

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD
January 11, 2002
107 Lab of Mechanics

Call to Order:

The meeting of the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Christie Pope, President, at 3:10 p.m. on January 12, 2002.

Attendance:

Present: Sanjeev Agarwal, Susan Carlson, Janice Dana, Dorothy Fowles, Carolyn Heising, Anthony Hendrickson, David Hopper, Jim Hutter, Gregory Palermo, Connie Post, Christie Pope, Max Porter, Rollin Richmond, William Woodman, Max Wortman.

Absent: Michael Duffy, Gary Phye.

Substitute members: Claudia Baldwin for Brad Thacker; Brad Thacker for Max Porter.

Guests: Mark Chidister, Lee Fletcher, Shu-min Huang, Ardith Maney, Yi Poon.

- I. **The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Board on December 4, 2001 were approved.**
- II. **The agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on January 15, 2002 was tentatively approved.**
- III. **Announcements**
 - A. **President Christie Pope**
 1. President Pope stated that the Board of Regents says it does not have to approve our nontenure-track policy, an observation confirmed by Provost Richmond, who said the President's Office consulted the Board of Regents about the matter and was told the same. Pope announced that she and Max Wortman will meet with Associate Provost Susan Carlson and ISU Counsel Paul Tanaka on Monday, 1/14, to consider some small changes in wording; if these proceed without a hitch, the policy can be placed on the agenda for the Executive Board meeting on January 22. A committee to handle requests for exceptions must be set up, said Pope, who suggested that the matter be given to the FDAR Council and that the Provost be given an actual vote on the committee.

Motion by Wortman to have the committee to consider exceptions composed of members of the FDAR Council together with the Provost,

who will also have a vote, was passed unanimously.

2. Council heads were requested by Pope to submit reports to be distributed electronically.
3. Pope asked the Executive Board for a motion to bring before the Senate about having a non-voting faculty member on the Board of Regents, noting that it is the Chair of the Board who does not believe the person should be able to vote if the person is an employee of the university.

Motion by Wortman to bring before the Senate the matter of having a non-voting faculty member on the Board of Regents was passed unanimously.

4. Pope announced that two guests will attend the meeting of the Executive Board on January 22: Paula Morrow to discuss university professorships and John Schuh to consider the review of the Office of Student Affairs.
5. In response to her request about the review of the Office of External Affairs, Pope reported that President Geoffroy believes it is a waste of good faculty time to proceed with the review now that the office has been disbanded.

Motion to terminate the review of the Office of External Affairs was passed. Max Wortman suggested that a thank-you note be sent to members of the committee.

6. Pope reminded members of the Executive Board that it has a lot of work to do during the second semester because that is when the councils get cooking. She said she will not invite a speaker to the Senate this spring unless there is a pressing need to do so.
7. At the March meeting of the Board of Regents to be held in Ames, Pope announced that the Executive Board is hosting a luncheon for the Board on the 13th and said that Executive Board members will be sent brochures about members of the Board of Regents.
8. Reporting Hutter's concern about the university calendar, Pope noted that the university calendar committee has completed its work on the calendar for 2005-07 and that it agreed to have graduation no later than December 17th. Tom Loynochan, who chairs the committee, says there is very little flexibility due to so many fixed dates on the calendar. Wortman, pointing out that membership of the committee is not drawn from the Senate, wondered if there should be more faculty representation on the committee. Instead of deans picking the members, Woodman suggested that perhaps caucuses could elect people to serve on it.

B. Provost Rollin Richmond

1. Since three of his four items are on today's agenda, Provost Richmond said he will wait until they come up.
2. Scott Chadwick, he noted, wants his project incorporated into the Senate's processes, and Pope said the Executive Board will work on that for its next meeting.

IV. Council Reports

A. Gregory Palermo (FDAR)

For the election of a senator from his department, Palermo asked if the Executive Board would grant an exception from the by-laws stipulating that an electronic ballot be open for six days. Pope responded that this is a matter for the governance committee, although she noted that the name of this person has been received from the College of Design and entered into the books. Palermo, stating that his department knows this person and knows the person is willing to serve, said that the department will proceed with the casting of private ballots unless he hears differently.

