mishmash. MGT, for example, pulled stuff off that was on-line and used it in an uncritical way. MGT also asserted that faculty do not teach enough and suggested that if administrators each taught a course or two the problem would be solved. Clearly the report in its present state would not be helpful to us at all, said Richmond, who noted, however, that MGT's suggestions about collaboration among the three universities are worth investigating as are their suggestions about outsourcing.

Pope reminded the Executive Board that every caucus in the Faculty Senate is supposed to elect a member for the new task force to examine the impact of budget cuts. Caucuses that have not submitted a name for this task force are urged to do so before the next meeting. Hutter, who said one volunteer has been garnered from the notice sent to the LAS Caucus, was asked by Pope to forward the name to Wortman, Chair of the new task force. So far, said Wortman, the only name he has received is one from Herrington. Pope reminded caucus chairs that names submitted for this task force must be of persons who are members of the Faculty Senate.

6. **FY'03 Budget.** According to Provost Richmond, the FY'03 budget will probably be finalized around late March or early April, depending on what the legislature does.
7. **Breakfast at the Knoll.** The next breakfast at the Knoll will be on Wednesday, December 19, and Pope asked for five to seven volunteers to attend.
8. **Electronic packets.** Responding to complaints by LAS Faculty Senators, Pope noted that the last year the Senate spent \$1300 last year for copying and that the

Senate has been hit with a \$700 cut this year. She stated that all attachments will be put into one and assured Board members that ordinarily there will not be many attachments. One reason for electronic transmission is that senators do not always want to make a copy of a document, only read it. She added, however, that for any Old Business with a resolution to vote on, the resolution will be distributed in hard copy to make it easier to edit or make changes.

Pointing that LAS faculty have brought this up at two of their caucus meetings, Hutter said they really do want something to arrive by campus mail, especially the gray sheet agenda. In addition, they want a written copy of anything that has to be voted on at the meeting plus a list of what will be arriving by e-mail. Hutter also reported that although caucus members do not agree on the matter of collapsing all attached documents into one, they are unanimous in their request that hard copies be hole-punched..

Palermo, who admitted that he is the last hold-out for hard copies on the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, asked that attachments distributed via e-mail be sent individually and not collapsed into one. Wortman, however, said that one attachment would save time when making hard copies. To questions about whether Sherri Angstrom could continue to send out hard copies of everything, Pope responded that it's a budgetary matter: We do not have sufficient funds to cover the cost of copying nor do we have a full-time secretary as do most faculty senates at universities of this size. Some board members, including Hopper, expressed a preference for electronic copies because of the ease in locating something at the press of a button.

9. **Faculty Senate Representative on Board of Regents.** Allowing for the possibility that she was out in front of the Faculty Senate on the issue of having a Faculty Senate representative on the Board of Regents, Pope said that after attending meetings and seeing administrators answer questions, she decided not to suggest it as a Faculty Senate Priority for 2001-02. Pope informed the Board that when our state legislators attended the November 13 meeting of the Faculty Senate, she asked them how to get this done. Finch told Pope she thinks it's a good idea and has given it to the drafting committee to draw up in like manner as the legislation done for adding a student representative to the Board of Regents in 1998. Pope said she discussed this last summer with the Faculty Senate presidents of the other two regents universities. The FS President of the University of Iowa seems enthusiastic and has spoken about to Mary Sue Coleman.

When Pope asked the Board if they support this idea, Hopper said it was proposed before by Bill Woodman but that there are some potential problems with it. Pope remarked that Don Powers at UNI believes this issue can be solved by asking for a retired faculty person. Hopper, however, objected to having a retired person do it because of the need to have someone be really up front on these matters.

Dorothy Fowles moved that the Executive Board support the idea that the Faculty Senate have a non-voting member on the Board of Trustees.

