

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, April 16, 2002
3:10-5:10 p.m.
107 Lab of Mechanics

Call to Order:

The meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board on Tuesday, April 16, 2002 was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by Christie Pope, President.

Attendance:

Present: John Cunnally (DES Caucus Chair), Janice Dana (FCS Caucus Chair), Jack Girton (AG Caucus Chair Substitute), Dorothy Fowles (J&A Council Chair), Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus), Anthony Hendrickson (Academic Affairs Council Chair), David Hopper (Faculty Senate Past-President), Jim Hutter (LAS Caucus Chair), Gregory Palermo (FDAR Council Chair), Christie Pope (Faculty Senate President), Gary Phye (EDU Caucus Chair), Max Porter (Governance Council Chair) Connie Post (Faculty Senate Secretary), Bill Woodman (RPA Chair), and Max Wortman (Faculty Senate President-Elect).

Absent: Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair), Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Provost Rollin Richmond, Susan Carlson (Provost Office).

- I. Approval of Minutes and Agenda:** The minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting on April 2, 2002 and the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on May 7, 2002 were accepted by consent.

II. Announcements

A. Faculty Senate President Christie Pope

- 1. Resolution about Protected Categories.** Pope has received word from President Geoffroy about actions taken by the Faculty Senate, and he has agreed to the resolution about protecting categories. After budget reductions for 03, he will no longer seek any budget reductions in the total number of faculty or in library acquisitions.
- 2. Ombuds Proposal.** President Geoffroy, who is still considering the ombuds proposal that was passed by the Faculty Senate, is worried that P&S will want one too. He is also worried about the cost. Pope said she suggested to him that an hourly wage be paid and that the Faculty Senate office secretary be used to handle phone calls. President Geoffroy also objected to the recommendation by the Faculty Senate that three former faculty members be hired for the position. Three would be too many, said Geoffroy, who told Pope he prefers to hire one and a back-up. Geoffroy also responded to the Faculty Senate resolution that says such a person can be fired but only with the consent of the Executive Board. He could not imagine firing someone, Geoffroy said, but nevertheless prefers to have flexibility so would like to replace the phrase "with the consent of the Ex-

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

ective Board” with the phrase, “after consultation with the Executive Board”. Geoffroy will get back in touch with Pope soon about this matter, and the Faculty Senate will then appoint a committee to work with him on this. Pope said she hopes this will be done in time to put it on the May consent agenda. If the persons are paid on an hourly basis, asked Tony Hendrickson, what difference does it make if it’s one or a hundred? Pope said Geoffroy is concerned that a person will go to one and perhaps not like the person, so go to another, etc. Jim Hutter said that the issue of Geoffroy being able to dismiss someone is something to which we would have to accede. When he says consult, though, make sure it is an actual meeting, not something by telephone or e-mail. The rule was not written with this President in mind, said Bill Woodman, but with previous ones. Jack Girton recommended that the ombuds proposal use the language of the Conduct Policy which states that when the President disagrees, he must meet and discuss his reasons.

3. **Executive Board Meeting on April 30.** Pope said there is little business to conduct at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board. Therefore, with its consent, she will cancel the meeting if there are only a few small items to take care of that might be easily handled by e-mail, etc. In that case, said Wortman, he would move the administrative committee meeting up to the 30th.
4. **Hopper’s Motion about Streets and Buildings.** Pope reported that President Geoffroy likes the motion but does want to add the phrase, “in very rare exceptions,” so that he will never be totally boxed in. Geoffroy notes that it is customary for someone to pay for 30 to 40% of a building in order for it to bear her/his name. He also mentioned that faculty sometimes do come up with money for the naming of a room, a lab, or a library within a building. Pope said she has appointed David Hopper as a committee of one to work these matters out with Geoffroy. Wortman stated that several rooms in the Honors Building have been named. Woodman, however, noted that the process of doing that is usually not vetted by the University, although the Brenton people and the College of Agriculture did work out an agreement. A similar agreement, said Wortman, was worked out between Andersen and the College of Business. Girton said he does not mind exceptions as long as it is spelled out in writing how they will be dealt with. That way the Faculty Senate can understand what President Geoffroy wants.
5. **Family Leave Policy.** Pope, who reported that the Family Leave Policy passed by the Faculty Senate was more generous and better than the one under consideration for the rest of the university, said that parts of the Senate’s policy could be an addendum. The Senate’s policy was used more as a model, said Pope, who noted that Geoffroy is now putting the language of the Senate proposal into the main proposal and that Paul Ta-