[Pope announced that the last portion of the meeting today will be reserved for Mark Chidister on the subject of benchmarks. President Geoffroy, having seen the benchmarks prepared by the University of Iowa, wants to produce something like this for ISU.]

B. James Hutter (LAS Caucus)

On behalf of the LAS caucus, Hutter stated a two-part resolution concerning the calendar:

1. Classes for Spring Semester of any year shall not begin prior to the day following the Martin Luther King national holiday celebration. Spring break shall occur between the end of first half semester classes and the beginning of second half semester classes.
2. Fall Semester exams shall conclude on or before December 18th unless that is a Thursday, in which case they may conclude on Friday the 19th.

Things happen around here, said Hutter, only if you have a resolution and vote on them. He said, however, that while he does not mind if we take a look at the calendar committee, the LAS Caucus does want to move on this.

Provost Richmond remarked that the issue is not simple, and Hutter responded that he is not asking for a snap vote. Pope suggested that the matter should be given to FDAR for further consideration. Fowles, noting that the dates of Spring Break are legislated for all three institutions, asked if ISU has the freedom to change the dates. Hutter's resolution should be deferred until next

month, said Wortman, who recommended that the intervening time be used by the Office of the Provost to look into the matter further. Pope stated that the resolution will be sent to FDAR but said the Council will be asked to hold off on it until the following Executive Board meeting to which Tom Loynochan, Chair of the University Calendar Committee, will be invited.

C. Tony Hendrickson, Academic Affairs Council

Hendrickson announced that his council has made a recommendation on the task force on the value of teaching and that the Executive Board has sent it back to them in several different drafts. A third draft, he said, has been prepared by Hutter. Pope suggested that the draft be sent by e-mail and voted on at the next meeting.

V. Special Report on Ombudsperson by Dorothy Fowles, Chair of Council on Judiciary and Appeals

In preparing its proposal, Fowles said the Council identified six major universities with an ombudsperson and an association known as the University and College Ombuds Association. According to Fowles, President Geoffroy agrees that the position could be filled by someone who is retired. Highlighting the recommendations prepared by the Council, Fowles noted that the person would be appointed by the President, which is the way it is done at the University of Maryland. A completely independent position, the person holding it would report directly to the President and would submit a written report to the President every two months as well as an annual report. The last three pages of the Council's ombuds proposal contains an appendix outlining the standards of practice for university or college ombuds.

Provost Richmond commented that at a school where he worked the person had guaranteed access to any office in the university, and wondered if the Council might want to add that to its proposal as well as reconsider the stipulation that a written report be submitted every two months. Richmond noted that a university with an ombudsperson had only two or three grievances a year in contrast to another university without one that had more than three hundred.

Palermo raised a procedural point about how the suggestions made by the Executive Board should be handled, given the approval of the proposal by the Judiciary and Appeals Council. Pope responded that the Executive Board can change any reports made to it by a council. Hutter, who recommended that the Executive Board hold off voting on the ombuds proposal until its next meeting, wondered if it could be sent to the Senate to be considered but not voted on until the following meeting. Pope said yes.

Motion to amend the ombuds proposal by stipulating that the person shall have direct access to any university officer and that the person need submit only one written report per term was passed.

[Pope stated she wanted to move to VIII on the agenda for today's meeting.]

VI Special Report on ERIP Policy by Gregory Palermo, FDAR Council Chair, and Ardith Maney, W&B Committee Chair. [VIII on the agenda]

Palermo noted Point #2 on the memo dated 12/8/01 that he handed out, and Maney called attention to the January 9th proposal released by the central administration of the university. The Executive Board was reminded that the Faculty Senate has only until February 12 to make recommendations in order to get the matter on the docket for the Board of Regents meeting in March. Unlike the administration's document, which fleshes things out specifically, Maney stressed that the Welfare and Benefits Committee looked at the principles involved.

According to Carlson, the matter is driven by the Regents' time line, not Warren Madden's. Conceding that it is not very much time to talk about something really important to everyone, Carlson pointed out that the options proposed are less generous than what we have now, that distinctions are now drawn between faculty and other employees, and that age can no longer remain a factor for all employees (but can for faculty).