A problem raised by Hutter is that a staff person is likely to come along and also want representation on the board. To Hutter's question about whether she attends meetings of the Board of Regents, Pope said she does but is not allowed to speak. Porter, who recommended that the member be non-voting as a way to get out of an ethical bind, wondered if we would want one representative for all three universities or one representative for each. Hopper observed that student representatives from the three universities rotate on the Board of Regents, and Pope said the same would hold true for faculty representation. Hutter said the matter should go to a faculty council but which one he did not know.

Motion by Dorothy Fowles that the Executive Board support the idea that the Faculty Senate have a non-voting member on the Board of Trustees was passed. There was one objection.

- 10. Next Executive Board Meeting.** Pope noted out that the next Faculty Senate meeting is December 11. This means that the next Executive Board meeting ordinarily would be December 18, which is the week of finals. Given that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on January 15, Pope wondered if the Executive Board needs to meet in advance of that date. Not much is coming up, she said, although John Shue does want to attend the meeting. After discussing the matter, it was agreed that the Executive Board will meet on Friday, January 11, at the usual time of 3:10 p.m. This means the Board will drop the December 18 meeting and move the meeting of January 8 to January 11 from 3:10-5:00 p.m. Pope announced that the selection of the President-elect would be made the Faculty Senate meeting on January 15 and urged those who know they would be a good president to come forward. Wortman noted that people can submit their name until Tuesday of the day of the meeting, and Porter stated that nomination information should go in the packet for the Faculty Senate meeting of December 11.
- 11. New Rules for Participating in Post-Semester Games.** Pope reported that she received a phone call from Barbara Lickliger, who advocates that rules be changed so that athletes in the fall will have to pass 6 credit hours in order to participate in post-semester games (think "bowl"). If they have a major, these credit hours have to contribute to it. As Provost Richmond noted, they have to be "real" courses; or, as Porter put it, they must be degree-eligible courses.

Gary Phye stated that he received a notice about having to notify the office about players within 24 hours for an exam given on Friday, December 21: if the players signed up for 12 hours, the office wants to know if they passed at least 6. Pointing out that this is the only time she can recall that grades can be turned in the day after Christmas, Pope said that the problem with notifying the office

about athletes by December 21 is that the NCAA clearly states that athletes shouldn't be treated differently. Pope observed that we are in a period when universities seem willing to scale back on sports; the PAC 10 and the Big 10, she noted, are saying that team sports should be confined to one semester only.

B. Provost Richmond

1. **New Rules for Participating in Post-Semester Games.** Provost Richmond added to the announcements about the change in the rules for participating in post-semester games by noting that he has asked the faculty to meet the deadlines set by the Big 10 rule. We've had students who didn't pass any courses, said Richmond, but yet went on to play in post-season games. Wortman said Christie has raised a good point about the 26th and asked if we couldn't make it the 28th or 29th. Other members of the board pointed out problems caused by finals week running so late in the month.
2. **Position Responsibility Statements.** The Provost reported that he has discussed position responsibility statements with Wortman and Pope and that he has had discussions with deans on this issue. Apparently there is some confusion: in one place it says it can be generic; in other, flexible.
3. **Budget.** The Provost said that most people know as much as he does about it and noted that there is increasing concern in Beardshear about another cut. He announced that there will be another revenue estimating conference on December 7 when legislators will make their decisions.
4. **Task Force on Strategic Effectiveness and Budget Priorities.** Provost Richmond said there is still confusion about what this task force is doing, including the matter of furloughs. He urged faculty to click on "T" on the ISU website to get an update.

Heising, stating that the deans do not appear to be consistent, asked if there is going to be any guidance to the deans or will they do their own proposals. According to the Provost, at the meeting on Saturday, 12/1 the deans received feedback on site and will receive more. While there is not uniformity, Richard said the deans have been asked to be inclusive in talking with people about what's going on. He noted that the deans, who have been asked for differential cuts and program elimination, are in a difficult position. Heising's comment about wide variation is accurate, said the Provost, who said one dean is asking for the highest priority while another is asking for the lowest.

Pope explained that she started the meeting with announcements because there was not a quorum and stated we would now return to the consent items.

