

Iowa State University
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
22 January 2002
107 Lab of Mechanics

Call to Order:

The meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board was called to order by Christie Pope, President, at 3:10 p.m. on January 22, 2002.

Present: Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Susan Carlson (Associate Provost), John Cunnally (DES Caucus Chair) Janice Dana (FCS Caucus Chair), Michael Duffy (AGR Caucus Chair), Dorothy Fowles (J&A Council Chair), Carolyn Heising (ENG Caucus Chair), Anthony Hendrickson (Academic Affairs Council Chair), David Hopper (FS Past-President), Jim Hutter (LAS Caucus Chair), Gregory Palermo (FDAR Council Chair), Gary Phye (ED Caucus Chair), Christie Pope (FS President), Max Porter (Governance Council Chair), Connie Post (FS Secretary), William Woodman (RPA Council Chair), and Max Wortman (FS President-Elect).

Substitutes: Claudia Baldwin for Brad Thacker (VET Caucus Chair)

Guests: Eric Hoiberg, Doug Houghton, John Lamont, Paula Morrow, John Schuh.

- I. The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Board on January 11, 2002 were approved.
- II. The agenda for the Executive Board meeting were approved with one change: there will be no announcements by Provost Richmond as this is the one meeting he does not attend. James Hutter asked for the privilege to make a brief announcement in place of Richmond. Max Porter stated that he has two things regarding Governance Council under Announcements and Reports. Motion to approve agenda as amended was passed.
- III. **Announcements**
 - A. **President Christie Pope**
 1. Items on the agenda today include parking, the review of the office of VP of Student Affairs, and a report on university professor awards. Those nominated by their departments should excuse themselves at that time.
 2. Provost Richmond has agreed not to include the one-week suspension in the Conduct Policy. Therefore it is a done deal and headed for the Board of Regents.

1/22/02 Executive Board Minutes

3. Diversity and international requirements have been in place for several years, and a mandated review of that policy will be done this semester. Ken Kruempel, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Curriculum, is in charge of the review, and the Faculty Senate is paying Mary Huba to do assessment surveys.
 4. Mark Chidister, who has pushed back the time for comments by the Faculty Senate on proposed benchmark indicators to February 4, is just looking for reactions. Members of the Executive Board have been asked to send e-mail reactions, which Mark will collect and send back to President Pope. The Faculty Senate Council on Resource Policies and Allocations will do a careful analysis of the responses. Comments may also be sent directly to RPA.
 5. The Faculty Senate will host a luncheon on March 13 for the Board of Regents when it meets at ISU. The luncheon will be paid by the Provost, and members of the Executive Board should make an effort to attend. At the Executive Board meeting on February 5, information on members of the Board of Regents will be distributed.
 6. Members of the Executive Board are invited to an Iowa Awards Ceremony in the Memorial Union on February 13 at which time a posthumous award will be given to George Washington Carver.
 7. Matters regarding the non-tenure track policy will be taken up under new business.
- B.** Provost Rollin Richmond [No announcements since this is the one meeting of the EB that he does not attend]

III. Report by Doug Houghton about Parking

John Lamont, the Faculty Senate representative on the Parking Committee, brought Doug Houghton to speak to the Executive Board about the new policy. Houghton said five years ago he took the job with the understanding that a parking ramp would be built; however, financial analysis revealed that to be impossible, and besides, there was no fee base for it. At that time ISU set up a reserve fund of \$200,000 a year to be used as seed money for new parking on main campus, said Houghton, who noted that in the meantime demand from students for parking greatly increased--skyrocketed, in fact. By June 30, 2002, which marks the end of the five-year period, there will be a million dollars in the reserve fund, Houghton reported. The Parking Division is self-supporting by way of fees and fines for its \$2 million budget, he added, pointing out that it receives no funds from the state or from tuition revenues. The problem with the reserve, according to Houghton, is that you cannot get very far with it, maybe one side of the campus or the other but not

1/22/02 Executive Board Minutes

both. To address parking needs at ISU, the following are included in a \$12.5 million proposal: the further extension of student parking at Jack Trice Stadium, a deck to built on a current lot on central campus, and a new multi-level garage. Houghton explained that a formal study of the proposal will not be done until community sentiment is gauged.