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

naka will look it over. Connie Post noted that the policy for faculty and P&S employees received the approval of the President's Cabinet on March 11, and gave an update on the status of the two separate consent items passed by the Senate about the policy. The first concerns an extension of the probationary period and is currently under revision by Post and Susan Carlson for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook where it will appear in a section that covers the full range of circumstances under which an extension of the probationary period may be requested. Pope noted that Geoffroy will withhold approval of the document on the probationary period until he reads the document from Tanaka. According to Post, the second consent item addresses leave with or without pay as well as the timing of the leave and other matters that have now been folded within the broad policy that pertains to faculty and P&S.

Post pointed out that the major change in this consent item is the narrowing of the categories for the arrival of children: whereas the Faculty Senate document includes "the birth of a child, or for the start of care for a child under the age of five who is an adopted or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis," the university policy covers only "the initial period of a child's arrival in the home, whether by birth or adoption of a child five years and under." In the matter of adoption, however, the university policy has been widened to include the following: "The adoption of a child from ages 6-17 may qualify upon the demonstration of need." Hutter said he is disappointed that the categories included in the Senate document have not been incorporated in the university policy and said they will have to be put back in at a later time.

Another change, said Post, has occurred in the university policy. Instead of a paragraph about a mandated review at the end of three years, which was endorsed by Jackie Litt and Liz Beck for UCW, Rex Heer for P&S, and Post for the Faculty Senate, a sunset clause has been inserted stating that the policy will expire in three years. The original document submitted by the Faculty Senate, P&S, UCW, and the Office of the Provost stated that the policy would be reviewed at the end of three years.

6. **Dead Week Proposal.** Pope stated that the President has agreed to the Dead Week Proposal.
7. **Provost Search Committee.** Pope reported that in her meeting with Geoffroy today she told him there is only one person from LAS on the Provost Search Committee, and that the person is from psychology. No one is on it from the humanities, noted Pope, who said Geoffroy acknowledged that several persons had spoken to him about this omission and that he is going to add to that committee another person from the humanities.
8. **2% Reallocation:** Pope stated that at today's meeting with President

Geoffroy, he said that legally speaking the Board of Regents expects ISU to reallocate 2% of department monies every year, and that this 2% will be turned back to the President's office to reallocate. He pointed out, however, that this is not being done, and as a result the reallocation is really smoke and mirrors. Pope said Geoffroy told her that he expects the next MGT-America report to insist on it.

9. **President's Advisory Committee on Planning and Budget.** Pope said she suggested that Geoffroy might want to consider accepting part of RPA--or at least the planning and budget committee under RPA--as the new advisory committee, but that Geoffroy stated this is not exactly what he has in mind. What he wants is a committee smaller than the current task force with maybe three faculty from the Faculty Senate plus six more faculty members. Geoffroy also said he wants all colleges represented and that members of the committee would have a one- to two-year term. Pope said she discussed with Geoffroy the matter of expertise versus general policy-making as well as the importance of having someone committed to this over some period of time. Geoffroy said he did not view the matter of having people without this expertise as that big a problem because he does not want a committee to deal with policy or budget. What he wants the committee for is to advise him about allocating the resources that are there. Pope pointed out that such a role really is policy, if, for example, you decide to give the College of Business all the money or spread it out. Geoffroy, said Pope, wants allocations to be considered for strategic effectiveness.