Maney stated that her committee has highlighted issues it believes have assumed more importance in a constrained budget environment. The administration's policy raises a number of possibilities, she said, and for most of us this is a lot of stuff to think about. According to Maney, it may not be possible to have this come before the Faculty Senate before the deadline of February 12. Carlson noted that this is an internal date, which means, said Pope, that the matter could be brought before the Senate at its February 12 meeting.

Palermo urged members of the Executive Board to examine the packet, including the memo from Maney, the Faculty Senate guidelines for ERIP prepared by a group on November 5th, the cover memo of January 9th, and an undated plan. The recommendations prepared by the W&B Committee should be reviewed to determine whether those principles are right-headed, said Palermo, who asked if it is possible to present the November 5th memo and the material by the group that Warren Madden chairs at the January 22 meeting of the Senate and then vote on it at the February 12 meeting. He also urged that the Madden document be examined in light of the principles enunciated by the W&B Committee. Noting that the W&B Committee that she chairs chose the principles and that an earlier document prepared by W&B also addressed principles, Maney pointed out that there are things in the Madden document that her committee did not know about and therefore could not address. She also said that it looks as though this document, which has been prepared by a special committee organized by the administration and the University Benefits Committee and chaired by someone on it, is going to be sent to that very committee.

Provost Richmond stated that the President is interested in meeting the deadline put in place by the Regents and, having asked Madden to do this, will probably move along based on this report and on the input Madden gets from this body and others to develop a plan and then take it to the Regents for approval. To facilitate the discussion, Pope wondered if it would be helpful to send all senators the guidelines developed by the W&B Committee and the Madden memo and ask for their response. If so, said Palermo, we need to enter this under New Business so that everyone will be sent these documents. Sending them out in a packet, said Woodman, is not enough;

something needs to be appended to it.

In response to the discussion about whether Madden's memo actually contains a proposal, Provost Richmond said that the guts of a proposal can be found in the "Safe Harbor" section. For the cover sheet to be appended to the packet of material sent to senators, Maney suggested that it include the time line as well as highlight such issues as whether the early retirement of faculty should be linked to other employees, etc. She also noted that the Madden plan says there should be some kind of appeal process. This is something new, said Maney, who identified it is something her committee brought up and therefore seems that the committee already has had an effect. Maney urged that greater sensitivity be given to the criteria for making decisions at the departmental level in order to create a paper trail for a faculty member who feels aggrieved in this matter.

To Thacker's question about how many types of plan would be available, Woodman said right now there is only one and that discretion is wholly at the unit level. Under the Madden memo, all faculty would be covered by the same plan, so the Safe Harbor constitutes a problem here since faculty are exempted from age as a retirement mandate. Woodman said it is not clear that the IRS will buy into this plan and warned that if it does not then it we should not accept this. Another issue, said Woodman, is whether it will be a faculty member's choice.

Pointing out that the Executive Board had already spent half an hour discussing the issue,

Wortman expressed his concern about how to expedite the matter of bringing it before the Senate where it is likely to generate considerable discussion. Woodman suggested that the issue be put on a website with an FAQ section. Pope expressed confidence that W&B Committee and the FDAR Council will come up with clear resolutions to prepare for the Faculty Senate, and Wortman underscored the importance of keeping it simple.

To Maney's query about whether her committee is expected to produce something simple by next Tuesday, Pope said no.

VII. Report on the Conduct Policy by Gregory Palermo, FDAR Council Chair [VI on the agenda]

President Pope noted that the Conduct Policy was approved by the President last May, but that recent court decisions require some changes to be made. Last month the Provost's Office issued several suggestions as a result of recent legal cases, she said, and the Executive Board needs to know whether these are clarifications. If they are, then the FDAR Council can move them forward and grant them here; however, said Pope, if these are policy changes, then they need to be taken back to the Senate. Stating that most of the changes in the Conduct Policy are minor, Palermo called the attention of the Executive Board to the following substantive changes that have been made by the Office of the Provost and ISU Counsel Paul Tanaka (Note: Material added to the Conduct Policy draft dated 10/24/01 has been underlined and a line placed through deleted material):

- #1: Except in the course of approved research activities or accepted teaching practice, intentionally providing false information, orally or in writing, to others with the understanding that they may rely upon such information, is ~~damaging to~~ violates the trust placed in faculty. Alteration of documents

used for official purposes is both a violation of law and is misconduct.
[10/24/01 Conduct Policy draft, page 10: lines 1-5]

Palermo reported that the FDAR Council considers this change to be beneficial to faculty because it “clarifies the process of ‘intentionally providing false information’ for approved research activities or accepted teaching practice; creates an exception for providing false information in these instances.”