Alternative Plans: Instead of the three projects, the million-dollar reserve fund could be used to build some parking, perhaps a smaller structure, but it would not substantially increase the level of service. Houghton pointed out that parking on the west side of campus, which is about 30-40 cars short, already exceeds capacity; and the east side is at capacity, but will exceed it when the business building opens. Houghton then fielded questions from members of the Executive Board, including the following:

Q&A on Parking: Hutter, who informed John Lamont that Hutter himself and Bill Woodman preceded him on this issue, sought clarification about the amount in the reserve fund, noting that the sum was \$220,000 to be used as seed money so that ISU could ask the Board of Regents for more. Hutter also stated that the Faculty Senate was told that interest on the sum would not be added to it. Houghton responded that the figure of \$200,000 was settled on, but that he would need to check the minutes to be sure. He said the first fee increase netted only \$25,000, so money had to be taken out of revenue. He also noted that a fourth project, a huge lot on the north side of campus, is also planned.

Hutter, who said there have been many complaints from faculty and staff because those who pay the general fee have a shorter walk to their offices than those with reserve stickers who pay a lot more and walk further, asked if the fees might be changed. Houghton replied that the current proposal addresses issues for central campus, not north campus (south side of the railway tracks near Stange). Hutter followed up on his question by inquiring about existing inequities, which Houghton said would be changed in the next five years by the Plant Science Institute.

About four or five years ago, Hutter noted, the Transportation Advisory Council recommended no increase in fees, but there was one anyway. Houghton admitted that it happened, and said it was only a 2-3% increase, and Hutter responded that it was only when Woodman intervened directly with Jischke that Madden was forthcoming about the increase.

Woodman wondered why the faculty are paying for the student parking problem, as outlined by Houghton. Houghton clarified himself, saying he did not mean to imply that. The student problem is more critical, said Houghton, which is why the Trice expansion has been set as a priority. Faculty parking is less of a problem. Woodman countered that he will support the proposal only with the understanding that if one office is built, one parking space will also be built.

The aesthetic issue prompted Duffy to ask where on central campus these structures will be placed. According to Houghton, the campus master plan dictates that the structure on west campus will be behind the College of Design near Howe Hall. The East structure

1/22/02 Executive Board Minutes

will be where the tennis courts are next to the Forker Building, near the lots numbered 50. Fowles, noting that the view is a central feature of the College of Design Building, expressed concern lest the new parking structure be erected in front of that building. Houghton said it is not likely to be placed there.

Faculty need for parking was raised by Max Wortman, and David Hopper responded that there are 355 fewer faculty now.

III. Proposal for Task Force on Teaching

Pope reported that the proposal has been sent back to the Academic Affairs Council, which submitted a new one. Tony Hendrickson, Chair of the Academic Affairs Council, pointed out that in the new proposal definitions and standards are particularized instead of standardized and that a clause about developing the personal responsibility statement has been added. The proposal for the Task Force on the Value of Teaching, noted Pope, originated with Howard Shapiro, who worked with Jack Girton on it. Pope asked if the Task Force is to be formed by the Provost or by the Office of the Provost. Hendrickson said the latter although he expects the Vice Provost to be involved. When Porter said it sounds as though the Office of the Provost is going to add another committee, Pope replied that it will not be a standing committee but a task force and that the Student Evaluation Task Force that Gary Phye and Tony Hendrickson served on is referred to in Girton's proposal. She also noted that Girton's proposal wants to establish a definition of good teaching and a definition of workloads and that the Task Force will seek to clarify the role of teaching on campus. Originally the Task Force was scheduled to report by September 1, but this date now seems too soon, said Pope.

This, remarked Woodman, could be very important for departments that straddle colleges. Duffy, noting that the College of Agriculture examined this issue in the 80s, said a specific date would be helpful. Wortman suggested December 1, and Hutter proposed March 1 as the date for a report to the Faculty Senate. Noting that the date of December 1 means the report will come to the Executive Board in January, Hutter stated that he wants at least one representative from each college to serve on the task force. If the task force is approved, said Wortman, Girton is the logical person to serve as Chair and Pope said she would be happy to appoint him.

Fowles raised a question about the use of the word *standardization* in the old proposal versus *standard* in the new. Hendrickson said to ignore the old proposal and drew the attention of the Executive Board to Line 4 of the new, starting with "exploring the definition and standard of faculty teaching workloads across colleges and disciplines, the creation of definitions of teaching 'excellence' . . ." Hutter recommended that *definition* and *standard* be pluralized. To Phye's comment that the Provost cannot tell you what a standard teaching load is, Hendrickson added that Kevin Schilling in the Music Department says that what is standard in his area is different from what is standard in psychology, etc. Hopper asked Hendrickson and Phye if there is any linkage between this and the student evaluation system, and Phye affirmed that there is. In fact, said Phye,

1/22/02 Executive Board Minutes
this is what it is all about.