Hendrickson wondered how Geoffroy would define policy and budget apart from strategic effectiveness. Pope, who responded that she tried to find out but did not come away with a good understanding, said that on the task force members were supposed to be involved with strategic planning, that the deans made actual plans, and the task force was shown the plans. This committee, said Pope, would not be doing the nitty gritty work.

Pope reported that she asked Geoffroy how he would like to relate to the Faculty Senate in the future. Stating that he has read all the literature, including *Getting to Yes*, Geoffroy said he would like to have more discussions with the Senate before it passes a bill because he thinks there is too much inflexibility once the Senate takes a position. Pope said she explained to Geoffroy that part of the problem is that the Faculty Senate is perceived by the faculty as being too cosy with the administration. She also noted that she has been sending Geoffroy in a formal way things the Senate passes and has tried to get him to respond formally to them. Pointing out that she likes the Faculty Senate to try to figure out first what it thinks about an issue, Pope said she mentioned to Geoffroy that a lot of things passed in the Faculty Senate are things he does not have to sign off on. One example is tasers, a resolution passed by the Senate on which

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

Geoffroy did not have to say whether he agreed or disagreed. To these comments, Pope said Geoffroy responded that at Maryland there was someone from the President's office that sat in on the Executive Board but that the person would not say much unless there was something important that should be mentioned. Pope told Geoffroy that the Provost attends meetings of the Executive Board, and Geoffroy replied that this year that has not always worked out well in terms of the Provost communicating with the President. Tasers, for example, were not important to the Provost, said Geoffroy, but that as President they were very, very important to him. He therefore urged that having a presidential assistant attend meetings of the Faculty Senate Executive Board be considered. Geoffroy stated that he wants to restructure his office, not by replacing Dobbs but by adding someone who will make speeches for him and to whom he will delegate a lot of responsibility.

Wortman said that such an appointment will make two offices that the Faculty Senate did not have much communication with this year: the President's office and the Provost's office. By that, he said he does not mean Pope's communication with them but the lack of communication, for example, between the Provost and the Vice Provost on Senate matters. If the proposed non-budget task force has six faculty on it that are not from the Faculty Senate, said Dorothy Fowles, then the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees should be in a position to know who would be representative of the faculty. She added that the responsibility should still come out of the Faculty Senate. Pope stated that Geoffroy did not say how he intends to do that, but did say that he depends on other administrators for advice about whom to appoint. According to Fowles, the perception as to who is making the appointments is important. Wortman said Fowles made a very good point. He noted that he has asked Denise Vrchota about a list of faculty on all university committees, and that Vrchota says the list no longer exists. Given the President's preference for inclusiveness, said Wortman, he needs to consider what those committees are like. Wortman added that Maryland has many committees with Faculty Senate sorts sitting on them.

Pope said that faculty chosen for this advisory committee should meet and discuss issues impacting faculty. Palermo wondered about the size of the committee, and Pope stated that there would be three from the Faculty Senate, plus six other faculty, in addition to administrators.

Wortman said he is pleased that gender distribution is even on the search committee for a new provost.

B. Faculty Senate President-Elect Max Wortman

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

1. **Administrative meetings.** There will be an administrative committee meeting on April 23 and August 27 to make sure everything is rolling along.
2. **Site of Faculty Senate Meetings for 02-03.** Next year the Faculty Senate meetings will be held at Gateway where the room size will be slightly larger.
3. **J&A.** Wortman stated that he does not want to take up Fowles' J&A matters at this time.

III. Reports of Councils

- A. **RPA (Woodman).** Responding to Pope's request for advice about RPA, Bill Woodman said things are unsettled with Geoffroy creating a new entity to deal with policy and budget. It is not clear what the function of the RPA Council is to be, and people who have sat on it and worked for years on it feel marginalized and are unhappy. Nothing can be done until we know about the entity that will be set up, so Woodman recommended that the council just sit tight and see what happens. If Geoffroy sets up an entity and the council has just a little input, then RPA needs to find a function or disappear.

