

**Faculty Senate Executive Board  
Minutes of the Meeting  
5 February 2002  
107 Lab of Mechanics**

[Unapproved minutes]

**Call to Order:**

The meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Board was called to order by Christie Pope, President, at 3:10 p.m. in 107 Lab of Mechanics on February 5, 2002.

**Attendance:**

**Present:** Sanjeev Agarwal (BUS Caucus Chair), Susan Carlson (Associate Provost), 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 (ISU Faculty Senate Past-President), Jim Hutter (LAS Caucus Chair), Gregory Palermo (FDAR Council Chair), Christie Pope (ISU Faculty Senate President), Max Porter (Governance Council Chair), Connie Post (Faculty Senate Secretary), Rollin Richmond (Provost), William Woodman (RPA Council Chair), and Max Wortman (ISU Faculty Senate President-Elect).

**Guests:** Liz Allen, Reporter for *The Tribune* of Ames, and Johnny Pickett, ISU Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance.

**I. Minutes:** The minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting on January 22, 2002 were approved.

**II. Consent Items**

- A Under New Business for today's meeting, withdraw item B.
- B Add waiver of degree requirements for a student killed by a drunk driver in a head-on crash.
- C Max Porter said he asked for two things under Governance Council, and we didn't get to them last time. In addition to those two items, he has two more.
- D Faculty Senate agenda for the February 12 meeting is as noted.

***Motion to approve agendas for the Executive Board meeting of 2/5 and the Faculty Senate meeting of 2/12 was passed.***

**III. Announcements**

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

**A. Announcements by Faculty Senate President Christie Pope**

1. Three more persons are needed for the 2/19 breakfast at the Knoll.
2. Bonnie Glantz, Chair of the Review of the Office of the Provost, has agreed to chair a brief review of the Provost, which will be done in April.
3. The University of Northern Iowa's Faculty Senate has agreed to support faculty representation on the Board of Regents. The Executive Council of the University of Iowa is taking it up today, and will present it to its Senate. Pope reported that she discussed the matter with Lisa Ahrens, who said she is opposed to the idea; however, after discussing it with Pope, Ahrens admitted it sounded intriguing. This probably means Ahrens is willing to reconsider the matter, says Pope, who added that she received a call from Barbara Finch, who is leading the way on this matter. Finch's bill is being looked at by a committee that meets at 8:15 tomorrow morning in the House Lounge for discussion, and Pope wondered if any Executive Board members could attend despite the short notice (the message about tomorrow's meeting was received today).
4. Pope said she has talked with the Provost about the concerns of the Executive Board concerning the nontenure-track policy and that he agrees it is fine to withdraw the phrase about the Provost having a vote.
5. The last ten minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting have been reserved for Carl Mize to present a resolution to rescind Jischke's name from the Honors Building.
6. Pope stated she would like to have a motion to go into closed executive session to apprise us in summary form of the review of the Officer of Student Affairs.

***Motion was made to go into closed executive session.*** Although Lisa Allen maintained that this has to be announced beforehand, Pope noted that she checked with Tanaka on this and that the booklet only applies to meetings of the Faculty Senate. James Hutter differed with Pope on the matter, saying he believed the rules applies to the Executive Board but that there is no rule that you have to announce it beforehand.

***Motion was made by Porter to postpone until Hutter returns to the room.***

**B. Announcements by Provost Richmond**

1. Provost Richmond thanked the Executive Board for its action on the Conduct Policy and noted the work done on it over a period of many years. He said it will be a very valuable document.

## Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

2. Richmond, who apprised the Executive Board of the budget situation, said that it looks increasingly likely that ISU will face an additional budget cut of 3-5%. Although it has not yet been decided on, the legislative liaisons say it looks very likely. President Geoffroy has taken steps to find those resources, reported Richmond, who said that big a cut will require the President to go to the units. Units are not spending at the usual rate, so there are resources there.

Q/A: Palermo asked if Richmond has conveyed this information to the deans and DEOs so they can resume high watch with respect to their cash, and Richmond said he did this a week ago when the matter first came up.

Q/A: To Porter's question about whether we are saving money on energy costs, given this mild winter, Richmond said Madden informs him the mild winter has enabled ISU to achieve considerable savings.

Q/A: Duffy asked what would be the total cut, and Richmond said an additional 3% might bring the total to 7-1/2% for this year. He noted that there is a political revenue group meeting this weekend, but it has no stature since it is not the official group.