II. Consent items

A. Minutes of the Executive Board Meeting of October 16

B. Executive Board Agenda for December 4

C. Faculty Senate agenda for December 11

Wortman asked if there is a place on the agenda for the Academic Affairs Resolution, and Pope said it would be added as would the athletic item noted by Hopper and the matter of nominations by Porter.

Motion to approve the minutes of the Executive Board for October 16, the Executive Board Agenda for December 4, and the Faculty Senate agenda for December 11 was passed.

III. Reports by Council and Caucus Chairs

A. Academic Affairs Council

Max Wortman, Chair, reported that Jack Girton sent the council the following item on value of a teaching task force and that the council has adopted it as a resolution:

The Academic Affairs Council of the ISU Faculty Senate recommends that a task force be formed, by the Faculty Senate and the Provost, to examine issues related to the valuation of graduate and undergraduate teaching activities at ISU. Specifically, we recommend a definition and standardization of faculty teaching workloads across colleges and disciplines, the creation of a standardized definition of teaching ‘excellence,’ and a clarification of the value or worth of teaching when considering promotion and tenure decisions, post-tenure review evaluations, and annual merit evaluations. The task force shall consist of a chair and one representative from each college, appointed by the Faculty Senate, and two representatives from the Office of the Provost, appointed by the Provost. The task force will report to the Faculty Senate and Provost by September 1, 2002.

By way of background, Wortman said the resolution was initiated by Shapiro who talked to Girton about his concern that teaching still does not get a fair shake in P&T. Wortman, noting that there are over 70 departments at ISU, said that Jack gave the Academic Affairs Council some material, the Academic Affairs Council worked on it, and this is what the Council has come up with. The document refers to the standardization of faculty teaching workloads across colleges and disciplines. We’re not trying to get everybody into a box on this, said Wortman, who insisted that the Council simply wants to get it studied.

Palermo said he disagrees with any standardized definition of teaching excellence and of faculty teaching loads but that he does not object to the matter being studied. According to Pope, a clarification of the value of teaching would be valuable, although faculty in history would see red if people from other disciplines got to

define what good teaching is in their area. In response, Carlson wondered if the reference is perhaps to how teaching is described in the P&T document, to which Pope responded that there may not be a historian on the committee, though. This is not unrelated to Shapiro's push to evaluate teaching, said Phye, who asked whether the recommendations here are for each college or across colleges; the latter he thought would be impossible.

Part of the concern here pertains to the number of appeals in which there are differences in teaching loads and expectations of performance, said Porter. On the other hand, he noted that sometimes the position responsibility statement was the same for everybody, so maybe standardization can be taken too far. Pope suggested that maybe the document should go back to the council for reconsideration. Although the Provost declared that he is supportive of the general direction, he said standardization will prove impossible. He suggested, however, that the document could be fixed by simply saying clarification rather than definition and standardization of teaching.

Palermo said the problem is DEOs and deans who do not respect the P&T document, especially those who demand that you become all things, some things, and no things. The Provost, however, disagreed. Heising also expressed disbelief that these matters can be standardized: in colleges with heavy research, that will dominate P&T, said Heising, who added that if you are a mediocre teacher it will not matter.

If each department and college has its own procedures for P&T, asked Hutter, can the LAS Dean take the position that the college's standards can be higher than those of the university? How do you react to the notion that everybody can be out there trying to outdo the university? Provost Richmond replied by stating that the list will always differ about what to do for P&T and then posed a couple of rhetorical questions: "Are there differences now? Yes. Do they contradict the university's general P&T document? I think not." Acknowledging Jack's concerns about his own department not paying enough attention to teaching and learning, Richmond nevertheless said it's a fool's errand to try to get everybody to agree on this. What we are trying to do, he said, is move the whole body a little bit to see learning and teaching as more important. He stressed that the recently revised P&T document is very good.