Wortman suggested that the matter be considered in May for the retreat in June. Palermo said that if Geoffroy's committee will not be concerned with policy or budget, then the only place for Geoffroy to get that will be his office. If so, then where will RPA be in all this? asked Palermo, who noted that once the value statements are made and 95% of the budget is accounted for, the remaining portion leaves little to be done. Specifically, 80% is fixed, 11% fluid, and 5% open. Where, then, would be the valued voice of the Senate? Palermo wondered. If his committee is not going to talk about policy and budget, asked Woodman, then why have it?

Regardless of how Geoffroy decides his office will handle the matter of this advisory committee, said Girton, the Faculty Senate should do its own analysis, rather than waiting to be asked to come and sit at the President's feet. Hutter said this is only a good idea if the door is closed to the Faculty Senate and it is shut out. Geoffroy is failing to see his own inconsistency, said Woodman, if he says he wants to work more closely with the Faculty Senate, on the one hand, and then says he will take only three from the Faculty Senate for his advisory committee but on his own chooses six more faculty. Porter recalled that when faculty interviewed Geoffroy, he was asked what he would do if ISU had a 7% budget cut, and he said he would work with each of the groups. Hutter commented that Geoffroy would say this committee would be doing just that.

- B. **Governance Council (Porter)**

- 1. Pope's Memo concerning Newlin's Request.** Max Porter reported that the Governance Council responded to Newlin's recommendation to change "to invite" to "to request" in the Constitution of the ISU Faculty Senate by offering the following alternative of its own: "Develop an accumulated list of proposed changes to the Constitution for a period not to exceed five years. This list is to be reviewed by the Governance Structure and Documents Committee periodically (not to exceed five years) for potential amendments to the Constitution." Porter stated that the Governance Council wants this language placed in the procedures document and said that only something pretty significant should be taken to the general faculty for a change. Newlin's request, in the opinion of the Council, does not seem to meet this requirement. Porter therefore moved on behalf of the Governance Council that this language be adopted. Hutter asked if the procedure recommended by the Governance Council answers what the Board of Regents is suggesting, and wondered if the Faculty Senate does not already have something about changing things. Porter responded that the Council is answering by saying it will put it on the list. According to Hutter, the Faculty Senate should go back to the Board of Regents on this and say absolutely not. Legally speaking, said Pope, Newlin is correct about the Board of Regents having the right to set the agenda. Yes, said Hutter, but the Board of Regents passed the Constitution. Pope pointed out that the Constitution only says that the President invites, and that it is up to the Board of regents to decide if that will be honored. In that case, said Hutter, why not say "recognize" instead of "invite"? Pope said she notices that a President always says, "May I have so and so speak?" That, said Hutter, sounds very much like a formality.

If the recommendation by the Governance Council is passed, asked Pope, does it have to go to the Senate? Porter said that at the May Faculty Senate meeting the Governance Council would like to have an item on the agenda to say the procedures document will be placed on the consent agenda to be received. The document itself will be put on the web. LAS wants this in hard copy, said Hutter, and Pope replied that there is no money to do that.

Motion to develop an accumulated list of proposed changes to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate for a period not to exceed five years was passed.

- 2. Status of Appointments for the Conduct Policy Board of Review.** Pope said that Lloyd Anderson sent them all and that 25 or 35 have been forwarded to the office -- whatever number was asked for. Porter inquired about the points under a, b, and c concerning the status of appointments for the Conduct Policy Board of Review, and Pope said these had all been done. Porter, who announced that the Faculty Handbook Committee met yesterday, directed the Board's attention to the handout, "Nontenure-

Track Faculty Appointments: Text for Faculty Handbook,” and noted that the items on the back were added by the Provost’s office. Porter asked Pope if she agrees with the bulleted items, and she asked Hopper if his committee did. He said yes, and Pope stated that she does, too.