Hutter returned to the meeting, and the Executive Board deliberated further about the motion to move into closed executive session. According to Hutter, he sees nothing that stipulates a 24-hour announcement before going into closed executive session.

### **Further Questions and Comments Directed to the Provost:**

Q/A: Hopper thanked Richmond for his help on the Conduct Policy, noting that without him it would not have happened.

### **Further Deliberations about Closed Executive Session:**

Pope asked the Executive Board what they wished to do about the matter of a closed executive session, and Hopper recommended that the Board do it. Pope therefore declared the motion active for a closed executive session.

*Motion to go into closed executive session was passed.* [Liz Allen leaves the room. The Executive Board discussed the performance of Tom Hill, Vice President of Student Affairs.]

*Motion to go out of closed executive session was passed.* [Liz Allen returns to the room.]

## **III. Council Reports**

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

- A. Academic Affairs Council.** Tony Hendrickson, Chair, brought several issues before the Board:
1. **Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching:** Having heard from the Task Force on Evaluation of Teaching, the Council voted to endorse the fundamental principles of the report on pages 5 and 6. Hendrickson noted that the Council's motion endorses the principles and reserve the right to endorse or not endorse specific methods of implementation.
  2. **Curriculum Committee:** The Curriculum Committee voted on two items: one, Item V. d. on today's agenda, to discontinue the Undergraduate Minor in Athletic Training, which the Council voted to bring forward; and two, Item V. e. on the agenda, a post-audit report in Performing Arts. Hendrickson, noting that both appear under new business, said that the post-audit report goes to the Board of Regents. Pope suggested we take these up now and that they be put on the Faculty Senate agenda for 2/12. The Curriculum Committee also recommends that a health science minor discontinued, said Hendrickson, who noted that the Council had reservations about dropping it. He also issued a caveat concerning the resolution about accepting student reservations.

*Motion to put on agenda for FS meeting on 2/12 the 10 principles of the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching is proposed.* [The Executive Board does not have the principles, and Hendrickson leave the room to xerox them. Meanwhile, the motion is put on hold.]

- B. FDAR Council.** Gregory Palermo, Chair, noted there is nothing but what is already on the agenda.
- C. Governance Council.** Max Porter, Chair, said there were two items left over from the last meeting. The first is an item forwarded to the Council by Pope concerning the Senate historian issue. Porter announced that the Governance Council passed a motion that the Faculty Senate should establish the position of Senate historian, and that the Council is now passing it on to the Executive Board for action. Wortman agreed with the recommendation, noting that he had just finished some archival work for one of his professional associations. To Hutter's question about why an historian is needed, Pope said the Faculty Senate needs a narrative of what us done so that it is not necessary to reinvent the wheel..

*[Motion to consider the ten principles of the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching is discussed, which returns the Executive Board to matters on the agenda under III. A. Academic Council:]*

- A. Academic Affairs Council: Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching.** Pope recalled that a few years ago, the president of the student body wanted some sort of student evaluations of courses and came to the Executive

## Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

Board to present his concern. The matter was taken up by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who took it to a Council led by Howard Shapiro.

Porter wondered if the Council addressed abuses in the student evaluation process, explaining that a student may make a negative evaluation that has nothing to do with the course or the pedagogy and that the professor has no recourse. Hendrickson responded that so far the Task Force has looked at bigger issues than that, including whether evaluations are used at all. Some colleges, said Hendrickson, do not. At ISU he noted that there has been less emphasis on formative evaluation and more on trying to develop a standardized syllabus and information that all students would have access to: Is it a lecture course? Are the exams typically multiple-choice?

So far, said Hendrickson, there has been more work done on areas of agreement about teaching than about implementing the instrument of evaluation. A year or year-and-a-half later, the Task Force has reached agreement on ten principles. Later one of the implementation steps will be to determine whether a common evaluation instrument is needed, Hendrickson pointed out, adding that there are related issues of reliability and validity. Noting that he and Gary Phye have a background in psychometric matters, Hendrickson said they have raised the issue about the same instrument eliciting split comments concerning the course and professor.

Pope noted LAS's finding that standardized teaching evaluations do not work, in part because students are looking for different things in a course and these are reflected in how they evaluate it. Most departments, said Pope, put syllabi on their web sites. According to Pope, the ten items discuss what makes good teaching, but do very little about helping students know how to choose actual courses. Hendrickson suggested that the ten items be viewed as a prequel, making it possible to first consider what common ground we have before going forward.