Porter recommended that governance documents of departments be brought on board for this project. To be sure, said Porter, there is no absolute uniformity, but we can try to get closer to it. The difference between policy and the administration, and policy and implementation is what he has been discussing with Shapiro this year. Porter said he would give the document to Tony for his meeting on December 15.

B. FDAR Council

Greg Palermo, Chair, reported on two matters: early retirement and the conduct policy. In the matter of the conduct policy, he stated that the Council needs to work on it some more before bringing it to the Senate. Concerning the conduct policy, Provost Richmond said we are not facing a crisis but certainly do not want to face a

grievance without such a policy. He expressed the hope that the policy could be taken to the Regents for the February, which may be possible, said Palermo, because we hope that the proposed changes will be editorial rather than substantive. Hopper asked the Provost whether it is true that administrative officers, e.g., a dean, can say there will be no early retirements in a given college. The Provost said, yes, citing Ames Lab as a unit that does not permit early retirement. His office, noted Richmond, would be pleased to work with faculty members who believe they're not being treated fairly in this regard.

C. Governance Council

Max Porter, Chair, announced that departmental elections need to be held December 11 and 15 and that on December 21st departmental elections should be complete. From January 14 to January 29 the at-large seats are to be filled, and January 29 will mark the close of nominations for at-large. On February 11 there will be electronic voting for at-large senators. The president-elect, said Porter, will be voted on at the January meeting.

Porter noted that by-law changes are being made under the procedures document and that the group working on this meets tomorrow morning at 8:00.

D. RPA Council

[No report, due to the absence of Bill Woodman, Chair]

E. Judiciary Council

Dorothy Fowles, Chair, reported that there currently are three appeals and that a meeting of the Council will be held on December 17th. The council, she noted, is using comparative data in its review of the judiciary process.

F. LAS Caucus

Problems with printing and a place to meet were reported by Jim Hutter, Chair, who asked the Provost if Scheman could give us rooms for one hour a month at no cost. Pope pointed out that space is available but at \$250 a room. Hutter recommended that Wortman explore where the LAS Caucus should meet next year and that he ask other caucus chairs if they are having any problems. We have offered the LAS Caucus the use of 107 Lab of Mechanics, said Pope, but then they would have to drive over to Scheman or else meet in the room in Scheman where the full Senate meets. Hutter expressed skepticism that anyone would come if the caucus meeting were held in a place other than where the full senate meets. To Wortman's question about why the Senate left Vet Med, Hopper said that at times access was a problem there as well.

The sound system and parking were also problems, added Hutter. Porter concluded the discussion by noting that the psychology of holding a meeting has a lot to do with what goes on.

IV. New Business

A. Athletic Department

Hopper stated that a committee is working on the NCAA accreditation review and welcomed comment from the Executive Board about the handout. As Hopper noted, nominations used to be solicited from the entire university community. Hutter said he understands that the NCAA believes the President is responsible, which means that the person who serves as a representative is really representing the president. Perhaps, stated Hutter, we could insist on Senate confirmation for the person selected by the President to serve. We should emphasize, however, that the President has the right to say it is his right to appoint, that senators really do not have a role in this.

Noting that Licklider has said that she believes her responsibility is to report to faculty, Hopper stated that the committee included language to that effect in the document. Last time the announcement was put out university-wide, said Hopper, who recalled that Barbara was nominated by Joanna. According to the document, said Hutter, the Committee on Committees serves the President by coming up with names. Hopper said the idea was that the Committee on Committees could make comments about the names. Porter expressed his concern that it ties the hand of the President too much to say “a list of no less than two nominees.”

Hopper said he would communicate with Mark tonight about the Executive Board discussion. If possible, the final language should be in the document by the open forum on December 11. The other half of this is that whatever goes in here should have the approval of the president. Therefore, Hopper said he suggests to the Executive Board that this recommendation be taken to the committee. According to Porter, we have the procedures document and Committee on Committees on our burner, and we should probably review this. Palermo said that his committee cheerfully surrenders it.

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

Constance Post,
Faculty Senate Secretary