#2: ~~In cases where there is a reasonable indication of criminal violation related to academic misconduct allegations involving federal funding, the Provost will notify ORI for consideration of reporting to the relevant agency~~ are research misconduct allegations involving funded projects, the Provost will notify the ORI so that the ORI may recommend interim action to the Provost for the purpose of protecting the integrity of the project. [10/24/01 Conduct Policy draft, page 14: lines 21-26]

According to Palermo, substituting the word *allegation* for a *reasonable indication of criminal violation* maintains the responsibility of the Office of the Provost for the protection of research project integrity. This change, Palermo reported, is considered neutral to positive from the perspective of the faculty.

#3 Faculty members shall not be suspended for periods less than one week.
[10/24/01 Conduct Policy draft, page 27]

Palermo reported that the FDAR Council believes this sentence constitutes arbitrary penalty-length clause that does not appear in the original document and that the sentence pre-empts the process of determining minor sanctions. The sentence therefore is judged to be detrimental from a faculty perspective, and the FDAR Council proposes to delete it. The minimum suspension of a week is necessary, said Carlson, because anything less would completely alter the way ISU reports salary and benefits. To Palermo’s query about why salary and benefits could not be calculated for a day, Carlson said there have been cases of police officers for whom a day’s worth of salary and benefits somehow made the Police Department liable for much more. She added that it would be useful for Tanaka to explain this to the committee that crafted the Conduct Policy.

Motion to accept the FDAR Council’s three recommended changes to the 10/24/01 Conduct Policy draft was passed.

VIII. ISU Benchmarks Report by Mark Chidister, Lee Fletcher, Shu-min Huang, and Yiu Poon [IX on the agenda]

Lee Fletcher, noting that the strategic plan of the university is the charge of his committee, reported that Mark Chidister from the President’s Office conveyed to the committee and to the council the President’s perception that input is needed for performance indicators. The issue is how progress under the plan should be measured.

According to Chidister, fifty performance indicators were crafted for the strategic plan last year but where ISU wanted to go with these was unclear. To facilitate discussion, a draft of the indicators was sent to Fletcher, Woodman, and Pope to distribute among members of the Faculty Senate, said Chidister, who emphasized the need to whittle the number down. He stated, moreover, that ISU needs to decide which ones to track individually and which to compare with other institutions before taking these back to the Board of Regents for their review and approval at the March meeting. As soon as he gets the input of the Faculty Senate, said Chidister, he will submit a plan to the President.

Chidister pointed out that some of the performance indicators are easier to assess than others. For example, ISU measures the graduation rate using six years as a benchmark, a national standard although U of I uses a four-year graduation rate. Other benchmarks are more difficult to assess, according to Chidister, who said that ISU is trying to assess the student's experience on campus, which is really difficult. Unlike the gathering of statistics about whether they graduate or get a job, whether they learn is much harder to assess.

Hutter questioned whether using graduation rates as a benchmark is a positive thing, given that some people should not be graduating at all. Chidister suggested that the question be turned around to ask what ISU should be doing to bring these students up to speed. Hutter, hinting that the problem is not restricted to graduation rates but goes back to the admissions process, suggested that ISU ought to admit only those who are qualified and skip the rest.

Tony Hendrickson, speaking for the Academic Affairs Council, said it has discussed how ISU might know when it is the best and believes objective methods for determining that are important. In the matter of admissions, said Hendrickson, comparison with peer institutions is important; at ISU, for example, anyone who graduates in the top 50% of the class is admitted whereas at the University of Illinois it is the top 20% or so. Raw material, Hendrickson concluded, is greatly different at Illinois from what it is here. Many students who come here may not belong, he said, and concentrating on graduation rates only serves to perpetuate what should not have been started in the first place.