Phye said his perceptions are similar to Tony's: first the principles and later the implementation. Consider, said Phye, the standardized single form: Just as the 370 school districts in Iowa use no single instrument, ISU is not likely to find a single instrument that can be used in all the colleges. In fact, Phye stated, the biggest problem in considering data involving assessment is staff development at the DEO level: how do you use this data? Hendrickson noted that much work remains to be done, pointing out that the Council is trying to create a pilot program to put information to students out there in a standardized format: course content, professor's style, etc.

Expressing regret that the students have been let down a bit on this, Pope said it is not clear how much the develop of expansive principles has to do with what the students are looking for. Bill Woodman added that students want an on-line source with common items across the university, essentially consumer surveys to

## Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

be published every semester. This is ironic, noted Woodman, because students complain about being treated in a mass way yet they want the same thing in evaluating professors, predictability, etc., all of which lead to the McDonaldization of the university. Hendrickson said that many of the things put on line will focus on courses on the 200 and 300-level because that is where students have the greater number of choices. For many introductory courses, students are happy just to get into the course, observed Hendrickson, who also pointed out that at the higher level students have no choice because only one person is teaching the class.

Palermo addressed the ninth item, which states that feedback should have multiple measures, formative and summative. That statement, according to Palermo, suggests a university-wide requirement of both formative and summative. He also wondered if the Council considered the implications of #9. Hendrickson replied that the focus was probably more on the first part of the sentence -- that different departments will have different foci in evaluating teaching. Hutter asked if the sentence could read “some of which might be formative” and “some of which might be summative.” Phye said he would be happy with this, raising the matter of what happens if a professor does a formative evaluation in the 6th or 7th week that makes it necessary to change the course mid-semester?

An important question, said Pope, is whether you are trying to get surveys for the students or for the faculty members. If you have a mid-semester evaluation, Pope asked, are you going to put that on the web? If so, that doesn't help students in making a choice because they have already chosen. Phye, who praised Howard Shapiro for having drawn the big picture, said he believes the first order of business will be to create a web page for students that provides information about courses such as the number of exams, etc. Palermo proposed the addition of “may” to the sentence so that it reads ““may include.” Phye responded that he can accept that as a friendly amendment but is unable to do so on behalf of the entire Task Force. Porter stated that the Executive Board can accept it as a regular amendment.

***Palermo amends the Fundamental Principle #9 of the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching by replacing “should” with “may” to read as follows: “The information collected may include quantitative and qualitative information.” The amendment was seconded.***

Hutter then offered an amendment to the amendment:

***Motion to amend the amendment by striking “is” and replacing it with “might be” to read as follows: “The information collected should include quantitative and qualitative information, some of which may be formative (during the course) and some of which may be summative (at the end of the course). The motion was seconded and passed.***

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

Having amended Fundamental Principle #9, the Executive Board voted on the motion to forward the Fundamental Principles of the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching to the Faculty Senate.

*Motion to forward the amended Fundamental Principles of the Task Force on the Student Evaluation of Teaching was passed.*

**B. Governance Council.** Max Porter, Chair, resumed discussion of the matters already raised.

1. **Faculty Senate Historian:** The first item of leftover business, noted Porter, is the recommendation that the Faculty Senate establish the position of Faculty Senate historian. Hutter said he would be happier with this if there were a handout outlining the duties, how chosen; length of term, etc. Porter, who explained that the Council saw no need to waste time by working out the details unless there was an endorsement of the concept, said he would like the Executive Board to approve the recommendation and then send it back to the Council to work out the details.

*Motion to endorse and forward the recommendation to establish the position of Faculty Senate historian was passed.*

2. **Committee for Oversight of the Nontenure-track Policy:** Porter stated that the Governance Council recommends that the Executive Board form a committee for oversight of the nontenure-track policy. The committee, said Pope, could meet with Susan Carlson and Paul Tanaka to work out transition procedures. Hopper wondered if it might be useful to have at least one member of the original committee also serve on this committee. Wortman recommended that it be Hopper since he served as chair of the original committee. Hutter pointed out that the recommendation says the committee should include one faculty member from each college.

*Move to form transition committee for oversight of the nontenure-track policy was passed.*

3. **By-laws: Article VI, Section 1, Subsection B3:** Porter explained that this is coming forward because of the concern about rapid turnover and problems resulting from that. Porter praised Wortman for his work on this by-law, noting that it has been worked on by many persons. The desire to assure continuity, said Hutter, is an issue that came up when the by-laws were revised. Although the Council is supportive of the general notion that there is a problem with continuity, Porter identified two points of concern. First, it is hard to find a person to chair and to accept a two-year

## Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

term. The second is more serious: these two things envision that the person named to a committee is committed to three years.