3. **New Item for Faculty Handbook.** Palermo objected to the first and second items on page 1 of the document, “Nontenure-Track Faculty Appointments: Text for Faculty Handbook”. According to Palermo, this does not mean that you have to advertise. He noted that his college is getting ready to set up search committees for each and every kind of position to be filled. Pope stated that master scholars are adjuncts rather than nontenure-track faculty. Palermo countered that the second point says that they are. This means, for example, that if the decision is made to invite a logistics person, this suggests you have to advertise for that person. Maybe, said Pope, this should say with the exception of master scholars. Hopper stated that the matter will be considered by the committee. Pope, who noted that the committee has been struggling with the matter of what to call master scholars and what to call P&S, said it wants to get rid of the title of adjunct.

Porter stated that the administration considers this a done deal and noted that the most recent meeting of the Governance Council was the first time Susan Carlson was in attendance. At that meeting, said Porter, Dean Ulrichson presented this as something that will be going into the handbook. Pope said she would talk to Carlson about this matter. Gary Phye said he heard that the practices outlined in the handout have been set in stone, and Hutter commented that things he believes were accepted somehow did not show up in the final document. Hopper responded that the Nontenure-Track Policy passed by the Faculty Senate stands word for word. What the Executive Board sees here, said Hopper, is the attempt of the Provost’s office and the Transition Committee to meet the immediate need of hiring people for next fall. This problem, said Palermo, is something none of us saw.

According to Porter, when he raised the question at the meeting Susan Carlson said the bulleted items are procedural items only and come out of the Provost’s Office. With respect to master scholars, Palermo said he does not know about other areas, but said that in his own there are certain proven talents. He therefore sees no reason not to create a pool of candidates with proven teaching talent in a regional market rather than conduct a traditional search. Hopper identified another issue, which is that these appointments are now continuing. What you do not want, said Hopper, is someone coming and saying he or she did not have a chance to apply for the appointment. Hutter pointed out that bullet #3 says you do not have to have a search to be advanced to Senior Lecturer. That will be considered at a meeting next week, said Hopper. Acknowledging that his committee

is not infallible, he pointed out that half the people seated around the table at today's Executive Board meeting are serving on the transition committee for the nontenure-track policy.

4. **Faculty Senate By-Laws.** Porter mentioned the changes and stated that the copy distributed to Executive Board members is clean. He then began the discussion of the policy regarding open meetings at Iowa State. Palermo asked if the Faculty Senate is on the list or not, and Pope stated that Paul Tanaka believes only the Faculty Senate meetings have to follow the rule but not others such as the Executive Board, councils, or committees.

C. **J&A Council (Fowles)**

1. **Increase in number of grievances.** Dorothy Fowles, who said Porter and Wortman have been privy to her plight in getting ad hoc investigatory committees going, reported that she had just gotten a third person to serve on the committee. She also stated that she knows of at least two and up to five more grievances that will be filed this year. Clearly there has to be some way to expand the committee if it is going to have that many grievances, said Fowles, who noted that there are five times more grievances this year than last. Pope said Geoffroy is trying to raise standards. According to Fowles, this year the committee has heard four and has two more on the docket and will likely get four or five more. Last year the committee heard two, had one or two the year before, and three the year before that. Palermo said the committee has had as many this year as in the last four or five years.
2. **Need for expanded committee to hear grievances.** Noting that the grievances vary widely in how long they take to hear, Wortman said someone had 25 witnesses. Fowles cited another case in which a person had 18 restitutions that he wants to be made. Given the enormous time required for some cases, Wortman stated that his preference, based on work with Ames Human Relations Commission, is to expand the committee. Currently, said Fowles, there are two members from each college on the committee. When the ad hoc committee meets, there must be a quorum in order to meet. No one should have to meet this often, Fowles said, noting that some people do not return her calls. Most who wish to file a grievance go to the Provost, and he says, oh, go talk to Dorothy. Fowles stated that there are 8 or 9 that she has talked to just in the last two weeks. Wortman said Fowles deserves praise for all her work. Hendrickson wondered if the grievances will be protracted this year because of the Provost leaving, and Fowles responded that some will want to wait until he leaves in order to get a fresh set of eyes. This happens a lot when you get a bad tenure year, said Girton, who noted that with only 18 people on the committee, you need to be able to go to an extended pool for these grievances. If these decisions were announced in September, Girton added, it would

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

not be so bad. Fowles said she likes the idea of having both a committee and an ad hoc committee. Pope requested that Executive Board members submit names of persons to serve on the ad hoc committee.