Pope asked the Executive Board if it wished to forward the proposal to the Faculty Senate for consideration or forward it with the Executive Board's approval to the Faculty Senate for consideration. Hopper moved that the proposal be endorsed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate for its consideration with appropriate changes in dates and wording. Sanjit Agarwal said that if the proposal is addressing both student evaluations and P&T matters, it should say so, and Hendrickson pointed out that the two are linked but nevertheless separate.

Move to endorse and forward to the Faculty Senate for its consideration the following proposal was passed:

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, it recommends that the exploration of definitions and standards of faculty teaching workloads across colleges and disciplines, the creation of definitions of teaching "excellence" appropriate to the various disciplines, and a clarification of the value or worth of teaching when developing the PRS, considering promotion and tenure decisions, post-tenure review evaluations, and annual merit evaluations. The task force shall consist of a chair and at least 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 issue a report by December 1, 2002.

IV. Non-tenure Track Proposal

Pope stated that today she received two sentences about the proposal from Susan Carlson, who would like to have them inserted under #8 of the Nontenure-track Policy. If the Executive Board accepts these changes, then the Nontenure-Track Policy is a done deal, said Pope, noting that it is not necessary to place this on the calendar for the Board of Regents. If the President signs off on it, Pope said the Provost can start setting up contracts for people, which is something his office wants to do very quickly.

Motion to adopt the following proposed changes to the Nontenure-Track Policy was made by Wortman:

To change under #7: Under "Lecturer and Clinician: a limited term full or part-time appointment of from one to three years," make it "one semester to three years."

To replace #8: Consistent with shared governance, the Faculty Senate will monitor compliance with the recommended caps and will review applications for exceptions forwarded from the Provost. Other related policy issues will be addressed by the FDAR Council with the Provost in attendance as a voting member.

In discussing the proposed changes to the nontenure-track policy, Duffy asked for an explanation of the difference between the way the policy is written now and the way it will appear with the changes. Pope responded that at its last meeting the Executive Board passed a resolution granting the Provost a vote. Hutter stated that the Provost should not be a voting member of any Faculty Senate Committee or Council. This is neither, said Pope, who explained that the administration was concerned about shared governance and wanted a voice about exceptions and this is why the Executive Board passed the resolution letting the FDAR Council be the committee to consider exceptions. Duffy responded that the Provost then will be voting on what will be forwarded to the Provost.

Motion made by Hutter to reconsider the resolution passed by the Executive Board at its 1/15 meeting to make the Provost a voting member of the committee to consider exceptions, comprised of the members of the FDAR Council.

Pope reminded the Executive Board that a motion is already on the floor and suggested that the matter be sent back to the Conference Committee and to the Office of the Provost for further discussion. (Members on the Conference Committee include Susan Carlson, Paul Tanaka, Christie Pope, Max Wortman, and Dave Hopper.) Pope suggested that it be held over until the February 5th meeting of the Executive Board.

V. Review of the Office of Student Affairs by John Schuh

John Schuh introduced two members of his committee present at today's meeting of the Executive Board, Janice Dana and Eric Hoiberg, and stated that the other members include J. Herman Blake, Lisa Dlouhy (student), Bev Kruempel, Katie Rau (student), and Levin Saunders. Schuh also reviewed the committee's charge.

Motion by Wortman to move into Executive Session to review the office of Vice President of Student Affairs with the Chair and members of the committee was passed with the stipulation that summary minutes be kept separately.

* * *

Motion for the Executive Board to go out of Executive Session was passed.

Motion made by Wortman to thank John Schuh and members of his committee for their exemplary service and to acknowledge it by sending a letter to each DEO or appropriate person was passed.

Hutter suggested that the letter also be sent to the Provost and appropriate administrators.

Schuh commented that the quality of the commitment of the committee working on this review was extraordinary. Almost no one ever missed a meeting, he said, which is a measure of how seriously members of the committee undertook this responsibility. To Duffy's question about why student participation was so low, Schuh responded that they would attend only if issues were of interest to them.

Motion to send letter to the Provost and to appropriate administrators commending members of the committee that reviewed the Office of Student Affairs was passed.

Pope said that President Geoffroy believes this is one of the best reviews he has ever seen, and Janice Dana noted that the President sent a letter to every member of the committee.

VI. Report on University Professors by Paula Morrow

Professor Morrow noted that the committee was formed just this year, and that criteria for the award can be found on the Provost's web page. Members of the committee in addition to Paula Morrow, Chair, include the following: Shirley Gilmore, Doug Hurt, Michael Kenealy, James McKean, Emily Moore, Neal Nakadate, Shirlee Singer, Dean Ulrich, and LeeAnne Willson.

Motion by Pope that the Executive Board go into Executive Session to discuss University Professor appointments was passed.

* * *

Motion by Pope to go out of Executive Session was passed.

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