According to Porter, what kept the Council from adopting a three-year term of appointment to committees is that people may not want to be appointed to a committee one year and stay on it for two more. Porter, who cautioned against trying to lock in what you hope to be a reasonable, normal process, said he wants to go with a two-year term for the chair but not a three-year term for members on the committee. Woodman pointed out that every year when the caucuses meet to elect new members, a Council sometimes is composed of entirely new members except for the chair. This is particularly a problem with RPA, said Woodman, because it deals with convoluted issues, and to get up to speed it makes no sense for them to spend only one year on the committee. Pope reminded the Board that issues dealing with governance will need to go on the agenda in March and stated her preference to take them up at the next Executive Board meeting. Porter added that the Council would like to put all of the governance issues together.

4. **Nominating Pools for Distinguished Professor and University Professor.** Porter asked if the proposed language for nominating members for the Distinguished Professor and University Professor nominating pools should go in the by-laws, the procedures document, or both? The relevant page has three items, with the second related to the Faculty Senate President and the third to standing committees. Palermo raised a point of order, stating that he wants these things to be mentioned when we approve the agenda.

- D. **Judiciary & Appeals Council.** Dorothy Fowles, Chair, said she will move her items to the next meeting.
- E. **RPA Council.** Bill Woodman, Chair, said there is nothing about the work of the Council that cannot be simply read in the minutes.

## IV. Old Business

### A. Nontenure-Track Policy

Pope reported that the disagreements have been resolved over the Provost having voting rights on the committee established to consider exceptions for the nontenure-track policy. The new statement reads as follows:

*Consistent with shared governance, the Faculty Senate will monitor compliance with the recommended caps and will review applications for exceptions*



Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

***forwarded from the Provost. Other related policy issues will be addressed by the FDAR Council with the Provost in attendance.***

In discussing the second point of the motion, Hutter said he cannot believe that these opportunities should be limited to master scholars and practitioners, and the Provost agreed. Hopper said the intent was not to get rid of “practitioner” and assured the Board that the document transitional force will address this issue. Hutter pointed out that even temporary appointments are short-term.

***Motion by Hutter to restore deleted words in point 2 of the motion was passed.***

Hutter: skipping #3, addressed the following matter under “Lecturer and Clinician” in #7: instead of the phrase “one to three years, and renewable for no more than a total of six years,” it should read “one semester to three years, and renewable for no more than a total of six years.” Noting that this is simply a clarification, Pope said it was not necessary for the Executive Board to vote on this change.

Under point #8 of the motion, Hutter suggested that the word “recommendations” be replaced with “caps”. Hopper said that #8 establishes an on-going policy for reviewing the caps without the process of going through the Senate, maintaining that the issue here is compliance with the caps. Fowles added that #8 is about exceptions, vis a vis caps. Palermo, noting that the choice of “recommendations” had been voted on, said that “caps” does not cover it whereas the current #8 covers the whole matter. Hopper disagreed, stating that the only place where exceptions to this policy will be allowed is in the case of caps.

***Motion is made and seconded to retain the word, “recommendations.”***

Hopper expressed concern that if this is done, it opens up the entire policy for modification, which was not the intent of the committee. Perhaps, said Hopper, “percentages” should be used rather than “caps”. Fowles said “recommendations” should be kept and “caps” crossed out and the following inserted under #8: “accept ... for exceptions.”

***Motion to call the question was passed.***

Janice Dana pointed out that the phrase, “from the Provost,” is left dangling in the sentence.

***Motion to retain the word, “recommendations,” was passed.***

***Motion by Fowles to include a reference in #8 to appointment limitations in #3 was passed.***

Pope called the attention of the Board to the final sentence in #8, and Fowles said the committee will wordsmith it.

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

Palermo stated that by taking out the word “teaching” in #1, this means that P&T will review Merit staff and all sorts of appointments. Hopper explained that the rationale is that these persons would have responsibilities other than teaching. In that case, said Palermo, why not use the word “faculty”.

*Motion is made to strike “teaching” and replace it with “faculty”.*

Fowles suggested that for the sake of consistency, the change be made in #4 too and in 1, 6, and 8 as well (and maybe more)--everywhere, in fact, that the phrase “nontenure-track” appears.