What complicates the matter further is that different disciplines require different indicators, said Shu-Min Huang. Another issue, he noted, is that ISU emphasizes research, but teaching now receives a lot of attention and several of the indicators reflect that. Yiu Poon pointed out that some of the performance indicators are in conflict with each other; for example, ISU wants to increase the six-year undergraduate graduation rate and increase the number of minority students, yet these students do not graduate as quickly.

Actually, said Chidister, the Office of Student Affairs is doing extraordinary things to help improve the six-year graduation rate. He reported that last year's persistence rate for minority students in the second year was greater than it was in the rest of the student body. To Chidister's query about the best way to get input from faculty and what the time frame might be, Pope suggested a response by e-mail within a week. Hutter, asking if senators would be responding to the 29 benchmarks, declared a week to be a bit abrupt. Acknowledging that the targets seem wonderful, Palermo said he has absolutely no idea whether any of them make sense. For example, in the matter of patents he wondered if ISU is looking for a 10% increase in them from 45 to 50 and asked if there is a presumption that the number of patents granted and the number of

students graduated are linked to mind. Chidister, who stated that he would be glad to provide senators with the information given to a subgroup that shows a five-year trend for all 50 performance indicators, expressed his concern that there aren't enough measures on here for the generation of mind and said he hopes the senate can help in this matter.

Hendrickson asked if the indicators appear in a prioritized order, and Chidister said no. He also responded to the issue raised by Hendrickson and others about whether the goals are in conflict with each other, especially for the performance indicator about more engaged teaching: is that possible, he asked, at the same time attention is given to creating more funded research, another performance indicator? According to Chidister, some of the 50 performance indicators generated from the tripartite intersections do not fit neatly into any of the categories and there is a perception that some of these are in conflict.

Other concerns about performance indicators emerged in the discussion. Carolyn Heising asked if the indicators truly reflect our diversity, and Fletcher wondered if progress on any one goal counts as much as progress on another. Are there key performance indicators, he asked, and what framework are we using to come up with a set of these? Addressing the matter of qualitative benchmarks, Wortman said he thinks Shapiro would be very interested in qualitative data since he is doing student learning kinds of things. Wortman admitted, however, that qualitative data probably does not show up in performance indicators for which comparisons with peer institutions are available. Hutter stated his desire to see all 50 performance indicators--not just the 29--and asked if it would be possible to see more data than just the targets for 2005. For example, he asked if the six year undergraduate graduation rate differs for students with SAT scores at different levels. A summary of that data is already available, said Palermo, and it shows that the higher the SAT score the higher the graduation rate in virtually all disciplines throughout ISU. The discussion of performance indicators ended with Hutter's recommendation that any document going to the Board of Regents have more detail in it.

IX. Family Leave Policy Report by Gregory Palermo and Constance Post [VII on agenda]

Palermo opened the discussion of the Family Leave Policy by recommending that the Executive Committee receive the report and forward it to the Senate for its consideration. In response to Palermo's question about whether the President is working on a broader policy, Provost Richmond said this is the best we can get at the present time. If we can get something through, he added, we can try to broaden it later.

After thanking Provost Richmond and Associate Provost Carlson for facilitating discussion of the policy, Connie Post reported on the collaborative efforts of W&M and UCW in drafting a response to the administration's draft of the document, Supporting the Arrival of Children for ISU Faculty and P&S Employees.

According to Post, the two committees have five concerns: broadening the policy, funding the policy, minding the tenure clock, comparing policies of peer institutions, and checking AAUP guidelines. Members of W&M have passed the following motion: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate Committee on Women and Minorities approves, with qualifications, the Supporting the Arrival of Children for ISU Faculty and P&S

Employees policy issued by the Office of the Provost. This qualified approval requires a formal review of the policy within a year.”

Motion to receive and forward resolution for parental leave and to have the FDAR Council provide additional guidance before the February Faculty Senate meeting was passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Constance Post
Faculty Senate Secretary