IV. Special Order: Approval of Tentative Agenda for the Faculty Senate Meeting on May 7, 2002

Pope apologized for such a full agenda on May 7, noting the rituals at the final meeting of the year of passing out mugs, thanking people, and entering memorial resolutions. This is also the meeting at which Owen Newlin, Chair of the Board of Regents, has elected to speak. The only new business, said Pope, is a motion by Emmerson about the ISU Foundation. If it gets anything else from committees, Pope asked the Executive Board if it could be placed on the agenda as consent items. She also wondered if she could get in touch with members about such matters by e-mail. Porter urged that those who worked on the Faculty Handbook Committee be thanked for their efforts, a matter left over from the last meeting.

V. Old Business

A. Recommendations to President Geoffroy on Inclusion of the Senate in his Proposed Planning and Budget Committee. Pope noted that these recommendations have already been discussed by the Executive Board at its meeting today.

B. Recommendations for a Research Committee Related to Bloedel's Office. Porter said the Executive Board needs to do something about this immediately and suggested that it try to make something happen with that committee. When this research committee was first discussed, said Pope, some said it belongs under RPA while others thought it appropriate to place it under AA. Palermo wondered what the mission action of this group would be. Pope turned to Porter, who said that its mission would be issues of importance to faculty, such as distribution and indirect costs involved in research. The committee would be a mechanism to put together input from the Faculty Senate on changes in research at ISU. If it is about budget and dollars' recuperativeness, said Palermo, then it is about RPA; other things might be about AA.

Pope raised the matter of symmetry, noting that RPA, as a late starter, has only one committee under it--unlike AA. Hendrickson said that AA has plenty to do, so it's not as though it needs more. Nevertheless, he expressed concern that research at this university seems to revolve only around dollars so that funded research is valued above scholarship as research. Scholarship relative to research is an academic matter, said Hendrickson, who said that in this area the Provost's Office has a jaundiced eye that looks only at the dollars brought in for research, not at its scholarly value. Perhaps the Governance Council needs to come forward with a proposal, said Hutter. That way matters regarding research could go to two or more places at the same time; however, for that to happen, something in writing is needed from the Governance Council. According to Pope, the Governance

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

Council believes this is something the Executive Board should decide. But wouldn't something in writing be needed as a starter? asked Hutter.

Wortman pointed out that this issue got its start when he was Chair of Academic Affairs and noted that he has also dealt with these matters at other institutions. There is more work under research than we are discussing here today, said Wortman, who believes it properly falls under three councils of the Faculty Senate. When he was on research council, Wortman said he expanded it to 26 people with many in the liberal arts because scientists, who do not understand what the unit of research is for people in the humanities, were getting start-up costs and English people nothing. Clearly, said Wortman, the Faculty Senate needs something like that to take care of issues relevant to the faculty.

Motion to assign the Research Committee to the Academic Affairs Council is seconded.

Porter pointed out that RPA has to deal with the money side, but overarching and most important of all is the issue of academic freedom. The Faculty Senate needs to protect it and right now the administration is not doing that, said Porter, who stated that the research committee could be assigned to any of the three councils. Wherever it is assigned, this committee needs to be formed and get going. Such a committee, Hendrickson said, would need to have expertise from a broad base of people about dollars and allocations, for one. It would also need people who can deal with FDAR issues there, not just the typical skill set of members on Academic Affairs.

Motion to form a research committee under Academic Affairs was passed.

- C. **Recommendations for a committee structure for RPA.** Pope noted that these recommendations had already been discussed at today's meeting.