*Motion to delete “teaching” in #1 and add “faculty” there and in other places as well was passed.*

Concerning the language in #3, Pope stated that President Geoffroy feels strongly about keeping “subscribes to” but not “and will adhere to”. Hutter objected, noting that this is quite a change. Asked by Hutter if he would like to comment, the Provost responded that the President wants flexibility to respond to unforeseen possibilities and therefore does not want to have to slavishly adhere to AAUP guidelines. Since exceptions are permitted, said Hopper, ISU is not adhering to the AAUP policy anyway. Hutter concluded that in light of the Provost’s explanation, he will not move to change the language from “subscribe” to “adhere” because “subscribe” suggests a good faith effort to adhere.

*Motion to forward and endorse, as amended, the nontenure-track policy was passed.*

**B. Ombudsperson Proposal**

Dorothy Fowles, Chair of the Judiciary and Appeals Council that prepared this proposal, reminded the Board that at its meeting in January it moved to bring the matter to the Faculty Senate but did not have a chance to discuss it. Fowles stated that the committee wants the Executive Board to endorse the proposal as presented and noted that the only change to the proposal is the addition of a sentence about confidentiality under the first of the four major principles:

*Motion to forward and endorse, as amended, the proposal to establish the office of an ombudsperson was passed. The first bulleted item under confidentiality now reads as follows (added material is underlined):*

*The ombudsperson:*

*☛ does not disclose the identity of any individuals who have or have not contacted the office, without permission of the party or parties*

**C. Arrival of Children Policy** [this policy was scheduled for consideration before

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

ERIP, but instead was considered afterward in order for Johnny Pickett, a guest at the meeting, to participate in the discussion--given the lateness of the hour]

**D. ERIP. Pope introduced Johnny Pickett, Assistant Vice President for Business and Finance, and Palermo, FDAR Chair, presented the proposal.**

Palermo reported that W&B developed three recommendations, which are listed under B. in the document, "Options for a New ISU Early Retirement Incentive Plan (ERIP) Prepared by Faculty Senate Welfare & Benefits Committee, January 2002. He particularly noted the advocacy aspect in the second recommendation. Since ERIP is supposed to be a management tool, FDAR offers this as guidance, said Palermo, who noted that the rest of the 5-page memo from Madden is so complex--if not arcane--that to debate it on the floor of the Faculty Senate would be well-nigh impossible.

Pickett responded that Madden's committee and those who drafted the proposal probably do not disagree, and she acknowledged that there is some similarity between the W&B proposal and the guidelines of the Regents. What is not reflected here, said Pickett, are the financial constraints. Constraints of post-retirement costs are high with people going out at 61 or 62 getting benefits for 8 years with the age cap taken off.

That is a pragmatic problem, Palermo admitted, pointing out that it is the prerogative of the Faculty Senate to advocate the best policy for faculty. If this is a tool to save resources, asked Palermo, how can it not save money? According to Pickett, if you approve someone who is 57 or 61, you can't turn someone down who is 67; if you do, then you could "disincent" some people. Woodman thanked Pickett for enlightening him about the problems of the ISU Early Retirement policy that included more than just the 1998 federal decision.

Pope asked for a vote on ERIP, either to forward or to endorse and forward. She also stated that she wants to proceed with the Arrival of Children Policy but wishes to hold over the MGT America report, the posthumous degree, etc.

***Motion by Palermo to add the following: The Faculty Senate will have the opportunity to review and comment on the final plan.***

Hopper moved that the word "small" be stricken. Palermo, stating that he wants an "appeals process" in the ERIP document in addition to the appeals process already in place in general, emphasized that this proposal does not undo the current process. Hutter questioned the phrase, "gendered access" under B. 1. in the W&B "Options" document. That language is there, said Palermo, because in some instances more women than men apply for ERIP. Hutter reiterated his request that the phrase, "Gendered access," be deleted from B. 1. Under B. 2., he also recommended that the word "all" be added in front of "faculty" and the phrase, "in small departments and colleges and" be stricken and the following put in its place: "and which". This also would necessitate adding "-s" to "include" in

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

the sentence. It was also recommended that “available for all” be added to the end of the sentence, which, which now reads as follows:

*In addition, the Faculty Senate encourages the administration to design a program which assures access to early retirement resources by all faculty and staff and which includes a clearly spelled out appeals process available for all.*

Woodman said that keeping the option open to all is a major task, pointing out that the University of Iowa made it open to everyone and that this was a problem. It also creates a tax problem for many if it is a right rather than a management tool, added Woodman. Palermo addressed Hutter’s concern about the use of the word “small,” noting that B. 2. adds the word but that B. 2. must be considered along with B. 1. The concern is that there be an appeals process for all. Pope suggested that Hutter withdraw his earlier motion and allow Palermo to make the necessary changes that have been suggested.

*Move to endorse and forward, as amended, the Faculty Senate Welfare and Benefits Committee working paper on ERIP was passed.*

- C. Arrival of Children Policy.** Palermo, FDAR Chair, explained the document, noting a significant intervention here in stopping the tenure clock for elder care, etc., not just for children. Woodman suggested that more time be taken to develop the document. Post, however, reminded the Board that time is a luxury we cannot afford in this matter because President Geoffroy has set February 15 as the deadline for input about the policy. To meet that deadline, recommendations about the policy must be considered by the Senate at its 2/12 meeting.

*Motion by Michael Duffy to forward with endorsement the FDAR recommendations for the Arrival of Children Policy was passed.*

**V. New Business**

- A. MGT-America Report [tabled until the next Executive Board meeting]**
- B. Proposal to Institute Reading Week (Tofilon and Schmidt) [tabled until the next Executive Board meeting.]**
- C. Proposal to Rescind the Name of the Honors Building (Mize, Robyt, Hall)**

*Motion was made by Dorothy Fowles to put the Mize, Robyt, Hall motion on the agenda for the 2/12 Faculty Senate meeting.*

Hendrickson stated that he finds the motion mean-spirited, noting that no one is canonizing Jischke--but only naming a building after him. Pointing out that the motion refers to the former ISU President as Mr. Jischke, Hendrickson said the framers of the motion should show more courtesy by saying Dr. Jischke.

## Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

According to Hutter, a minority portion of the ISU community does not want Jischke's name on the building, and the problem is that this was crammed through. Suggesting that the matter be postponed, Hutter said he does not want to send it to the Faculty Senate at this time.

When Pope asked if the Executive Board is not obligated to put a senator's motion on the floor, Duffy said he would speak against the motion to delay because it is not the responsibility of the Executive Board to say that a group cannot put a motion forward. Hutter countered that the new Senate Constitution and by-laws explicitly took up the subject of the role of Executive Board, saying it can amend resolutions or reject them totally. A second procedure, said Hutter, is to have a senator bring a resolution to the floor him- or herself.

Pope stated the motion to postpone had not been seconded, at which point Hendrickson moved to second Hutter's motion. Porter added that the Board needs to look at the timing here, and Palermo noted that postponing allows those who drafted the motion to assert themselves and stand up. If not on the agenda, said Porter, then the drafters of the motion have to go through hoops to put it there. There will likely be some angry folks, Pope commented, if they are not given a chance. According to Hendrickson, some people object that five years had not elapsed before the building was named. He stated, however, that he talked with someone who said the committee decided to waive that rule and that it was within its purview to do so.

***Motion to postpone placing the matter of rescinding the name of the Honors Building failed, and discussion of Fowles' motion to put the matter on the agenda resumed. A vote on the motion to place the proposal on the 2/12 Faculty Senate agenda was 6-6, and when taken again the vote was 7-6. The motion was passed.***

Hutter urged the Executive Board to get ride of the ad hominem arguments before sending the motion to the Faculty Senate. Concerned about what it means if the Executive Board modifies the motion, Palermo asked whether modifying it means the motion becomes the position of the Executive Board. Although Hutter pointed out that he did not include the word "endorse" in his motion, Fowles maintained that if the Executive Board changes the motion, then it is endorsing it. At this point Porter reminded the Board that Hutter's motion is to amend the proposal by Mize, Robyt, and Hall.

***Motion to amend the proposal by Mize, Robyt, and Hall to rescind the name of the Honors Building passes with 7 voting to amend and 5 not to amend. The amended proposal reads as follows:***

***Whereas the Honors Building at Iowa State University, presently under construction, is to be named the Martin Jischke Honors Building, and***

Minutes of the 2/5/02 Faculty Senate Executive Board Meeting

***Whereas the policy of Iowa State University is that buildings not to be named after an ex-university official for at least five years after the official leaves the university,***

***Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate opposes the naming of the Honors Building after Martin Jischke at this time.***

Pope stated that Fowles' motion, as amended, forwards the motion to the Faculty Senate for consideration but does not endorse it. Palermo stated his wish to have his vote recorded in the negative, and Hopper, Hendrickson, Wortman, and Fowles joined Palermo in his request.

Motion to adjourn at 5:45 p.m. was passed.

Constance Post,  
Faculty Senate Secretary