VI. **New Business: Emerson's Resolution on the Foundation**

As Pope distributed the new Emerson proposal, she noted that Hopper has been appointed by Geoffroy to a committee dealing with this matter. She also reminded members of the Executive Board that the ISU Foundation is private and therefore not subject to the open meetings law, etc. This committee, said Pope, could be advisory to the Foundation and therefore not have to go to the President for approval. Porter said this might be a problem because the Foundation has been set up under a separate corporation. According to Pope, it would put further pressure on the Foundation to open its books.

Hopper reported that there have been fruitful meetings between the press and the Foundation about this matter. Although the IRS requires detailed reports and these have recently been posted on the Foundation's web site, Hopper acknowledged that the Foundation cannot be compelled to do this. Right now, he said, the Foundation is moving in the direction of doing this and the main item of concern is the privacy of its donors. The Foun-

dition is also getting new leadership.

Hendrickson said that unless someone is going to remain anonymous, as it states in the second paragraph of the proposal, it would be possible to know the name and amount without knowing the financial records of the donor. Hutter said he wanted to suggest a brief amendment under paragraph four whereby “be asked” would be deleted and the paragraph would read as follows: “The Senate also recommends that the State Auditor should, at least once every four years, conduct an audit of Foundation records -- in addition to existing private audits that are annually commissioned by the Foundation.”

Porter pointed out that there is already a motion on the floor. Suggested changes, said Pope, should be given to the Executive Board to rewrite and vote on next time. Hopper recommended that everything in the fourth paragraph be deleted starting with “in addition to,” and asked Hutter if he would be willing to accept that.

Motion to amend paragraph four of the proposal was passed, so that it now reads: “The Senate also recommends that the State Auditor should, at least once every four years, conduct an audit of Foundation records.”

Palermo, who inquired about the phrase, “anonymous private donors,” in paragraph two, wondered if could they not be anonymous public donors. Fowles questioned the wording, “need not be made public.” Woodman, who said the canard is always about donors, recommended that the second sentence be dropped as well as the material under (c) [which should be marked (d) since the statement contains two sections marked (b)]. Hopper strongly endorsed the changes suggested by Woodman and urged that the word “donors” be removed. Hutter pointed out that if the material under the second (b) is removed, then it will not be necessary to re-letter the items in the second paragraph.

Palermo inquired about the third paragraph of the proposal, which states that the university will publish an annual report. This motion, said Pope, is to endorse current efforts. Woodman recommended that the sentence be recast to read: “The Senate urges the publication of an annual report that identifies . . .” Palermo reminded members of the Executive Board that the second sentence has been deleted, so that the third paragraph is now the second.

Hopper stated that the amounts transferred to ISU as well as the amounts received by the Foundation are on the web site, which is a public record. The university black hole is not discussed, said Palermo, which is why the material under the current © was added. Porter noted that many donors request that funds go to a particular venue. Every endowment, said Hopper--noting that he has reviewed 1077 of them--has an MOA, a Memorandum of Agreement, that stipulates how the funds can be used. Sometimes, he noted, the MOA is rather bizarre. Pope asked Hopper if he was suggesting that other portions of the proposal be deleted. Hopper responded that the Faculty Senate will look silly if it asks for things that are already available.

Motion to amend Emerson’s proposal regarding ISU and the ISU Foundation was

4/16/02 Executive Board Minutes

passed, and the proposal now reads as follows:

“The Faculty Senate endorses current efforts to make more records of the Iowa State Foundation open to the public in the spirit of openness and the Iowa Open Records Law.

“The Senate endorses the publication of an annual report that identifies:

(a) amounts received by the Foundation;

(b) amounts transferred to Iowa State University; and

(c) how these funds were distributed at the university, college, and departmental levels.

“The Senate also recommends that the State Auditor should, at least once every four years, conduct an audit of Foundation records.”

Palermo requested that an abstention be recorded.

Wortman said he wanted to thank Pope for her work as President of the ISU Faculty Senate this year. [Round of clapping.]

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Constance Post,
Faculty Senate Secretary